CHAPTER 6.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

In many cases, the impact of a single project may not be significant, but the cumulative impact may be significant when combined with other projects. Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) states that "the discussion [of cumulative impacts] need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone." Section 15130(b) further states that a cumulative impacts discussion "should be guided by standards of practicality and reasonableness."

Cumulative impacts can occur from the interactive effects of a single project. For example, the combination of noise and dust generated during construction activities can be additive and can have a greater impact than either noise or dust alone. However, substantial cumulative impacts more often result from the combined effect of past, present, and future projects located in proximity to the project under review. Therefore, it is important for a cumulative impacts analysis to be viewed over time and in conjunction with other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future developments, the impacts of which might compound or interrelate with those of the project under review.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b)(1)(A) allows for the preparation of a "list of past, present, and probable future projects" as a viable method of determining cumulative impacts. This discussion utilizes that approach: an initial list and description of related projects, followed by a discussion of the effects that the project (combined with the list) may have on each environmental category of concern (e.g., traffic and noise). Consistent with CEQA, this discussion is guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness.

The locations of the cumulative projects are depicted in *Figure 6-1*, *Cumulative Project Locations*. A brief description of each cumulative project is presented below in *Table 6-1*, *Cumulative Projects*; the numbers in the list correspond to the locations shown in *Figure 6-1*.

Table 6-1
Cumulative Projects

No.	Project Title	Brief Project Description	Status
1	Spectrum Center	Construction of 1,568 dwelling units (DU), 3,689,000 square feet of commercial, and 360,000 square feet of industrial space.	72% constructed
2	Medical Examiner	Construction of office space totaling 84,000 square feet	Approved
3	San Diego County Operations Center	Construction of office space totaling 874,000 square feet	55% occupied
4	Kyocera	Construction of office space totaling 104,000 square feet	In review
5	National University	Construction of Commercial space totaling 54,500 square feet	Completed

Table 6-1
Cumulative Projects

No.	Project Title	Brief Project Description	Status
6	Fairfield Residential	Residential development of 288 DU	Completed
7	Kearny Mesa Community Sign	Gateway sign for the community of Kearny Mesa located at Kearny Villa Road and MiraBella	Approved to begin construction in July 2013
8	Ruffin Rd./Murphy Canyon Rd. Bikeway Project	This project will install 3.25 miles of Class II Bikeways from Kearny Villa Road to Murphy Canyon Road and upgrade the existing Class III facility on Murphy Canyon Road between Aero Drive to city limits that will connect to Murphy Canyon Road Bikeway	Post Construction/ Completed
9	Balboa Ave./Tierrasanta Blvd Bikeway	This project provides for the installation of approximately 13.5 miles of Class II bike lanes on Balboa Avenue from Morena Boulevard to Santo Road.	Post Construction/ Completed
10	S-163/Clairemont Mesa Blvd. Interchange Project	The Phase I of the project consisted of bridge widening and ramp realignment on the eastern side of the interchange which has been completed. Phase II consists of ramp realignment on the western side.	Design to begin construction in June 2013
11	Kearny Villa Road Bike Lane Improvements	This project provides for the resurfacing and repair of damaged bicycle lanes on Kearny Villa Road.	Post Construction/ Completed
12	Kearny Mesa Trunk Sewer	Kearny Mesa Trunk Sewer (TS #17) was originally built in the early 1960s with 40% upgraded pipelines in the late 1970s and approximately 11.5 miles long. It is located in the Kearny Mesa, Serra Mesa, Birdland, and Mission Valley East communities, District 6. The size of the pipe varies from 12 to 36 inches in diameter. The pipe material is vitrified clay and polyvinyl chloride. The trunk sewer is proposed to be replaced along 11,300 feet, and is proposed to be rehabilitated along 11,700 feet.	Proposed
13	Tierrasanta Temporary pump station upgrade	The Tierrasanta Temporary pump station has four constant-speed pumps (two are 20 horsepower (hp) rated at 132 gallons per minute (gpm); two are 40 HP rated at 850 gpm), and pumps from the Kearny Mesa 600 zone to the Tierrasanta 752 zone. This PS is located at 11100 Clairemont Mesa Blvd.	Proposed
14	Serra Mesa Library	This project provides for a 15,000-square-foot library on City-owned property located on the 8900 block of Aero Drive in the Serra Mesa and Kearny Mesa Communities	Completed
15	Fire Station #36 Reconstruction	This project provides for the renovation of fire station #36 on Chateau Drive.	Planned
16	Sunroad Centrum II	This project is about 250,000 square feet and is classified as the second tower in the Sunroad Centrum Center which consists of 379-unit, 2-building project, including a 750-space parking structure.	Construction
17	Palladium at Aero	The Palladium at Aero project includes a maximum of 360 apartments and almost 5,200 square feet of retail space on 7.5 acres at Aero Drive and Sandrock Road. It would replace four single- and two-story buildings set far back from the road with buildings of up to six levels.	Approved
18	Mira Bella, formerly Parkview at Aero Drive	Approximately 288 residential condominium units with 29 affordable units and 20,000 square feet of office space on a 6.11 acre site at 3540 Aero Court	Completed

Table 6-1
Cumulative Projects

No.	Project Title	Brief Project Description	Status
19	Verizon Wireless Communications Facility (WCF)	The WCF consists of a 50-foot tall monopine supporting twelve (12) panel antennas, and two (2) Global Positioning System (GPS) antenna; and a 184-square-foot prefabricated equipment building, and 312-square-foot equipment enclosure containing the monopine and a 30 kilowatt (kW) enclosed emergency generator with a 150-gallon diesel tank.	Approved
20	Interstate 15 (I-15) Managed Lanes	4 managed lanes with moveable barrier (ML/MB) from State Route 56 (SR 56) to SR 52, and 2 managed lanes from SR 52 to I-8	Funding Allocated
21	SR 52 Managed Lanes	2 managed lanes from Interstate 805 (I-805) to I-15, and 2 managed lanes with general purpose lane improvements from I-15 to SR 125	Funding Allocated
22	I-15/SR 52 interchange	HOV Connectors	Funding Allocated
23	I-805 Managed Lanes	4 managed lanes from SR 905 to Carrol Canyon Rd.	Funding Allocated

6.1 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

6.1.1 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION AND PARKING

The traffic analysis presented in *Section 5.2, Transportation/Circulation and Parking*, includes a cumulative traffic scenario for the year 2035, which includes the cumulative projects and other development expected under the Kearny Mesa Community Plan. As stated therein, two freeway segments and one ramp meter would have significant cumulative impacts: I-15—Clairemont Mesa Boulevard to Balboa Avenue and I-15—Balboa Avenue to Aero Drive.

Since there is no currently programmed and funded improvement plan for the impacted segments of I-15, the two identified freeway segment impacts would be cumulatively significant and unavoidable. One ramp meter at Clairemont Mesa Boulevard to southbound I-15 was also identified as having a cumulative impact. The Clairemont Mesa Boulevard to southbound I-15 on-ramp currently has one high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane and two single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) lanes and is built to its ultimate configuration; therefore, no feasible mitigation is available. Impacts would remain cumulatively significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, under the Year 2035 Plus Full Project Buildout scenario, four intersections would have significant cumulative impacts, as follows.

- Clairemont Mesa Boulevard/Ruffin Road (Intersection)
- Clairemont Mesa Boulevard/Murphy Canyon Road (Intersection)

- Balboa Avenue/Ruffin Road (Intersection)
- Viewridge Avenue /Balboa Avenue (Intersection)

The project's contribution to these intersections would be mitigated to less than significant upon implementation of the mitigation measures identified in *Section 5.2*.

Overall, combined with other reasonably foreseeable projects and with the implementation of mitigation, the project's contribution to the cumulative condition would remain cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Refer to *Section 5.2* for a complete discussion of the project's cumulative effects on traffic and circulation.

6.1.2 AIR QUALITY

As discussed in *Section 5.3, Air Quality*, construction emissions from the project would exceed the City's significance thresholds for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). Mitigation measures, as identified in *Section 5.3*, would reduce construction-related NO_x emissions; however, even with incorporation of these mitigation measures, NO_x emissions are anticipated to be above the threshold. Construction impacts are therefore considered significant and unavoidable. Operational emissions would exceed the City's significance thresholds for NO_x, carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) primarily due to motor vehicle emissions and stationary source emissions, specifically operation of the emergency generators during testing. With incorporation of mitigation measures as identified in *Section 5.3*, impacts would still remain significant for these emissions.

The cumulative effect of the project and other projects in the vicinity would incrementally contribute to the San Diego Air Basin's (SDAB's) levels of PM_{10}, reactive organic gas, NO_x, carbon monoxide, ozone (O_3), and sulfur dioxide (SO_2). The SDAB is in nonattainment for $PM_{10,}$ and the project's operation emissions would exceed the significance threshold for PM_{10}. Additionally, due to construction of cumulative projects during the same time frame, the area will experience increased emissions due to construction activities, equipment, and increased traffic. As such, the project's impacts would be cumulatively considerable. As stated in *Section 5.3*, no mitigation is available to reduce $PM_{10,}$ NO_x, and CO emissions to a level less than significant. Therefore, as analyzed in detail in *Section 5.3*, the project's impacts would be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

6.1.3 GREENHOUSE GASES

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are said to result in an increase in the Earth's average surface temperature, commonly referred to as "global climate change." Global climate change, by definition, is cumulative as it is the result of combined worldwide contributions of GHGs to the

atmosphere over many years. Impacts associated with the project discussed in *Section 5.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, also serve as the project's cumulative impact analysis.

The GHG analysis prepared for the project determined that the project would increase/reduce GHG emissions by 17.5%. The estimated GHG emissions associated with the project are derived from vehicular traffic, area sources, stationary sources, electrical generation, water supply, and solid waste, as shown in *Table 5.4-5, Estimated Net Change in GHG Emissions*. The project has incorporated sustainable features into the project design to reduce its overall emissions, as identified in *Table 3-3, Project Design Features*, in *Chapter 3.0, Project Description*. The project design features reflect the types of emissions reduction measures recommended by public agencies to reduce the magnitude of GHG emissions and help California achieve its statewide goals. Furthermore, technology will likely improve over time, with implementation of future phases of the master plan, serving to further reduce GHG emissions.

However, even with the features presented in *Table 3-3*, the project would not achieve the target of 28.3% below the business-as-usual scenario that has been established for the purposes of assessing the GHG emissions of projects in the City. This is also due to the uniqueness of hospital facilities, which are not generally subject to energy-efficiency requirements applied to other non-residential building types, such as those specified in California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 6. Hospitals are also required to meet other state laws related to ventilation and air exchanges, resulting in increased energy needs. Therefore, as analyzed in detail in *Section 5.4*, the project's impacts would be cumulatively considerable, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

6.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Based on the analyses contained in *Chapter 5.0* of this EIR, the project's contribution to cumulative land use, noise, energy, paleontological resources, biological resources, health and safety, visual effects and neighborhood character, geologic conditions, hydrology/water quality, public utilities, and public service and facilities impacts would not be cumulatively considerable, as analyzed below.

6.2.1 LAND USE

The project would be consistent with the City's General Plan and Kearny Mesa Community Plan land use designations, and zoning. The project's Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would allow for hospital use within the Light-Industrial IL-2-1 zone, and the Planned Development Permit (PDP) would enable the project to exceed the maximum .50 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) allowed within the Kearny Mesa Community Plan. A Site Development Permit (SDP) would allow for development of the site, which contains environmentally sensitive lands along the slopes, on- and off-site, adjacent to Clairemont Mesa Boulevard. A variance is also needed to allow for two retaining walls along Clairemont Mesa Boulevard which, to accommodate the widening of the roadway, will be up to 20 feet high, and thus exceed the 9-foot height maximum. Cumulative projects

within the Kearny Mesa Community Plan area would also be required to comply with the City General Plan and the Kearny Mesa Community Plan. Projects that are not consistent with the General Plan land use designation or zoning would require implementation of a General Plan amendment, community plan amendment, and/or zone change. Projects that require a General Plan amendment and/or community plan amendment are required to demonstrate conformance with pertinent goals, policies, and recommendations. *Table 5.1-1, Project's Conformance with City of San Diego's 2008 General Plan*, and *Table 5.1-2, Project's Conformance with the City of San Diego Kearny Mesa Community Plan*, located in *Section 5.1, Land Use*, provide an analysis of the project's land use consistency. As demonstrated, the project would not result in a significant cumulative impact due to an inconsistency or conflict with an adopted land use plan, land use designation, or policy.

6.2.2 NOISE

As described in *Section 5.5, Noise*, temporary noise from construction activities would exceed the City's threshold for on-site sensitive receptors, but would be temporary and therefore not cumulatively considerable. The project-generated traffic noise would be in compliance with applicable laws and ordinances after implementation of project design features listed in *Table 3-3*. Noise from the project's on-site uses, such as mechanical equipment at the proposed utility yards, would be mitigated to below a level of significance. Over time, as cumulative development continues, the ambient noise level would increase due to an increase in traffic volumes and a general increase in urban activity/human presence. For example, proposed residential projects in the area that have yet to be constructed would add to the ambient noise level in the community due to traffic and increased urban activity/human presence. However, the project and all cumulative projects are located in a highly urbanized area, and all future projects would be required to adhere to the City's noise thresholds. As such, the project would not cumulatively increase noise levels in conjunction with the other reasonably foreseeable projects. Though the project would result in a significant and unavoidable noise impact to interior noise levels due to construction, this would be temporary in nature and would not contribute to a cumulative considerable noise condition. Cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

6.2.3 PALEONTOLOGY

As discussed in *Section 5.6, Paleontological Resources*, there is the potential for paleontological resources to occur on site. On-site monitoring during grading and submittal of a monitoring results report is required along with fossil recovery and curation. Monitoring would be required for any future project in the Kearny Mesa Community Plan area that has the potential to impact such resources. Implementation of a paleontological mitigation program would avoid or reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

Cumulative projects that require substantial excavation, such as roadway projects, have the potential to result in adverse impacts to paleontological resources. Projects on state or public lands would be required to comply with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097–5097.6. Other cumulative projects would be regulated by state and location regulations. As such, any significant paleontological resource impacts as a result of the project or other future projects would be mitigated on a project-by-project basis; impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

6.2.4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As discussed in *Section 5.7, Biological Resources*, development of the project and off-site traffic improvements would result in direct impacts to sensitive upland habitats (i.e., Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan Tier I through Tier III), which are considered significant and require mitigation. The project would directly permanently impact approximately 0.4 acre of coastal sage scrub habitat (Tier II). Additionally, there is moderate potential for one raptor species to forage on site, Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) (state-listed Watch List species, MSCP covered). Mitigation measures, as stated in *Section 5.7*, would reduce these impacts to less than significant. Appropriate mitigation would be required for any future project in the Kearny Mesa Community Plan area that has the potential to impact such resources. Implementation of the City's MSCP would help to ensure a regional conservation effort and protect biological resources. Additionally, any significant biological resource impacts as a result of the project or other future projects would be mitigated on a project-by-project basis; impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

6.2.5 ENERGY

The project would result in an increased demand for energy resources, as discussed in *Section 5.8, Energy*. Hospitals are not generally subject to energy-efficiency requirements, such as those specified in Title 24, as they are required to meet other state laws related to ventilation and air exchanges, resulting in increased energy needs. However, in order to partially offset these increased energy needs, the project has incorporated sustainable features into the project design to reduce its electricity use; refer to *Table 3-3*. Water conservation measures identified in *Table 3-3* would also serve to reduce the amount of electricity needed to supply water to the project site. With these conservation measures, the project would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on energy supplies due to the use of excessive amounts of electricity, natural gas, or petroleum.

6.2.6 HEALTH AND SAFETY

The project, in combination with other cumulative projects, is not expected to significantly increase impacts related to health and safety. Measures to ensure that construction and operation activities related to the project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment are discussed in *Section 5.9, Health and Safety*. Per mitigation measure HS-4, both a Medical Waste Management Plan and the Hazardous Materials Business Plan will be

prepared or updated prior to receiving a certificate of occupancy for each of the buildings on the site. With implementation of mitigation measure HS-4, impacts associated with the accidental handling, storage, disposal, or release of hazardous materials, including hazardous medical waste at the proposed hospital campus once operational, would be less than significant.

The project site is located in a highly developed urban area and is surrounded by development. The property is not within or adjacent to an area designated as within City's "Very High Fire Hazards Severity Zone" (City of San Diego 2009). Due to the proposed development of the site, which includes paved areas around the site perimeter, no native habitat areas, and fully irrigated landscaping, as well as the surrounding fully developed sites, the risk of wildfire on the site is considered low. For these reasons, the proposed development of the site as a hospital would not result in an increase in risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Impacts related to wildland fires at the site would be less than significant. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact related to the health and safety of the public and surrounding environment.

6.2.7 VISUAL EFFECT AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Aesthetics and Neighborhood Character

As analyzed in *Section 5.10, Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character*, the project would not result in significant visual or neighborhood character impacts. The project would be consistent with existing patterns of development, which include commercial, office, and light industrial uses to the north; the Polinsky Children's Center (child welfare services and residential care, including education and crisis intervention) and office buildings to the east; restaurants and commercial retail uses to the west; and the Chinese Bilingual Preschool, office buildings, and light industrial/manufacturing uses to the south.

Though the project would add height and bulk on site with proposed new structures, cohesive landscaping, building articulation, and stepped rooflines would reduce the perceived bulk and scale of the buildings. The character of the buildings is classic modern, which would not conflict with the surrounding environment that is commercial and industrially based. The exterior wall of the building would be a metal and glass system that is panelized to provide scale and crisp detail to the smooth surfaces. Fin-type sunscreens would provide shading of the glass areas facing east, south, and west and provide a depth to the building façade's appearance while also providing additional visual detail and interest due to shade/shadow cast patterns. Though light blue in color with a silver-like accent color for the window surrounds and sun-screens, the building's exterior would also take on the colors of the surrounding landscape and sky. Therefore, because the project's architecture would provide visual interest with a modern, sophisticated design that would not starkly contrast with adjacent development and because the project would not conflict with the development regulations set forth in the City's Municipal Code, impacts would be less than significant.

Implementation of cumulative projects would continue to add to the sense of an urban community. Since the project site and surrounding area consist of a built-up urban node, the cumulative development would not represent a substantial cumulative degradation in visual quality. While neighborhood character would continue to change over time, cumulative impacts as a result of implementation of the project are considered to be less than significant.

Lighting and Glare

The project area is in a highly dense urban node that already exhibits several major lighting sources, such as lighting along major roadways (e.g. Ruffin Road and Clairemont Mesa Boulevard). The existing site currently includes lighting around buildings, along walkways, and in parking areas for safety and security reasons. Other significant sources of light in the area include other commercially developed properties. The project would include exterior lighting for safety and security purposes that would be shielded and would be in compliance with existing regulations. The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. Given these factors, the contribution of light emitted from the project's hospital buildings would be less than significant. The project and cumulative projects are also subject to the City's Outdoor Lighting Regulations. As such, the project, combined with other reasonably foreseeable projects in the immediate vicinity, would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact relative to light pollution.

The project would incorporate large window area glazing in a natural glass color that has less than 30% reflectance (approximately 26% reflectance). As a result, the reflection of natural or artificial light off of the structural façade would not represent a safety impact to motorists on surrounding roadways. The project and cumulative projects in the area would be designed in accordance with the State of California Building Code and Municipal Code requirements. The project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, and therefore, when considered cumulatively with other reasonably foreseeable projects in the project vicinity, would not result in significant cumulative impacts associated with light and glare in the community.

6.2.8 GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS

Proper engineering design, utilization of standard construction practices, adherence to the erosion control standards established by the City's Grading Ordinance, implementation of best management practices (BMPs) required by the stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), and implementation of the recommendations found in the Geotechnical Report (GEOBASE INC. 2012) would ensure that the potential for geological impacts resulting from the project would be less than significant. In addition, implementation of grading BMPs required by the project's SWPPP would ensure that the potential for impacts would be less than significant. The site has very low erosion potential, and any on-site geologic hazards would be avoided by standard remedial grading measures and would not combine with any off-site hazards to create cumulative geologic impacts.

6.2.9 HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

The project site currently consists of asphalt paved parking lots and one 330,000-square-foot building associated with the County of San Diego Public Works. Approximately 19 acres of the 20-acre project site (95%) are comprised of impervious surfaces. Proposed improvements include the construction of new buildings, realignment of parking lots and drive aisles, as compared to pre-development conditions, and the installation of new landscaped areas. The proposed landscaped areas (medians and bioretention areas) will effectively reduce the project site runoff coefficient, as compared to pre-development conditions. Approximately 17 acres of the 20-acre project site (85%) would be comprised of impervious surfaces after construction of the project, a reduction of 10% as compared to existing conditions (RBF 2013). Proposed improvements will not negatively impact the project site in terms of hydrology or hydraulics.

As discussed in *Section 5.12 Hydrology/Water Quality*, the project requires additional storm drain infrastructure that will be installed, including perforated sub-drains for bioretention and porous pavement areas, a proposed storm drain system, grate drains, curb inlets, and headwalls. The project site drainage area will not be negatively impacted by the proposed development. In fact, the project would control and therefore beneficially impact drainage conditions on the project site and no impact would occur. Therefore, the project would decrease the rate or volume of surface runoff, while providing new conveyance infrastructure. No impacts to hydrology would result.

The project does not represent a substantial additional source of polluted runoff. The project is not anticipated to cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses. The project would not result in ponded water and impacts related to an increase in pollutant discharge would be reduced to less than significant through compliance with regional and local permit requirements and implementation of BMPs. Implementation of the site design, source control, and treatment control measures identified in the *Kaiser Permanente Central Hospital Medical Center Preliminary Water Quality Technical Report*, prepared by RBF Consulting on May 8, 2012 (provided as *Appendix K* to this EIR) would ensure water quality impacts remain at a level less than significant.

The project, in conjunction with other future projects, may potentially affect water quality on a cumulative scale; however, future projects are required to comply with applicable federal, state, and City regulations for stormwater and construction discharges, including the application of BMPs, which would reduce cumulative impacts to water quality to a level below significance. The project would implement BMPs and project-specific measures to reduce potential effects. The project would be in compliance with state and City water quality standards. Thus, the project would not combine with existing urban runoff or that of cumulative projects. Compliance with stormwater standards would preclude a cumulatively considerable contribution to downstream water quality.

6.2.10 PUBLIC UTILITIES

Solid Waste

According to the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (City of San Diego 2011), cumulative impacts to solid waste facilities would be significant if the project includes the construction, demolition, and/or renovation of 40,000 square feet or more of building space. Additionally, "cumulative project impacts are mitigated by the implementation of a project-specific Waste Management Plan (WMP), which reduces solid waste impacts to below a level of significance." The project meets the City's 40,000-square-foot threshold. A WMP for the project has been prepared (included as *Appendix M*). Implementation of the WMP would ensure that the project would reduce waste by a minimum of 75% of construction- and demolition-related waste, and implement waste reduction measures during the occupancy phase of the project. The measures identified in the WMP, when implemented, would ensure that potential impacts to solid waste management facilities, including landfills, materials recovery facilities and transfer stations, and services, including collection, would be below a level of significance. Some of the projects in the cumulative project list would contribute to solid waste and impact landfill capacity waste management facilities, and waste management services. However, these projects and the project would each be required to prepare a WMP and comply with City ordinances. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively significant impact, and impacts would be less than significant.

Water and Wastewater

Cumulative impacts may result from water demand that exceeds pertinent requirements. As detailed in *Section 5.13*, *Public Utilities*, the project's water conservation design features would help in the reduction of the unanticipated demand of the project and further ensure that the existing water system would have the capacity to serve the project site. Cumulative projects would be required to adhere to the City's current Urban Water Management Plan and, therefore, are not expected to result in significant impacts to the City's water supply.

Regarding wastewater capacity, the addition of the approximately 192,000 gallons per day (gpd) of sewage during wet weather from the project represents an increase of approximately 0.106% over the approximately 180 million gpd of wastewater processed by the Metropolitan Sewerage System. The Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Facility has excess capacities of 240 million gpd (City of San Diego 2012). As discussed in *Section 5.10*, this treatment facility has sufficient capacity for the project. Cumulative projects would be required to demonstrate that adequate wastewater capacity can be provided. As such, the project, in combination with other reasonably foreseeable projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact related to water or wastewater.

Stormwater Drainage

Cumulative projects would result in an increase in impervious surfaces that would increase stormwater runoff volumes. The construction or expansion of stormwater drainage facilities may be required. However, most future stormwater drainage facilities would be required to conduct environmental review pursuant to CEQA. In addition, regulations such as the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, California Water Code, and Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act would reduce the potential for a significant cumulative impact to occur relative to stormwater drainage facilities. The project would not significantly alter the existing drainage patterns and would result in an overall decrease in surface runoff from the site. Therefore, the project, in combination with other future cumulative projects, would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact related to stormwater drainage.

Electricity and Natural Gas

Per the City's CEQA Significance Thresholds, San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) continuously forecasts future energy demands to ensure that infrastructure capacity can meet demand. Where projects with large power loads are planned, these new large power loads are considered by SDG&E together with other existing or anticipated future loads in the project vicinity, and electrical substations are upgraded or new substations are built if the capacities of existing substations are exceeded. To accommodate the increase in energy use at the site the project includes an SDG&E yard that would be constructed in the southeastern corner of the site south of the Energy Center and loading dock. The new SDG&E yard would be approximately 39 feet by 41 feet (or 1,600 square feet) and would be a fully enclosed exterior structure with a wall height of approximately 18 feet. Since the project would be constructed over several years through two phases, SDG&E would have ample notice to appropriately plan and review for the increases in energy demand at the site and manage the infrastructure, including the on-site yard. Overall, impacts to SDG&E's ability to service the project are expected to be less than significant and, with the project's on-site SDG&E service yard, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts to SDG&E's ability to maintain service in the project area would be less than significant.

6.2.11 PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

As detailed in *Section 5.14, Public Services and Facilities*, the project would not involve an incremental increase in demand for parks, libraries, or schools. Regarding fire protection services, with the services of two fire stations in the project site, the project would be served by sufficient fire protection services and would not generate the need for a new or expanded fire station in the project area. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulatively significant impacts relative to schools, libraries, parks, police protection, and fire protection, and impacts would be less than significant.

Path: Z:\Projects\737201\MAPDOC\MAPS\EIR Figs\Figure6_1_CumulativeProjectLocations.mxd

DUDEK

6986

SOURCE: DigitalGlobe 2008

FIGURE 6-1

Cumulative Project Locations

KAISER CENTRAL SAN DIEGO HOSPITAL EIR

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 7.0 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR briefly describe potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant and therefore were not discussed in detail in the EIR. The environmental issues discussed in the following sections are not considered significant, and the reasons for the conclusion of non-significance are discussed below.

7.1 AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

The project site is currently a developed property of about 20 acres in size. The site contains buildings used for County of San Diego operations and two large surface parking lots. The site is designated as Industrial Light (IL-2-1) by the City of San Diego Municipal Code and M-1A, Industrial/Retail/Office by the Kearny Mesa Community Plan, neither of which allow for agriculture or forestry uses. The site is considered as "urban and built-up land" and does not contain grazing land, prime farmland, unique farmland, farmland of local importance, or farmland of statewide importance, as designated by the California Department of Conservation (2008). Furthermore, the site is not subject to a Williamson Act contract or in the vicinity of a parcel under a Williamson Act contract that would restrict that land to agricultural or related open space uses (County of San Diego 2003). The soil on the project is almost entirely comprised of Redding gravelly loam, 2% to 9% slopes (RdC) and a portion of Redding cobbly loam, 9% to 30% slopes, as mapped by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS 2012). These soils do not qualify for a Storie Index Rating of 80 to 100 in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service land use capability classification, which constitutes soil suitability for agricultural resources and rate as "very poor" and "non-agricultural," respectively. Also, the site is located in a highly developed urban area, adjacent to existing buildings that include light industrial and commercial uses, where the use of pesticides on agricultural crops would be severely limited. Therefore, no significant impacts to agricultural resources would result.

In addition to the conditions described above, the site is currently developed and does not include any trees. The site is also not zoned for forest or timberland production. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to timberland resources.

7.2 HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Archaeological Resources

Dudek conducted a cultural resources inventory on the project site on August 7, 2012, in accordance with the standards and guidelines defined under CEQA. Dudek also conducted records searches with the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). Dudek's review of the previous cultural resources investigations

near the project area indicates that there is very low potential for the inadvertent discovery of cultural resources during groundbreaking activities. No cultural resources were observed during intensive pedestrian survey of the area. These findings are further described in *Appendix N, Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center Project, San Diego County, California* (Dudek 2012). Based on these observations, it is recommended that cultural monitoring is unnecessary during future ground disturbing activities associated with the current proposed project. As such, significant impacts to historical resources would not result.

Built Environment

Historical resources typically include properties eligible or potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, as well as those that may be significant pursuant to state and local laws and registration programs such as the California Register of Historical Resources or the City of San Diego Historical Resources Register.

The City of San Diego criteria for determination of historic significance, pursuant to CEQA, is evaluated based upon age (over 45 years), location, context, association with an important event, uniqueness, or structural integrity of the building. In addition, projects requiring the demolition of structures that are 45 years or older are also reviewed for historic significance in compliance with CEQA. CEQA Section 21084.1 states that "A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may cause a significant effect on the environment."

Historical Resources staff determined that the property/structure is no an individually designated resource and is no located within a designated historic district. Furthermore, the property does not meet designation criteria as a significant resource under any adopted criteria. Therefore, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

7.3 MINERAL RESOURCES

According to the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the project site is located within Mineral Resource Zone 3 (MRZ-3). MRZ-3 includes areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data (City of San Diego 2010). Additionally, the property is currently developed and is not being used for mineral resource extraction. Also, mineral resource extraction would be an incompatible use with the site's current zoning and adjacent land uses. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to mineral resources.

7.4 POPULATION AND HOUSING

The project converts the current uses on the project site by the County of San Diego into a general acute and tertiary care hospital, hospital support building, medical offices and Energy Center. The project would result in the creation of 450 beds at the hospital. According to data from the California Health Care Foundation, between 2001 and 2007, the amount of general acute care hospitals and the number of hospital beds in San Diego County decreased by 4% and 5%, respectively (California Health Care Foundation 2010). San Diego County has 2.0 beds per 1,000 people, which is below the statewide average of 2.2 beds per 1,000 people (California Health Care Foundation 2010). As the current population ages, the number of beds needed in San Diego is expected to rise. The addition of 450 hospital beds and related medical support services is expected to serve the existing and projected medical needs of the surrounding area.

The project does not propose any new housing or residential units and therefore, would not result in an increase in population. No housing would be removed, relocated, or otherwise altered, and no population and housing impacts would result from the project.

7.5 RECREATION

The project would construct a new hospital facility and associated infrastructure on the project site that is currently occupied by buildings used for County of San Diego operations. Consequently, the project would not eliminate any existing recreational facilities or build any new recreational facilities that might result in adverse environmental effects. The project does not propose to construct any housing or permanent residential uses and would not increase population in the area. Therefore, the project would not increase demand for recreational areas or uses in the community, which could cause or accelerate their physical deterioration. No impacts to local recreational facilities would occur as a result of the project.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 8.0 MANDATORY DISCUSSION AREAS

This section discusses other issues for which CEQA requires analysis in addition to the specific issue areas discussed in *Chapter 5.0, Environmental Analysis*. These additional issues include (1) significant effects which cannot be avoided; (2) significant irreversible environmental changes which would be caused by the project should it be implemented; and (3) growth-inducing impacts.

8.1 SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to identify significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). As discussed in *Chapter 5.0, Environmental Analysis*, of this EIR, implementation of the project would result in significant impacts to transportation/traffic circulation, noise, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, air quality, paleontological resources, health and safety, and public utilities. Also, it would result in cumulative impacts to transportation/traffic circulation, global climate change, and air quality. Where significant impacts were identified, mitigation measures were developed that would reduce impacts to less than significant.

8.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES WHICH WOULD BE CAUSED BY THE PROPOSED PROJECT SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) requires the evaluation of:

> [u]ses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project [that] may be irreversible since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or non-use thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as a highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified. (14 CCR 15000 et seq.)

Approval of the project would cause irreversible environmental changes consisting of the following:

- Alteration of the human environment as a consequence of the hospital campus development process. The project would irreversibly alter the site from its previous use as the County of San Diego Operations Center to a medical center consisting of hospital structures and related facilities. This would constitute a permanent change. Once construction occurs, reversal of the land to its original condition is highly unlikely. The

project is consistent with current and planned use designations associated with the project site, as analyzed in *Section 5.1, Land Use*, of this EIR.

- Increased requirements of public services and utilities by the project, representing a permanent commitment of these resources. Service providers have adequate supply of resources to supply the project (see *Sections 5.13, Public Utilities, and 5.14, Public Services and Facilities*).
- Use of various new raw materials, such as lumber and forest products, metals (such as iron and steel), sand and gravel, asphalt, petrochemicals and other materials for construction. Some of these resources are already being depleted worldwide. The energy consumed in developing and maintaining the site may be considered a permanent investment that would incrementally reduce existing supplies of fossil fuels, natural gas, and gasoline.

8.3 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15126.2 (d) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. If the project has characteristics which "may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively," they must be discussed as well without assuming the growth is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it stimulates population growth or a population concentration above what is assumed in local and regional land use plans, or in projections made by regional planning authorities, such as the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Significant growth impacts could also occur if the project provides infrastructure or service capacity to accommodate growth levels beyond those anticipated by local or regional plans and policies. The City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (City of San Diego 2011) state that a project would have a significant impact related to growth inducement if it would:

1. Induce substantial population growth in an area;
2. Substantially alter the planned location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the population of an area;
3. Include extensions of roads or other infrastructure not assumed in the community plan or adopted Capital Improvement Project list, when such infrastructure exceeds the needs of the project and could accommodate future development. Using the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds for growth inducement, the project would not result in significant impacts. These conclusions are presented below.

The project would involve the phased construction of various hospital buildings, including associated medical office buildings, outpatient hospital support buildings and a parking structure. The proposed medical center would result in a greater availability of hospital services, which would serve projected increases in demand in the area. As the local population ages, the demand for medical services and hospital beds in the area will also increase, while more efficient means to meet these demands will also be needed to otherwise keep potentially rising costs down. Meeting projected demands for hospital and medical services would not be growth-inducing.

This project promotes infill development rather than encouraging new development within a currently undeveloped area. As this is an infill project, all major public services and utilities currently service the area; therefore, growth inducement as a result of the extension of these facilities into a new area would not occur. Overall, the project would not result in significant growth-inducing impacts.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 9.0 ALTERNATIVES

9.1 INTRODUCTION

CEQA requires that EIRs contain an analysis of alternatives to the project that would reduce or eliminate environmental impacts. Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR should "describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives" (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). The selection of alternatives is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires an EIR to evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (Section 15126.6(f)). The EIR should identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and briefly explain the reasons for that determination (Section 15126.6(c)). Additionally, CEQA requires discussion of the No Project Alternative to give decision makers the ability to compare impacts of approving the project with those of not approving the project (Section 15126.6(e)).

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, a range of alternatives to the project are considered in this EIR. These alternatives were developed in the course of project planning, environmental review, and public input. The discussion in this section provides a description of alternatives considered and an analysis of whether the alternatives meet most of the objectives of the project. These project objectives were introduced in *Section 3.1.2* of this EIR and are restated here for reference purposes:

1. Create a comprehensively planned, integrated medical center campus that includes a modern 450-bed Kaiser Permanente hospital, community amenities, and new employment opportunities in San Diego.
2. Provide high-quality health care in new, state-of-the-art inpatient and outpatient facilities for Kaiser Permanente members and central San Diego County by the phase replacement of outmoded existing structures, technology, and equipment in a practical and cost-effective manner.
3. Provide development capacity at the Kaiser Medical Center that would accommodate growth of Kaiser Permanente members requiring inpatient and outpatient health care services within the Central County service area.
4. Provide a variety of services, such as cancer care, imaging, cardiology, obstetrics, pharmacy, labs, and emergency services and medical office space in a central campus-like setting.

Per CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.6 (b) and (c), the focus of this analysis is to determine 1) whether alternatives are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening the significant environmental effects of the project, 2) the feasibility of alternatives, and 3) whether an alternative meets most of the basic project objectives.

As discussed in the EIR, implementation of the project would result in significant impacts to land use, transportation/traffic circulation, noise, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, air quality, paleontological resources, health and safety, and public utilities, as well as cumulative impacts to transportation/traffic circulation, GHG emissions, and air quality. Most of these impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures identified in this EIR. Significant project impacts related to land use, transportation/traffic circulation, noise, GHG emissions, and air quality would remain significant and unavoidable.

9.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

9.2.1 Off-Site Locations

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines, Sections 15126.6(f)(2), the applicant and City attempted to identify a feasible alternative off-site location within the project area that could be available for the proposed hospital development. Per CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (f)(2)(A), the key question and first step in analysis of the off-site location is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by putting the project in another location.

There are few if any similarly sized sites under single ownership in the project area. Kaiser could foreseeably assemble, lease, or purchase land for certain components of the proposed project, such as medical office space, in nearby office parks such as the Spectrum Sunroad development between Overland Avenue and Kearny Villa Road. The remaining components would still be built at the proposed project site along Ruffin Road. Additionally, Kaiser could redevelop its existing facilities at 7060 Clairemont Mesa Blvd and 5871 Copley Drive, both of which are near I-805. However, if the entire hospital was not located on another site, this alternative could result in greater automobile trips than the proposed project since this would force doctors to travel between the medical offices and main hospital campus. Therefore, this alternative could result in a higher number of automobile trips, and greater impacts when compared to the proposed campus-oriented project. It does not appear that the applicant can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to other sites in the area that would meet the project objectives, particularly Objective no. 4. Therefore, off-site locations capable of accommodating the entire project are considered infeasible, and no off-site location alternatives were carried forward in this analysis.

Regardless, the availability of an alternate site does not in and of itself reduce impact potential. It is expected that developing a similar project at an alternative site would result in a similar array of project impacts and would simply transfer the impact potential to areas surrounding the

alternate site location. For these reasons, an alternative site location would not necessarily be preferred over the project site.

9.2.2 Reduced Development Alternative

A reduced development alternative was initially considered that would assume a reduced square footage, with the goal of avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the project's identified significant impacts, such as traffic, GHG emissions, and/or air quality. Reducing the square footage of the project would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by this alternative, which would in turn reduce noise, GHG emissions, and particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM_{10}) emissions. To reduce noise impacts and PM_{10} emissions to below a level of significance, it was calculated that a 35.4% reduction in daily vehicle trips would be required. This would result in deletion of all medical offices (180,000 square feet) as well as 41 beds, for a total of 409 beds (as discussed in the *Kaiser San Diego Central Medical Center – Project Alternatives Traffic Assessment Memorandum* included in this EIR in Appendix C, LLG 2013). Other project components on the site for this alternative would be unchanged when compared to the project.

The proposed project is contributing a small percentage of trips to an already failing LOS freeway segment in the 2035 scenario. To reduce or eliminate the project's identified significant unavoidable traffic impacts, a reduction in the project's square footage would require a drastic reduction in key proposed components, including the elimination of all medical office buildings on the site. By eliminating the medical offices on this site, this alternative would not meet most of the project objectives, as it would not allow for a comprehensively planned, integrated, modern, state-of-the art inpatient and outpatient facility that would provide high- quality care and new employment opportunities to existing and future San Diego residents. The Reduced Development Alternative would therefore not be feasible and was not further considered for detailed evaluation.

9.2.3 Cooling Tower Alternative

Noise impacts resulting from cooling tower operations would be significant, as identified in *Section 5.5.4.* Accordingly, this alternative would shift the cooling towers to a different location on site in an attempt to reduce or avoid these impacts. Since the cooling towers are connected and part of the larger Energy Center, the entire Energy Center would also require relocation. Also, the proposed loading dock must remain adjacent to the Energy Center, as it serves as the location where oxygen and fuel deliveries are made to the Energy Center.

The currently proposed site plan has been intentionally designed to avoid compatibility impacts to adjacent sensitive land uses, such as the Polinsky Children's Center to the immediate east (refer to *Figure 5.1-1*). The applicant, having received input from administrators at the Polinsky Children's Center, has intentionally located the proposed parking structure along the eastern site boundary in an effort to buffer the main hospital campus' noise and operational activities from

the Polinsky Center. Hence, relocating the cooling towers and Energy Center along the eastern site boundary would not reduce, but rather result in greater, noise compatibility effects. The cooling towers cannot be shifted to the south along Ruffin Court, as that would bring noise impacts closer to the offsite Chinese Bilingual Preschool along Ruffin Court, therefore not resulting in any noise reduction advantage. Moving the cooling towers and Energy Center along the northern or northwestern boundaries of the site would result in similar impacts as the proposed project because of their adjacency to the property line and hospital rooms, and hence, impacts would not be reduced. Locating these industrial-type components at the project site's highly visible frontage is also not desirable. As such, because the noise impacts would not be reduced or avoided, this alternative was not further considered for detailed evaluation.

9.3 ALTERNATIVES UNDER CONSIDERATION

The alternatives evaluated in this section are directed at avoiding or lessening the environmental impacts of the project as identified in this EIR. The alternatives address the significant impacts as identified in the project environmental analysis presented in *Chapter 5, Environmental Analysis*. The analysis of alternatives in the section focuses only on the effects found to be significant through the project environmental analysis and provides a comparison analysis of those effects in contrast to those anticipated for the project.

The discussion in this EIR focuses on three alternatives: No Project, a Reduced Bed Alternative, and the Alternate Layout Alternative.

9.3.1 Reduced Bed Alternative

This alternative assumes a reduced number of beds, with the goal of avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the project's identified significant impacts, particularly air quality. Reducing the number of proposed beds would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated by this alternative, which would in turn reduce particulate matter (PM_{10}) and carbon monoxide emissions. To reduce PM_{10} and carbon monoxide emissions to below a level of significance, it was calculated that a 35.4% reduction in daily vehicle trips to and from the project would be required. This equates to 223 fewer beds than the 450 beds proposed under the project, for a total of 227 beds. Other project components on the site for this alternative would not change from the project.

With this reduction in beds, it should be noted that the project's NO_x would still exceed the emissions threshold of 250 pounds per day (refer to *Table 5.3-7* in *Section 5.3.6*). The project's NO_x emissions (615.88 pounds per day) are substantially over the emissions threshold of 250 pounds per day, largely due to stationary, operational, mechanical equipment emissions. Reducing the proposed number of beds in an effort to reduce the NO_x emissions to below a level of significance would not be feasible because a majority of beds would need to be removed from the site plan.

Environmental Analysis

Land Use. This alternative would reduce the number of beds proposed under the project from 450 to 227. Accordingly, a deviation for an increase in FAR would not be required under this alternative, as it would be under the proposed project. Land use compatibility impacts would therefore be less than significant and reduced when compared to the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic Circulation. With a reduction in the number of beds, this alternative would have less square footage than the project; however, it would still result in additional trips along the roadways in the project vicinity. The number of daily trips that would be generated under this Reduced Bed Alternative would be 35.4% less than the project. This equates to 4,460 fewer daily trips for the entire project. However, with the reduction in trips the project would still contribute to the delays with LOS of E at the intersections of Clairemont Mesa Boulevard and Ruffin Road, and Ruffin Road and Balboa Avenue (refer to Table 9-1 in the Traffic Impact Analysis included in Appendix C). Additionally, though this alternative's contribution to traffic on I-15 would be reduced when compared to the proposed project, it would still be considered a cumulatively significant impact, as discussed in the *Kaiser San Diego Central Medical Center – Project Alternatives Traffic Assessment Memorandum* included in this EIR in Appendix C (LLG 2013). Therefore, similar to the project, direct impacts would be potentially significant and unavoidable, and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Noise. Noise generated from construction of the proposed project would be considered significant, and in the case of on-site construction noise impacts (both exterior and interior), these impacts would be significant and unavoidable. The Reduced Bed Alternative would result in the same impacts. The noise generated from construction activities under this alternative would, similar to the project, exceed City thresholds at on-site sensitive receptors, and therefore, significant impacts would result. Though mitigation measure NOI-1 would reduce on-site noise impacts from both daytime and nighttime construction activities, the degree to which proposed mitigation would reduce on-site exterior and interior noise levels cannot be accurately determined at this time. Therefore, the on-site construction noise impacts (both exterior and interior) would be significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, as described in *Section 5.5.4,* traffic noise levels in the 2035 With Full Project Buildout scenario along Clairemont Mesa Boulevard would cause interior noise levels to exceed City standards in patient rooms in the northernmost portion of the Acute Care Hospital. Similar to the project, impacts from this alternative would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation required to reduce interior noise.

Overall, noise impacts resulting from the Reduced Bed Alternative would be similar compared to the project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This alternative would reduce construction-related and operational GHG impacts proportionately with the reduced project size. However, impacts would still be unavoidable to below a level of significance under the Reduced Bed Alternative, since the proposed hospital buildings and associated traffic cannot achieve the goal of 28.3% reduction in GHG emissions below the business-as-usual scenario, even with the project design features aimed at reducing emissions. As described in *Section 5.4, Greenhouse Gas Emissions*, the project as a whole cannot achieve a 28.3% reduction in business-as-usual emissions. Under the Reduced Bed Alternative, even though GHG emissions would be reduced, this alternative would achieve a maximum of 17% reduction in business-as-usual emissions and, therefore, would similarly not achieve the 28.3% reduction standard.

Air Quality. When compared to the project, this alternative would emit proportionately less the PM_{10} generated by traffic under the project. As discussed in *Section 5.3, Air Quality*, the net PM_{10} emissions are primarily caused by paved road dust, which is a function of total vehicle-miles traveled. The project would exceed the 100 pounds/day threshold for PM_{10} by 75.5 pounds/day, with 175.5 pounds/day of PM_{10} emissions, of which 154.62 pounds/day would be generated by net project-related traffic. The Reduced Bed Alternative would reduce daily traffic trips by a minimum of 35.4%, and PM_{10} emissions would be reduced to below the City's emission threshold of 100 pounds/day. Similar to the project, the Reduced Bed Alternative would not exceed the City's other air quality significance thresholds for volatile organic compounds, sulfur oxide, or particulate matter less than 2.5 microns. However, just as under the project, NO_x emissions under the alternative would still exceed established thresholds. Overall, air quality impacts under the Reduced Bed Alternative would be reduced when compared to the project, but would still be significant and unavoidable (for NO_x emissions).

Paleontological Resources. When compared to the project, this alternative would require slightly less grading since the footprint of most of the buildings would be the same. This alternative would still involve the disturbance of subsurface geologic formations that could potentially support paleontological resources at the project site. Mitigation measures associated with the project would still apply to this alternative. Therefore, impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Biological Resources. This alternative would also require the disturbance of the 0.4 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat along the northern site boundary and the mitigation associated with the project would still apply to this alternative. Impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Health and Safety. Under the Reduced Bed Alternative, an increase in use of hazardous materials from baseline conditions would still result, since the majority of the project components would still be implemented. Also, demolition of structures containing asbestos, lead-based paint, mercury switches, PCB-containing ballasts, and refrigerants would still result, as

would potential excavation of contaminated soils on the site. Overall, impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Project Objectives

The Reduced Bed Alternative would not meet Project Objectives Nos. 1 and 3 (as described in *Section 3.1.2* of this EIR), since it would limit the number of beds developed and would not provide development capacity to accommodate growth of Kaiser Permanente members requiring inpatient and outpatient health care services in a seismically stable facility. Overall, this alternative would not meet most of the project objectives.

9.3.2 Alternate Layout Alternative No. 1

As analyzed in *Section 5.5, Noise,* of this EIR, implementation of the project would result in significant traffic noise impacts to sensitive receptors on the project site, and these impacts would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures NOI-2 and NOI-3. Traffic noise levels in the 2035 With Full Project Buildout scenario along Clairemont Mesa Boulevard would cause interior noise levels to exceed City standards in patient rooms in the northernmost portion of the Acute Care Hospital. Accordingly, Alternate Layout Alternative No. 1 would shift patient beds away from Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, further south on the site in an attempt to reduce or avoid these impacts. *Figure 9-1* shows the site plan for this alternative. The structures would be the same heights as stipulated under the proposed project, with the parking structure at 7 stories, hospital tower and HSB at 5 stories, and the Energy Center at 3 levels, partially underground.

Environmental Analysis

Land Use. This alternative would result in similar land use compatibility impacts when compared to the project; that is, secondary impacts would be significant and unavoidable, because the same secondary land use impacts to traffic, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions would occur.

Additionally, components of this alternative would be incompatible with surrounding land uses and design standards. The hospital support building/patient tower windows would be oriented toward the Polinsky Children's Center. During project coordination meetings with Polinsky Children's Center, Polinsky staff requested privacy at their facility and hence this orientation would be incompatible with this surrounding sensitive land use.

This alternative would be inconsistent with Kearny Mesa Community Plan design standards in the Industrial and Urban Design Elements, since the parking structure would abut Clairemont Mesa Boulevard. Siting the parking structure in this location on the site would conflict with building scale, building scale and design, and landscaping adjacent to streets standards provisions in the Community Plan. This alternative would also place the proposed parking

structure at the intersection of Ruffin Road and Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, an unattractive campus entry for the Kearny Mesa community.

Transportation/Traffic Circulation. This alternative would result in similar transportation/traffic circulation impacts since the same traffic-generating uses would still be included. Similar to the project, direct impacts would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation incorporated, and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Noise. As evaluated in *Section 5.5*, noise generated from construction of the proposed project would be considered significant, and in the case of construction noise, impacts would be unavoidable.

The Alternate Layout Alternative No. 1 would avoid the project's significant traffic noise impacts at the Acute Care Hospital. Noise modeling was conducted at two sensitive receptor locations (1st floor and 6th floor of the Acute Care Hospital), and exterior noise levels were calculated at 62 dB at the first level and 63 dB at the 6th level; as such, interior noise levels (without mitigation) would be 42 dB and 43 dB at the 1st and 6th floors, respectively. These noise levels were predicted at the easternmost portion of the patient towers, which would represent worst case traffic noise levels.

Traffic noise impacts would be avoided because this alternative would result in a shift in patient beds further south on site. Also, since the parking structure along Clairemont Mesa Boulevard would be the same height as the patient tower, it would block traffic noise from Clairemont Mesa Boulevard. Traffic noise impacts would be less than significant and would avoid the project's significant traffic noise impacts.

The noise generated from construction activities under this alternative would, similar to the project, exceed City thresholds at on-site sensitive receptors, and therefore, significant impacts would result. Although mitigation measure NOI-1 would reduce on-site noise impacts from both daytime and nighttime construction activities, the degree to which proposed mitigation would reduce on-site exterior and interior noise levels cannot be accurately determined at this time. Therefore, the on-site construction noise impacts (both exterior and interior) would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall, noise impacts resulting from this alternative would be reduced compared to the project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This alternative would not result in a reduction in construction-related and operational GHG impacts since the same development intensity would result. Impacts would therefore be similar (significant and unavoidable) when compared to the project.

Air Quality. This alternative would not result in a reduction in construction-related and operational air quality impacts since the same development intensity would result. Impacts would therefore be similar (significant and unavoidable) when compared to the project.

Paleontological Resources. When compared to the project, this alternative would require similar grading since the development intensity would be the same. This alternative would still involve

the disturbance of subsurface geologic formations that could potentially support paleontological resources at the project site. Mitigation measures associated with the project would still apply to this alternative. Impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Biological Resources. This alternative would also require the disturbance of the 0.4 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat along the northern site boundary and the mitigation associated with the project would still apply to this alternative. Impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Health and Safety. Under this alternative, an increase in the use of hazardous materials from baseline conditions would still result since the majority of the project components would still be implemented. Also, demolition of structures containing asbestos, lead-based paint, mercury switches, PCB-containing ballasts, and refrigerants would still result, as would potential excavation of contaminated soils on site. Overall, impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Project Objectives

The Alternate Layout Alternative would meet all of the project objectives (as described in *Section 3.1.2* of this EIR).

9.3.2 Alternate Layout Alternative No. 2

Similar to Alternate Layout Alternative No.1, this alternative attempts to reduce or avoid the proposed project's significant traffic noise impacts to sensitive receptors on the project site. Traffic noise levels in the 2035 With Full Project Buildout scenario along Clairemont Mesa Boulevard would cause interior noise levels to exceed City standards in patient rooms in the northernmost portion of the Acute Care Hospital. Accordingly, Alternate Layout Alternative No. 2 would shift patient beds to away from Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, further south on the site in an attempt to reduce or avoid these impacts. *Figure 9-2* shows the site plan for this alternative. The structures would be the same heights as stipulated under the proposed project, with the parking structure at 7 stories, hospital tower and HSB at 5 stories, and the Energy Center at 3 levels, partially underground.

Environmental Analysis

Land Use. This alternative would result in similar land use compatibility impacts when compared to the project; that is, secondary impacts would be significant and unavoidable, because the same secondary land use impacts to traffic, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions would occur.

Additionally, components of this alternative would be incompatible with surrounding land uses and design standards. The patient tower windows would be oriented toward the Polinsky Children's Center. During project coordination meetings with Polinsky Children's Center, Polinsky staff requested privacy at their facility and hence this orientation would be incompatible with this surrounding sensitive land use.

This alternative would be inconsistent with Kearny Mesa Community Plan design standards in the Industrial and Urban Design Elements, since the parking structure would abut Clairemont Mesa Boulevard. Siting the parking structure in this location on the site would conflict with building scale, building scale and design, and landscaping adjacent to streets standards provisions in the Community Plan. This alternative would also place the proposed parking structure at the intersection of Ruffin Road and Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, an unattractive campus entry for the Kearny Mesa community.

Transportation/Traffic Circulation. This alternative would result in similar transportation/traffic circulation impacts since the same traffic-generating uses would still be included. Similar to the project, with mitigation implemented direct and cumulative impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Noise. As evaluated in *Section 5.5*, noise generated from construction of the proposed project would be considered significant, and in the case of construction noise, impacts would be unavoidable.

The Alternate Layout Alternative No. 2 would avoid the project's significant traffic noise impacts at the Acute Care Hospital. Noise modeling was conducted at two sensitive receptor locations (1st floor and 6th floor of the Acute Care Hospital), and exterior noise levels were calculated at 62 dB at the first level and 63 dB at the 6th level; as such, interior noise levels (without mitigation) would be 42 dB and 43 dB at the 1st and 6th floors, respectively.

Traffic noise impacts would be avoided because this alternative would result in a shift in patient beds further south on site. Also, since the parking structure along Clairemont Mesa Boulevard would be the same height as the patient tower, it would block traffic noise from Clairemont Mesa Boulevard. Traffic noise impacts would be less than significant and would avoid the project's significant traffic noise impacts.

The noise generated from construction activities under this alternative would, similar to the project, exceed City thresholds at on-site sensitive receptors, and therefore, significant impacts would result. Although mitigation measure NOI-1 would reduce on-site noise impacts from both daytime and nighttime construction activities, the degree to which proposed mitigation would reduce on-site exterior and interior noise levels cannot be accurately determined at this time. Therefore, the on-site construction noise impacts (both exterior and interior) would be significant and unavoidable.

Overall, noise impacts resulting from this alternative would be reduced compared to the project.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This alternative would not result in a reduction in construction-related and operational GHG impacts since the same development intensity would result. Impacts would therefore be similar (significant and unavoidable) when compared to the project.

Air Quality. This alternative would not result in a reduction in construction-related and operational air quality impacts since the same development intensity would result. Impacts would therefore be similar (significant and unavoidable) when compared to the project.

Paleontological Resources. When compared to the project, this alternative would require similar grading since the development intensity would be the same. This alternative would still involve the disturbance of subsurface geologic formations that could potentially support paleontological resources at the project site. Mitigation measures associated with the project would still apply to this alternative. Impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Biological Resources. This alternative would also require the disturbance of the 0.4 acres of coastal sage scrub habitat along the northern site boundary and the mitigation associated with the project would still apply to this alternative. Impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Health and Safety. Under this alternative, an increase in the use of hazardous materials from baseline conditions would still result since the majority of the project components would still be implemented. Also, demolition of structures containing asbestos, lead-based paint, mercury switches, PCB-containing ballasts, and refrigerants would still result, as would potential excavation of contaminated soils on site. Overall, impacts would be similar compared to the project.

Project Objectives

The Alternate Layout Alternative would meet all of the project objectives (as described in *Section 3.1.2* of this EIR).

9.3.4 No Project Alternative

CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (e), requires that an EIR evaluate a “no project” alternative along with its impact. The purpose of describing and analyzing a no project alternative is to allow a lead agency to compare the impacts of approving the project to the impacts of not approving it. Specifically, Section 15126.6 (e)(3)(B) requires that an EIR, for a development project on identifiable property, address the no project alternative as a “circumstance under which the project does not proceed.” In other words, the no project alternative assumes that the project site would not be developed with the project.

Under the No Project Alternative, the project would not be implemented on the site. The existing on-site County Administration building (330,000 square feet) would not be demolished and would be left vacant.

Environmental Analysis

Under this alternative, none of the environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the project would occur. However, the project would still need to be built

elsewhere in order to meet the project objectives. Therefore, construction impacts of the project would likely be transferred elsewhere. (For a discussion of the effects of off-site alternatives, refer to *Section 9.2.1*.

Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative does not meet any of the objectives set forth in *Section 3.1.2* of this EIR.

9.4 Alternatives Summary and Environmentally Superior Alternative

Alternatives discussed in *Section 9.3* are compared to the project in *Table 9-1, Summary of Alternatives' Impacts*.

Table 9-1
Summary of Alternatives' Impacts

Environmental Issue	Project	Reduced Bed Alternative	Alternate Layout Alternative No. 1	Alternate Layout Alternative No. 2	No Project Alternative
Land Use	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts avoided	Greater Impacts	Greater impacts	Impacts avoided
Transportation/ Traffic Circulation	Direct and cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable	Impacts slightly reduced, but would remain significant and unavoidable	Similar impacts	Similar impacts	Impacts avoided
Noise	Significant and unavoidable	Similar Impacts	Traffic noise impacts to on-site receptors would be avoided. Temporary construction related noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Traffic noise impacts to on-site receptors would be avoided. Temporary construction related noise impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.	Impacts avoided
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts slightly reduced, but remain significant and unavoidable	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Impacts avoided
Air Quality	Significant and unavoidable	Impacts would be reduced, but remain significant and unavoidable.	Similar Impacts	Similar Impacts	Impacts avoided

Table 9-1
Summary of Alternatives' Impacts

Environmental Issue	Project	Reduced Bed Alternative	Alternate Layout Alternative No. 1	Alternate Layout Alternative No. 2	No Project Alternative
Paleontological Resources	Less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures	Similar impacts	Similar impacts	Similar Impacts	Impacts avoided
Biological Resources	Less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures	Similar impacts	Similar impacts	Similar Impacts	Impacts avoided
Health and Safety	Less than significant with incorporation of mitigation measures	Similar impacts	Similar impacts	Similar Impacts	Impacts avoided
Meets Most of the Basic Project Objectives?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

Per Section 15126.6 (e) (2) of the CEQA Guidelines, an environmentally superior alternative must be identified (other than the No Project Alternative). CEQA also requires that the environmentally superior alternative be selected from the range of reasonable alternatives that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project.

As discussed in *Section 9.3.3* and summarized in *Table 9-1*, impacts resulting from implementation of the project would not occur under the No Project Alternative. Under this alternative, however, none of the project objectives would be met. CEQA Guidelines, Section 15126.6 (e)(2), states that "if the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives."

Under the Reduced Bed Alternative, the project would result in reduced impacts to transportation/traffic circulation, greenhouse gases, and air quality. Both Alternate Layout Alternatives would avoid the proposed project's significant traffic noise impacts.

Overall, the two Alternate Layout Alternatives would avoid a significant noise impact resulting from the proposed project while resulting in greater land use compatibility effects. The Reduced Bed Alternative would slightly reduce transportation/traffic circulation, greenhouse gases, and air quality impacts. While the Reduced Bed Alternative would not meet most of the project objectives, it would achieve the greatest reduction in environmental impacts, and thus would be the environmentally superior alternative.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DUDEK

7372-01

SOURCE: CO ARCHITECTS 2013

FIGURE 9-1

Alternative Layout Alternative No. 1

KAISER CENTRAL SAN DIEGO HOSPITAL EIR

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

DUDEK

7372-01

SOURCE: CO ARCHITECTS 2013

FIGURE 9-2

Alternative Layout Alternative No. 2

KAISER CENTRAL SAN DIEGO HOSPITAL EIR

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 10.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 21081.6 requires that a mitigation monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) be established upon certification of an environmental impact report (EIR). It stipulates that "the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes made to the project or conditions of project approval, adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation."

This MMRP has been developed in compliance with Section 21081.6 of CEQA and identifies **(1)** mitigation measures to be implemented prior to, during, and after construction of the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center project; **(2)** the individual/agency responsible for that implementation; and **(3)** criteria for completion or monitoring of the specific measures.

10.1 GENERAL

10.1.1 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART I OF II

Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)

1. Prior to the issuance of a Notice To Proceed (NTP) for a subdivision, or any construction permits, such as Demolition, Grading or Building, or beginning any construction related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Director's Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve all Construction Documents (CD), (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the MMRP requirements are incorporated into the design.
2. In addition, the ED shall verify that the MMRP Conditions/Notes that apply ONLY to the construction phases of this project are included VERBATIM, under the heading, "**ENVIRONMENTAL/MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS**."
3. These notes must be shown within the first three (3) sheets of the construction documents in the format specified for engineering construction document templates as shown on the City website:

   http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/standtemp.shtml
4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.
5. **SURETY AND COST RECOVERY –** The Development Services Director or City Manager may require appropriate surety instruments or bonds from private Permit Holders to ensure the long term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

10.1.2 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II OF II

Post Plan Check (After permit issuance/Prior to start of construction)

1. **PRE CONSTRUCTION MEETING IS REQUIRED TEN (10) WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY WORK ON THIS PROJECT.** The PERMIT HOLDER/OWNER is responsible to arrange and perform this meeting by contacting the CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER (RE) of the Field Engineering Division and City staff from MITIGATION MONITORING COORDINATION (MMC). Attendees must also include the Permit holder's Representative(s), Job Site Superintendent and the following consultants: **Paleontological Monitor, and Lead and Asbestos Abatement Monitor.**

   NOTE: Failure of all responsible Permit Holder's representatives and consultants to attend shall require an additional meeting with all parties present.

   CONTACT INFORMATION:

   a) The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the **RE** at the **Field Engineering Division – (858) 627-3200**

   b) For Clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, it is also required to call **RE and MMC at (858) 627-3360**

2. **MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) No. 274240 and /or Environmental Document No./State Clearing House No. 2012071092, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc.

   NOTE: Permit Holder's Representatives must alert RE and MMC if there are any discrepancies in the plans or notes, or any changes due to field conditions. All conflicts must be approved by RE and MMC BEFORE the work is performed.

3. **OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS:** Evidence of compliance with all other agency requirements or permits shall be submitted to the RE and MMC for review and acceptance prior to the beginning of work or within one week of the Permit

Holder obtaining documentation of those permits or requirements. Evidence shall include copies of permits, letters of resolution or other documentation issued by the responsible agency: The San Diego RWQCB would use the EIR and supporting documentation in its decision to issue a NPDES General Construction Activity Stormwater Permit; the San Diego Air Pollution Control District would use the EIR and supporting documentation when issuing Authorities to Construct and Permits to Operate boilers, thermal fluid heaters, and emergency generators in the Energy Center at the site.

4. **MONITORING EXHIBITS:** All consultants are required to submit , to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on a 11x17 reduction of the appropriate construction plan, such as site plan, grading, landscape, etc., marked to clearly show the specific areas including the **LIMIT OF WORK**, scope of that discipline's work, and notes indicating when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.

   NOTE: Surety and Cost Recovery – When deemed necessary by the Development Services Director or City Manager, additional surety instruments or bonds from the private Permit Holder may be required to ensure the long term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

5. **OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:** The Permit Holder/Owner's representative shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist

Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to or at Preconstruction Meeting
Biology	Biologist Limit of Work Verification	Limit of Work Inspection
Paleontology	Paleontology Reports	Paleontology Site Observation
Noise	Acoustical Reports	Noise Mitigation Features Inspection
Traffic	Traffic Reports	Traffic Features Site Observation
Waste Management	Waste Management Reports	Waste Management Inspections
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

10.2 TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC CIRCULATION

Mitigation Measures TRA-1and TRA-2 are required for the Near-Term Plus Full Project Buildout Scenario:

TRA-1 **Clairemont Mesa Boulevard/Ruffin Road (Impact D-1) (100% contribution) –** The improvement required to mitigate this impact is an eastbound right-turn lane on Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, which the applicant shall provide prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for Phase II to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. Figure M-1 in Appendix M graphically depicts the potential improvement. (Refer to Appendix M of the Traffic Impact Analysis for conceptual plans. The Traffic Impact Analysis is attached as Appendix C of this EIR.) The median would be relocated 3 feet to the north and the eastbound lanes would be reconfigured to provide a bike lane and an eastbound right-turn lane. This would require the acquisition of approximately 10 feet x 190 feet of additional right-of-way (ROW) from the existing retail center at the southwest corner of the intersection. Acquisition of 10 foot of ROW would result in reducing the existing building 28-foot setback from the curb line to 18 feet, and may be difficult to achieve in a timely manner. This impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

TRA-2 **Balboa Avenue/Ruffin Road (Impact D-2) (100% contribution)** – Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for Phase II, the applicant shall modify signal and provide SB to WB right-turn overlap phasing at the Balboa Avenue / Ruffin Road intersection, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. (U-turns are not currently permitted and therefore, providing SB right-turn overlap phasing will not impact any U-turning traffic).

The following mitigation measures are required for the impacted locations with cumulative impacts at the full project buildout scenario (Year 2035):

TRA-1 **Clairemont Mesa Boulevard/Ruffin Road (Impact C-1) (100% contribution) –** Mitigation Measure TRA-1 described above would also mitigate this cumulative impact. Since implementation of TRA-1 is contingent upon acquisition of a ROW to widen the roadway, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

TRA-2 **Balboa Avenue/Ruffin Road (Impact C-3) (100% contribution)** – Mitigation Measure TRA-2 described above will also mitigate this cumulative impact.

TRA-3 **Clairemont Mesa Boulevard/Murphy Canyon Road (Impact C-2) 100% contribution)** – Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for Phase I, the applicant shall widen Clairemont Mesa Boulevard to provide a third through lane on Clairemont Mesa Boulevard between Ruffin road and Murphy Canyon Road, satisfactory to the City Engineer. This lane will become a shared through / right-turn lane at Murphy Canyon Road, therefore providing additional capacity at the intersection. (See conceptual drawing M-2 in Appendix M of the Traffic Impact Analysis for a conceptual plan. The Traffic Impact Analysis is attached as Appendix C of this EIR.)

TRA-4 **Viewridge Avenue/Balboa Avenue (Impact C-4) (100% contribution)** – Prior to issuance of the first occupancy permit for Phase II, the applicant shall restripe the southbound approach of the Balboa Avenue / Viewridge Avenue intersection to provide a second southbound left-turn lane and provide appropriate signal modifications to accommodate the second southbound left turn lane, satisfactory to the City Engineer (see conceptual drawing M-3 in Appendix M of the Traffic Impact Analysis for a conceptual plan. The Traffic Impact Analysis is attached as Appendix C of this EIR).

The above improvements will result in the elimination of parking for a distance of 160 feet along the east curb of View Ridge Avenue, north of Balboa Avenue. This is a reduction of approximately 7 parking spaces. Field observations during various times indicated a maximum of 4 and minimum of 1 occupied spaces.

10.3 NOISE

The following mitigation measure shall be incorporated to reduce the on-site exterior and interior noise impacts associated with both daytime and nighttime construction activities:

NOI-1: To mitigate the on-site exterior and interior noise impacts associated with both daytime and nighttime construction activities, the following features shall be incorporated into the project during construction, to the satisfaction of the City:

- All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.
- Construction noise reduction methods such as shutting off idling equipment, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied sensitive receptor areas, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools, rather than diesel equipment, shall be used where feasible.
- Implement noise attenuation measures, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources.

- During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from or shielded from sensitive receptors.
- During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practical from noise sensitive receptors.
- Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding property owners and residents to contact the job superintendent if necessary. In the event the City receives a complaint, appropriate corrective actions shall be implemented and a report of the action provided to the reporting party.

Mitigation measure NOI-1 would reduce on-site noise impacts from both daytime and nighttime construction activities. However, since this is a phased project and it is uncertain exactly where construction activities may occur relative to on-site sensitive receptors, the degree to which proposed mitigation actually reduces on-site exterior and interior noise levels cannot be accurately determined. Therefore, the on-site construction noise impacts (both exterior and interior) are considered significant and unavoidable.

The following mitigation measures shall be incorporated to reduce the on-site interior noise impacts associated with traffic noise along Clairemont Mesa Boulevard.

NOI-2: To mitigate interior noise impacts within hospital patient rooms and medical offices, the proposed project would be required to incorporate sound-rated windows having a minimum STC 38 sound-rating, and acoustical tile ceilings for the hospital rooms and staff offices along the western hospital building façade. An interior noise study shall be required prior to submittal of final building plans to ensure the interior CNEL would not exceed 45 dB in hospital patient rooms, and 50 dB within hospital offices.

NOI-3: To mitigate the on-site interior noise impacts at the Acute Care Center North building area due to traffic along Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, an interior noise study shall be required to ensure that the interior CNEL would not exceed 45 dB. The interior acoustical analysis shall be required prior to issuance of building permits.

Mitigation measure NOI-3 would reduce on-site interior noise impacts through implementation of an interior noise study to ensure interior noise levels for portions of the Acute Care buildings facing Clairemont Mesa Boulevard would be reduced to below 45 dB CNEL.

10.4 AIR QUALITY

Mitigation measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 would reduce emissions associated with PM10 and NOx.

AQ-1: To ensure construction of the project would not result in a significant impact relative to fugitive dust (PM10), the following requirements shall be implemented by the

applicant's contractor during all construction phases, and incorporated in the contractor's grading plans subject to review by the City of San Diego Development Services Department:

- All active construction areas, unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas shall be watered at least three times per day and/or stabilized with nontoxic soil stabilizers as needed to control fugitive dust.
- Exposed stockpiles (e.g. dirt, sand, etc.) shall be covered and/or watered or stabilized with nontoxic soil binders as needed to control emissions.
- Traffic speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 miles per hour.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would ensure impacts related to fugitive dust during construction would remain less than significant.

AQ-2: Prior to approval of any grading permits, the following requirements shall be placed on all grading plans, and shall be implemented by the applicant's contractor during grading of each phase of the project to minimize NOx emissions:

- Minimize simultaneous operation of multiple construction equipment units. During construction, vehicles in loading and unloading queues shall turn their engines off when not in use to reduce vehicle emissions.
- All construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's specifications.
- All diesel-fueled on-road construction vehicles shall meet the emission standards applicable to the most current year to the greatest extent possible. To achieve this standard, new vehicles shall be used, or older vehicles shall use post-combustion controls that reduce pollutant emissions to the greatest extent feasible.
- The effectiveness of the latest diesel emission controls is highly dependent on the sulfur content of the fuel. Therefore, diesel fuel used by on- and off-road construction equipment shall be low sulfur (less than 15 ppm) or other alternative, low-polluting diesel fuel formulation.

AQ-3: To ensure contribution to ozone formation during emergency generator testing is minimized, if a triennial 4-hour emergency generator testing is conducted by the applicant or its contractors, the testing period shall occur only between November and April. This testing schedule shall be identified specifically in the application for Authority to Construct submitted to the San Diego Air Pollution Control District. A copy of the Authority to Construct issued by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District shall be submitted to the City of San Diego Development Services Department.

Mitigation measures AQ-1, AQ-2, and AQ-3 would reduce emissions associated with PM10 and NOx. No additional feasible mitigation is available to reduce anticipated vehicle trips and

stationary source emissions during project operations; therefore NOx emissions would remain significant and unavoidable. No feasible mitigation is available to reduce PM_{10} emissions to a less than significant level during operation. Impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

10.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following mitigation measure shall be implemented to reduce impacts to 0.4 acres of coastal sage scrub to below a level of significance:

BIO-1: Prior to Notice to Proceed (NTP) for any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits, the owner/permittee shall contribute to the City of San Diego Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF) to mitigate for the loss of 0.4 acre of coastal sage scrub habitat. This fee is based on mitigation ratios, per the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines, of 1:1 for coastal sage scrub (of which impacts occurred outside the MHPA, yet mitigation would be required inside the MHPA). Therefore, the resulting total mitigation required for direct project impacts for a total of 0.4 acres equivalent contribution to the City's Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF) plus a ten percent (10%) administrative fee.

The implementation of mitigation measure BIO-1 would mitigate impacts to sensitive biological resources to a less than significant level.

10.6 PALEONTOLOGY

PALEO-1 The following shall be implemented for construction phases that would exceed City thresholds:

I. Prior to Permit Issuance

A. Entitlement Division Plan Check

1. Prior to issuance of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits or a Notice to Proceed for Subdivisions, but prior to the first preconstruction meeting, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.

B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD

1. The applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Paleontology Guidelines.

2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project.

3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

II. Prior to Start of Construction

A. Verification of Records Search

1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site-specific records search has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.

2. The letter shall introduce and pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.

B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings

1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring, the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified paleontologist shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Paleontological monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.

   a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM, or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.

2. Identify Areas to be Monitored

   Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Monitoring Exhibit (PME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11 inches by 17 inches) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits. The PME shall be based on the results of a site specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).

3. When Monitoring Will Occur

   a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.

   b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, presence or absence of fossil resources, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

III. During Construction

A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching

1. The monitor shall be present full-time during grading/excavation/trenching activities as identified on the PME that could result in impacts to formations with high and moderate resource sensitivity. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the PME.

2. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as trenching activities that do not encounter formational soils as previously assumed, and/or when unique/unusual fossils are encountered, which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

3. The monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVRs shall be faxed by the CM to the RE on the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (Notification of Monitoring Completion), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

B. Discovery Notification Process

1. In the event of a discovery, the Paleontological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching activities in the area of discovery and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.

2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.

3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.

C. Determination of Significance

1. The PI shall evaluate the significance of the resource.

a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required. The determination of significance for fossil discoveries shall be at the discretion of the PI.

b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Recovery Program (PRP) and obtain written approval from MMC. Impacts to significant resources must be mitigated before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume.

c. If resource is not significant (e.g., small pieces of broken common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils) the PI shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a non-significant discovery has been made. The Paleontologist shall continue to monitor the area without notification to MMC unless a significant resource is encountered.

d. The PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that fossil resources will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.

IV. Night and/or Weekend Work

A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract

1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.

2. The following procedures shall be followed.

a. No Discoveries

In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, The PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to MMC via fax by 8 a.m. on the next business day.

b. Discoveries

All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III – During Construction.

c. Potentially Significant Discoveries

If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III – During Construction shall be followed.

d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8 a.m. on the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.

B. If night work becomes necessary during the course of construction

1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.

2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.

C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

V. Post Construction

A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report

1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Paleontological Guidelines which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring.

a. For significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, the Paleontological Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.

b. Recording Sites with the San Diego Natural History Museum

2. The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms) any significant or potentially significant fossil resources encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the San Diego Natural History Museum with the Final Monitoring Report.

3. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or for preparation of the Final Report.

4. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.
5. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
6. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.

B. Handling of Fossil Remains

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.
2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the geologic history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.

C. Curation of fossil remains: Deed of Gift and Acceptance Verification

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains associated with the monitoring for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution.
2. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.

D. Final Monitoring Report(s)

1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Final Monitoring Report to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC that the draft report has been approved.
2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC, which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution

10-05-2009

With implementation of Mitigation Measure PALEO-1, impacts would be less than significant.

10.7 HEALTH AND SAFETY

To reduce identified significant impacts from the release of hazardous materials to below a level of significance, the following mitigation measures are provided:

HS-1 Prior to demolition permit issuance, Kaiser shall provide proof to the City of San Diego that:

- The existing 500-gallon diesel AST and associated pipes have been properly removed in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

- All existing hazardous materials and chemicals including, but not limited to, photo-development fluids, water-treatment chemicals, paints, and solvents stored on site have been removed in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.
- A qualified environmental specialist has inspected the site buildings for the presence of polychlorinated biphenyls, mercury, and other hazardous building materials. If found, these materials shall be managed in accordance with the Metallic Discards Act of 1991 (California Public Resources Code, Sections 42160–42185) and other state and federal guidelines and regulations. Demolition plans and contract specifications shall incorporate any necessary abatement measures in compliance with the Metallic Discards Act, particularly Section 42175, which describes materials requiring special handling, for the removal of mercury switches, polychlorinated biphenyl-containing ballasts, and refrigerants.
- Current lead-based paint and asbestos surveys have been conducted by a California Division of Occupational Safety and Health–certified asbestos assessor and San Diego County DEH Services–certified lead-based paint assessor of all facilities proposed for demolition. The surveys shall determine whether any on-site abatement of lead-based paint and/or asbestos-containing materials is necessary. In addition, the survey shall include an abatement work plan prepared in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations for any necessary removal of such materials. The work plan shall include a monitoring plan to be conducted by a qualified consultant during abatement activities to ensure compliance with the work plan requirements and abatement contractor specifications. Demolition plans and contract specifications shall incorporate any necessary abatement measures for the removal of materials containing lead-based paint and asbestos to the satisfaction of the City Planning and Building Department. The measures shall be consistent with the abatement work plan prepared for the project and conducted by a licensed lead/asbestos abatement contractor.

With Implementation of mitigation measure HS-1, impacts from the release of hazardous materials during demolition activities would be less than significant.

HS-2 To reduce the risk of accidental release of hazardous materials during construction activities at the site, Kaiser shall prepare and implement during all construction activities a hazardous substance management, handling, storage, disposal, and emergency response plan. A hazardous materials spill kit shall be maintained on site for small spills. Additionally, Kaiser shall monitor all contractors for compliance with applicable regulations, including regulations regarding hazardous materials and hazardous wastes, including disposal. Hazardous materials shall not be disposed of or released on the ground, in the underlying groundwater, or any surface water. Totally enclosed containment shall be provided for all trash. All construction waste, including trash and litter, garbage, other solid

waste, petroleum products, and other potentially hazardous materials, shall be removed to a waste facility permitted to treat, store, or dispose of such materials.

With implementation of mitigation measure HS-2, impacts from the accidental release of hazardous materials during construction activities would be less than significant.

HS-3 Prior to receiving a grading permit, Kaiser shall prepare a Hazardous Materials Contingency Plan (HMCP) and ensure that grading and excavation staff has received training about how to identify suspected contaminated soil and USTs and has been made aware of the hazardous materials contingency plan. In the event that grading, construction, or operation of proposed facilities will encounter evidence of contamination, USTs, or other environmental concerns, the HMCP shall be followed. The HMCP shall (1) specify measures to be taken to protect worker and public health and safety and (2) specify measures to be taken to manage and remediate wastes. Although there is potential for soil contamination elsewhere on the property, the plan should highlight the current and former UST areas as potential areas of soil contamination. The plan shall include the following:

- Identification of the known former soil contamination areas
- Information on how to identify suspected contaminated soil
- Procedures for temporary cessation of construction activity and evaluation of the level of environmental concern
- Procedures for limiting access to the contaminated area to properly trained personnel
- Procedures for notification and reporting, including internal management and local agencies (fire department, County of San Diego DEH, Air Pollution Control District, etc.), as needed
- A worker health and safety plan for excavation of contaminated soil
- Procedures for characterizing and managing excavated soils
- Procedures for certification of completion of remediation.

With implementation of mitigation measure HS-3, the potential impacts from excavation and exposure to contaminated soils on the site are anticipated to be less than significant.

HS-4 Prior to receiving a certificate of occupancy for the first component of the proposed project, as described in *Section 3.2* of this EIR, Kaiser shall prepare a site-specific Medical Waste Management Plan (MWMP) and the Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center to reflect the inventory of hazardous materials and wastes being used at each facility (as required by the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division (County of San Diego 2011; County of San Diego 2012)). After the first

MWMP and HMBP is prepared and approved, and prior to receiving a certificate of occupancy for each of the new facilities constructed in later phases as described in *Section 3.2* of this EIR, Kaiser shall update the MWMP and the HMBP for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center to reflect the additional inventory of hazardous materials and wastes being used at each facility (as required by the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division (County of San Diego 2011; County of San Diego 2012)).

With implementation of mitigation measure HS-4, impacts associated with the accidental handling, storage, disposal, or release of hazardous materials, including hazardous medical waste at the proposed hospital campus once operational, would be less than significant.

CHAPTER 11.0 REFERENCES CITED

Section 3.0 Project Description

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers). 2013. *Traffic Impact Analysis.* Prepared for Kaiser Hospital Kearny Mesa. San Diego, California: LLG. May 2013.

Section 5.1 – Land Use

City of San Diego. 2008a. "Land Use and Community Planning Element." In *City of San Diego General Plan, City of Villages*. Adopted March 10, 2008. www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/#genplan.

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. City of San Diego, Development Services Department. January 2011. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2012a. *Land Development Manual – Base Zones*. San Diego Municipal Code, Land Development Code, as amended. March 2012.

City of San Diego. 2012b. City of San Diego Municipal CodeChapter 14: General Regulations, Article 3: Supplemental Development Regulations, Division 1: Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations. June 2012. Accessed on July 8, 2013. http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter14/Ch14Art03Division01.pdf

FAA (Federal Aviation Administration). 2013. Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation. Aeronautical Study no. 2012-AWP-7135-OE. Issue Date: May 29, 2013.

Henegar, L. Phone call between L. Henegar (City of San Diego, Long-range Planning) and A. Bleier (Dudek). October 29, 2012.

SANDAG 2011 2050 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy

San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission. 2004. *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, Montgomery Field.* Amended October 4, 2004. San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.

SDCRAA (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority). 2008. *MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.* Prepared by Mead & Hunt. Santa Rosa, California: Mead & Hunt. October 2, 2008.

Section 5.2 – Transportation/Circulation and Parking

City of San Diego. 1998. *Traffic Impact Study Manual.* Adopted July 1998.

City of San Diego. 2003. *Trip Generation Manual.* May 2003.

City of San Diego. 2011. Kearny Mesa Community Plan. Adopted October 6, 1992. Updated April 26, 2011.

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers). 2013. *Traffic Impact Analysis.* Prepared for Kaiser Hospital Kearny Mesa. San Diego, California: LLG. May 2013.

N. Prasad. 2013. E-mail from Narasimha Prasad, Senior Transportation Engineer, Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers, to Emily Lyons, Dudek on July 8, 2013.

SANTEC/ITE (San Diego Traffic Engineers' Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers). 2000. *Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies [TIS] in the San Diego Region*. Final Draft. March 2, 2000.

TRB (Transportation Research Board). 2000. *Highway Capacity Manual 2000.* Last updated May 8, 2012. Accessed November 5, 2012. http://www.trb.org/Main/Blurbs/152169.aspx.

Section 5.3 – Air Quality

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 1997. *Areawide Source Methodologies, Section 7.9, Entrained Paved Road Dust, Paved Road Travel*. July 1997.

CARB. 2007. *Fossil Fuel Emission Standards in the Distributed Generation Certification Regulation Sections 94200 et seq. Article 3, Subchapter 8, Chapter 1, Division 3 of Title 17, California Code of Regulations*. http://www.arb.ca.gov/energy/dg/2006regulation.pdf

CARB. 2011. *Area Designations Maps / State and National*. Accessed at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm.

CARB. 2012a. *Glossary of Air Pollutant Terms*. CARB website. http://www.arb.ca.gov/html/gloss.htm.

CARB. 2012b. *Ambient Air Quality Standards.* CARB website. http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf.

CARB. 2012c. *Air Quality Data Statistics.* CARB website. Accessed at: http://arb.ca.gov/adam.

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. City of San Diego, Development Services Department. January 2011. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2012. *Scope of Work for an Environmental Impact Report for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center Project, Project No. 274240*. July 5, 2012.

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 1998. "Natural Gas Combustion." Chap. 1.4 in *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors.* Vol. 1, *Stationary Point and Area Sources.* Update (Supplement D) to 5th ed. AP-42. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: EPA, Office of Air and Radiation; Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. July 1998. http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ ap42/ch01/index.html.

EPA. 2000. "Stationary Gas Turbines." Section 3.1 in *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors.* Update to 5th ed. AP-42. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: EPA; Office of Air and Radiation, Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. April 2000. http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ap42/ch03/index.html.

EPA. 2012a. "What are the Six Common Air Pollutants?" Environmental Protection Agency, Air & Radiation. Last updated April 20, 2012. http://www.epa.gov/air/urbanair/.

EPA. 2012b. "Region 9: Air Programs, Air Quality Maps." Environmental Protection Agency, Pacific Southwest, Air, Quality Analysis. Last updated May 5, 2012. Accessed August 17, 2012. http://www.epa.gov/region9/air/maps/maps_top.html.

EPA. 2012c. "AirData: Access to Air Pollution Data." Environmental Protection Agency, AirData. http://www.epa.gov/airdata.

Jones & Stokes. 2007. *Software User's Guide: URBEMIS 2007 for Windows; Emissions Estimation for Land Use Development Projects*. Version 9.2.4. Prepared for the South Coast Air Quality Management District. November 2007. http://www.urbemis.com/ support/manual.html.

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers). 2013. "Trip Generation Tables." In *Traffic Impact Analysis.* Prepared for Kaiser Hospital Kearny Mesa. San Diego, California: LLG. May 2013.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2011. *January Weather in San Diego*. Average Monthly Weather for San Diego Lindbergh Field. Western Region Headquarters. United States Department of Commerce. http://www.wrh.noaa.gov/ sgx/climate/san-san-month.htm.

SDAPCD (San Diego Air Pollution Control District). 1969. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 51, Nuisance*. Effective January 1, 1969.

SDAPCD. 1994. *Rules and Regulations. Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 69.2, Industrial and Commercial Boilers, Process Heaters and Steam Generators.* Adopted September 27, 1994).

SDAPCD. 1995a. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation XV, Federal Conformity, Rule 1501, Conformity with General Federal Actions.* Adopted March 7, 1995.

SDAPCD. 1995b. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation XI, National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, Subpart M, Rule 361.145, Standard for Demolition and Renovation.* Adopted February 1, 1995.

SDAPCD. 1996a. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation XII, Toxic Air Contaminants, Rule 1200, Toxic Air Contaminant – New Source Review.* Effective June 12, 1996.

SDAPCD. 1996b. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation XXII, Toxic Air Contaminants, Rule 1210, Toxic Air Contaminant Public Health Risks – Public Notification and Risk Reduction.* Effective June 12, 1996.

SDAPCD. 1997. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 50, Visible Emissions.* Amended August 13, 1997.

SDAPCD. 1998a. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation II, Rule 20.1, New Source Review – General Provisions.* Revised November 4, 1998, Effective December 17, 1998.

SDAPCD. 1998b. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation II, Rule 20.2, New Source Review – Non-Major Sources.* Revised November 4, 1998, Effective December 17, 1998.

SDAPCD. 1998c. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 69.3, Stationary Gas Turbine Engines – Reasonably Available Control Technology.* Revised Effective December 16, 1998.

SDAPCD. 2000a. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation II, Permits, Rule 10 Permits Required.* Amended April 27, 2000.

SDAPCD. 2000b. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 69.4.1, Stationary Reciprocating Internal Combustion Engines.* Adopted November 15, 2000).

SDAPCD. 2001. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 67, Architectural Coatings.* Revised December 12, 2001.

SDAPCD. 2005. "Measures to Reduce Particulate Matter in San Diego County." San Diego County Air Pollution Control District. December 2005. http://www.sdapcd.org/planning/PM-Measures.pdf.

SDAPCD. 2007. "Eight-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan for San Diego County." San Diego County Air Pollution Control District. May 2007. http://www.sdapcd.org/planning/8-Hour-O3-Attain-Plan.pdf.

SDAPCD. 2009. *Rules and Regulations, Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 55, Fugitive Dust.* Adopted June 24, 2009, Effective December 24, 2009.

SDAPCD. 2010a. Rules and Regulations, Regulation IV, Prohibitions, Rule 69.3.1, Stationary Gas Turbine Engines—Best Available Retrofit Control Technology. Revised February 24, 2010.

SDAPCD. 2010b. "Fact Sheet – Smog in San Diego County." San Diego County Air Pollution Control District. January 2010. http://www.sdapcd.org/info/facts/smogsd.pdf.

Yorke Engineering. 2012.

Section 5.4 – Greenhouse Gases

BAAQMD (Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2010. "Greenhouse Gas Model (BGM)." Version 1.1.9 Beta. http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CEQA-GUIDELINES/Tools-and-Methodology.aspx.

California Natural Resources Agency. 2009. *Final Statement of Reasons for Regulatory Action: Amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines Addressing Analysis and Mitigation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Pursuant to SB97*. December 2009. http://www.ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/.

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2006. "AB 32: The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. Public Workshop to Discuss Establishing the 1990 Emissions Level and the California 2020 Limit and Developing Regulations to Require Reporting of Greenhouse Gas Emissions." PowerPoint slides. December 1, 2006. http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/meet/2006_12_01_presentation_intro.pdf.

CARB. 2008. *Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change*. California Air Resources Board. October 2008. http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/psp.pdf.

CARB. 2011. "California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000–2008 – by Category as Defined in the Scoping Plan." California Air Resources Board. October 26, 2011. Accessed September 2012. http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/tables/ ghg_inventory_scopingplan_00-09_2011-10-26.pdf.

CAT (California Climate Action Team). 2006. *Final 2006 Climate Action Team Report to the Governor and Legislature*. March 2006. http://www.climatechange.ca.gov/ climate_action_team/reports/2006report/2006-04-03_FINAL_CAT_REPORT.PDF.

CAT. 2009. *Draft 2009 Climate Action Team Report to the Governor and Legislature.* March 2009.

CCAR (California Climate Action Registry). 2009. *General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions.* Version 3.1. January. http://climateregistry.org/ resources/docs/protocols/grp/ GRP_V3_April2008_FINAL.pdf

City of San Diego. 2012. *Scope of Work for an Environmental Impact Report for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center Project, Project No. 274240*. July 5, 2012.

Cleveland National Forest Foundation (Cleveland National Forest Foundation et al., Petitioners) v. SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments, Respondent). 2012. Case no. 2011-00101593.

ENVIRON International Corporation. 2011. "Appendix D, Table 9.1 – Water Use Rates." *CalEEMod User's Guide*. Version 2011.1. Prepared for the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD); Diamond Bar, California. Emeryville, California: ENVIRON International Corporation. February 2011. http://www.caleemod.com/.

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 1996. "Large Stationary Diesel and All Stationary Dual-fuel Engines." Section 3.4 in *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors.* Update to 5th ed. AP-42. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: EPA; Office of Air and Radiation; Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. October 1996. http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ ap42/ch03/index.html

EPA. 1998. "Natural Gas Combustion." Chap. 1.4 in *Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors.* Vol. 1. *Stationary Point and Area Sources.* Update (Supplement D) to 5th ed. AP-42. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: EPA; Office of Air and Radiation; Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards. July 1998. http://www.epa.gov/ttn/chief/ ap42/ch01/index.html.

EPA. 2005. "Greenhouse Gas Emissions from a Typical Passenger Vehicle." Emission Facts. EPA420-F-05-004. Washington, D.C.: EPA, Office of Transportation and Air Quality. February 2005. Accessed July 31, 2012. http://web.archive.org/web/20110315164622/ http://www.epa.gov/otaq/climate/420f05004.htm.

EPA. 2010. *EPA and NHTSA Finalize Historic National Program to Reduce Greenhouse Gases and Improve Fuel Economy for Cars and Trucks*. Regulatory Announcement. Office of Transportation and Air Quality. EPA-420-F-10-014. April 2010. http://www.epa.gov/oms/climate/regulations/420f10014.pdf.

EPA. 2011. *Final Rulemaking: Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standard*s. Regulations and Standards–Vehicles and Engines. Last updated February 2011. http://www.epa.gov/otaq/ climate/regulations.htm.

EPA. 2012. *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990–2010*. EPA 430-R-12-001. Washington, D.C.: EPA. April 15, 2012. http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ emissions/usinventoryreport.html.

EPA and NHTSA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. 2010. *Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards; Final Rule*. EPA–HQ–OAR–2009–0472. NHTSA-2009-0059. http://www.epa.gov/oms/climate/regulations/ldv-ghg-final-rule.pdf

EPA and NHTSA. 2012. *2017 and Later Model Year Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards*. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0799, NHTSA-2010-0131. October 15, 2012. http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-10-15/pdf/2012-21972.pdf.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2007. "Summary for Policymakers." In *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*, edited by S. Solomon, D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H.L. Miller. 1–18. A report of Working Group 1 of the IPCC. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press. http://ipcc-wg1.ucar.edu/wg1/docs/ WG1AR4_SPM_PlenaryApproved.pdf.

Jones & Stokes. 2007. *Software User's Guide: URBEMIS2007 for Windows; Emissions Estimation for Land Use Development Projects*. Version 9.2.4. Prepared for the South Coast Air Quality Management District. November 2007. http://www.urbemis.com/ support/manual.html.

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers). 2013. "Trip Generation Tables." In *Traffic Impact Analysis.* Prepared for Kaiser Hospital Kearny Mesa. San Diego, California: LLG. May 2013.

National Climatic Data Center. 2009. "Global Warming Frequently Asked Questions." National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. http://lwf.ncdc.noaa.gov/oa/climate/globalwarming.html.

Navigant Consulting Inc. 2006. *Refining Estimates of Water-Related Energy Use in California*. Public Interest Energy Research (PIER) final project report. CEC-500-2006-118. Prepared for the California Energy Commission, PIER Industrial/Agricultural/Water End Use Energy Efficiency Program. Sacramento, California: Navigant Consulting Inc. December 2006. http://www.energy.ca.gov/pier/project_reports/CEC-500-2006-118.html.

OPR (California Governor's Office of Planning and Research). 2008. *CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change through California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review*. Technical Advisory. Sacramento, California: OPR. June 19, 2008. http://opr.ca.gov/download.php?dl=ceqa/pdfs/june08-ceqa.pdf.

RBF Consulting. 2013. *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center. Preliminary Water and Sewer Report.* Prepared for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center. San Diego, California: RBF. January 2013.

Section 5.5 – Noise

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2011. Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. For New Highway Construction, Reconstruction, and Retrofit Barrier Projects. Division of Environmental Analysis. May 2011.

City of San Diego. 2006. Chapter 5: Public Safety, Morals and Welfare, Article 9.5: Noise Abatement and Control Division 4: Limits Section 59.5.0404 Construction Noise.

City of San Diego. 2008a. *City of San Diego General Plan Noise Element*. March 2008.

City of San Diego. 2008b. City of San Diego Municipal Code, Chapter 5: Public Safety, Morals and Welfare, Article 9.5: Noise Abatement and Control Division 4: Limits Section 59.5.0401 Sound Level Limits.

City of San Diego. 2008c. *City of San Diego General Plan Update – Final Program EIR.* Accessed November 2, 2012 at http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/peir.shtml.

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. City of San Diego, Development Services Department. January 2011. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

Dudek. 2012. Noise Assessment. Prepared by Dudek for Kaiser Permanente. December 2012. (The complete report is included as *Appendix F* of this EIR.)

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers). 2013. Traffic Impact Analysis. Prepared for Kaiser Hospital Kearny Mesa. San Diego, California: LLG. May 2013.

SDCRAA (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority). 2008. *MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.* Prepared by Mead & Hunt. Santa Rosa, California: Mead & Hunt. October 2, 2008.

Section 5.6 – Paleontological Resources

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. City of San Diego, Development Services Department. January 2011. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

GEOBASE INC. 2012. *Geotechnical Report; Kaiser Permanente San Diego Service Area Central Hospital, Hospital and Central Utility Plant.* Prepared for Kaiser Foundation Health Plan Inc. Laguna Hills, California: GEOBASE. March 2012.

RBF Consulting. 2012. *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center; Preliminary Water and Sewer Report*. Prepared for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center. San Diego, California: RBF. April 4, 2012.

Section 5.7 – Biology

ACOE (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). 1987. *Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual.* Online ed. Environmental Laboratory, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. Vicksburg, Mississippi: U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station. January 1987. Accessed September 1, 2010. http://www.fedcenter.gov/Bookmarks/index.cfm?id=6403&pge_id=1606.

ACOE (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). 2008. *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0).* Environmental Laboratory, ERDC/EL TR-08-28. Vicksburg, Mississippi: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center. September 2008. Accessed September 24, 2012. http://el.erdc.usace.army.mil/elpubs/pdf/trel08-28.pdf.

Bing Maps. 2011. “San Diego County, GIS layer” [aerial photographic map].

CDFG (California Department of Fish and Game). 2012. “State and Federally Listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California.” California Natural Diversity Database. CDFG, Biogeographic Data Branch. October 2012. Accessed October 1, 2012. http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/plants_and_animals.asp.

City of San Diego. 1997. *City of San Diego Multi Species Conservation Plan, Subarea Plan*. March 1997. http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/mscp/docs/SCMSCP/FinalMSCPProgramPlan.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2008. *Land Development Manual – General Rules for Overlay Zones*. San Diego Municipal Code, Land Development Code, as amended. http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter13/Ch13Art02Division01.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2009. *Land Development Manual – Biology Guidelines*. San Diego Municipal Code, Land Development Code, as amended. August 2009 draft amendments. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/landdevcode.shtml.

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. City of San Diego, Development Services Department. January 2011. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2012. *Storm Water Standards Manual.* City of San Diego, Think Blue. January 20, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/thinkblue/pdf/stormwatermanual.pdf.

CNPS (California Native Plant Society). 2012. *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants*. Online ed. Version 8-01a. Sacramento, California: CNPS. http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/.

Dudek. 2012. *Biological Resources Letter Report for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center, City of San Diego, California. Project No. 274240.* Encinitas, California: Dudek. November 6, 2012.

Holland, R.F. 1986. *Preliminary Descriptions of The Terrestrial Natural Communities of California.* Nongame-Heritage Program, California Department of Fish and Game. October 1986.

Oberbauer, T., M. Kelly, and J. Buegge. 2008. *Draft Vegetation Communities of San Diego County.* March 2008. Accessed September 12, 2012. http://www.sdcanyonlands.org/canyon-groups/canyon-group-resources/canyon-enhancement-guide/189-canyon-enhancement-planning-guide-materials.

Section 5.8 – Energy

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2008. *Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change*. October 2008. http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/psp.pdf.

CARB. 2012. "Clean Car Standards – Pavley, Assembly Bill 1493." California Environmental Protection Agency, California Air Resources Board. Accessed October 31, 2012. http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/ccms/ccms.htm.

CEC (California Energy Commission). 2011. *2011 Integrated Energy Policy Report.* Final Commission Report. CEC-100-2011-001-CMF. California Energy Commission. Accessed October 31, 2012. http://www.energy.ca.gov/2011publications/ CEC-100-2011-001/CEC-100-2011-001-CMF.pdf.

CEC. 2012a. "SB 1368 Emission Performance Standards." California Energy Commission. Accessed October 31, 2012. http://www.energy.ca.gov/emission_standards/index.html.

CEC. 2012b. *2012 Integrated Energy Policy Report Update.* CEC-100-2012-001-CMF. California Energy Commission. http://www.energy.ca.gov/2012publications/ CEC-100-2012-001/CEC-100-2012-001-LCD.pdf

City of San Diego. 2008. "Conservation Element." In *City of San Diego General Plan, City of Villages*. Adopted March 10, 2008. www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/#genplan.

EPA and NHTSA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration). 2012. *2017 and Later Model Year Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards; Final Rule*. EPA–HQ–OAR–2010–0799, NHTSA-2010-0131. October 15, 2012. http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2012-10-15/pdf/2012-21972.pdf.

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan). 2013. *Traffic Impact Analysis.* Prepared for Kaiser Hospital Kearny Mesa. San Diego, California: LLG. May 2013.

U.S. Department of Energy. 2012. "U.S. States – California." U.S. Energy Information Administration, Independent Statistics & Analysis. Accessed October 31, 2012 at: http://www.eia.gov/beta/state/data.cfm?sid=CA.

Section 5.9 – Health and Safety

City of San Diego. 2009. "Official Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map," City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department. Grid Tile: 28. February 24, 2009. Accessed September 14, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/fire/pdf/maps/grid28.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. San Diego, California: City of San Diego, Development Services Department. Revised January 2011. Accessed September 17, 2012. www.sandiego.gov/development-services/news/pdf/sdtceqa.pdf.

County of San Diego. 2011. *Medical Waste Management Plan*. San Diego, California: County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Accessed September 14, 2012. http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/deh/hazmat/pdf/hm-9213.pdf.

County of San Diego. 2012. "HazMat Business Plan (HMBP)." California Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95. County of San Diego. Accessed September 14, 2012: http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/deh/hazmat/hazmat.html.

Dudek. 2012. *Environmental Hazards Report*. Prepared for Kaiser Permanente, San Diego Central Medical Center. San Diego, California: Dudek. July 2012.

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan). 2013. *Traffic Impact Analysis.* Prepared for Kaiser Hospital Kearny Mesa. San Diego, California: LLG. May 2013.

Section 5.10 – Visual Quality

City of San Diego. 2011a. *Kearny Mesa Community Plan*. Adopted October 6, 1992. Updated April 26, 2011.

City of San Diego. 2011b. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. San Diego, California: City of San Diego, Development Services Department. Revised January 2011. Accessed September 17, 2012. www.sandiego.gov/development-services/news/pdf/sdtceqa.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2012. San Diego Municipal Code, Sections 142.0701–142.0740. General Development Regulations Division, Off-Site Development Impact Regulations, as amended September 6, 2012. Accessed November 2012. http://docs.sandiego.gov/ municode/MuniCodeChapter14/Ch14Art02Division07.pdf.

FAA (Federal Aviation Administration). 2012. Determination of No Hazard to Air Navigation. Aeronautical Study no. 2012-AWP-7135-OE.

GEOBASE Inc. 2012. INC. 2012. *Geotechnical Report; Kaiser Permanente San Diego Service Area Central Hospital, Hospital and Central Utility Plant.* Prepared for Kaiser Foundation Health Plan Inc. Laguna Hills, California: GEOBASE. March 2012.

Section 5.11 – Geologic Conditions

California Geological Survey. 2007. Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones. Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey. September 21, 2012. http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/rghm/ap/Pages/Index.aspx.

City of San Diego. 2009. *Land Development Manual*. San Diego Municipal Code, as amended. August 2009. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/landdevcode.shtml.

City of San Diego. 2008. *City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study, Geologic Hazards and Faults. Grid Tiles: 26 and 31*, April 3, 2008.

GEOBASE INC. 2012a. *Geotechnical Report; Kaiser Permanente San Diego Service Area Central Hospital, Hospital and Central Utility Plant.* Prepared for Kaiser Foundation Health Plan Inc. Laguna Hills, California: GEOBASE. March 2012.

GEOBASE INC. 2012b. *Geotechnical Report, Claremont Mesa Boulevard Retaining Walls, Kaiser Permanente – San Diego Central Hospital, San Diego, CA,* Prepared for Kaiser Foundation Health Plan Inc. Pasadena, California: GEOBASE. December 2012.

Geocon Inc. 2009. *Geotechnical Investigation—County Operations Center (Annex), Clairemont Mesa Boulevard and Ruffin Road, San Diego, California.* Project no. G1043-52-01. January 8, 2009.

RBF Consulting. 2012. Preliminary Drainage, Grading and Utility Plan for Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Conditional Use Permit and Planned Development Permit. June 29, 2012.

Section 5.12 – Hydrology/Water Quality

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds.* San Diego, California: City of San Diego, Development Services Department. Revised January 2011. Accessed August 31, 2011. https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2012. *Storm Water Standards*. Revised January 2012.

RBF (Consulting). 2013a. *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center Preliminary Drainage Study*. Prepared for Kaiser Permanente. January 2013.

RBF. 2013b. *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center Preliminary Water Quality Technical Report.* Prepared for Kaiser Permanente. January 2013.

San Diego RWQCB (Regional Water Quality Control Board). 1994 *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9).* September 8, 1994, with amendments effective on or before April 4, 2011.

Section 5.13 – Public Utilities

City of San Diego. 2010. *2010 Urban Water Management Plan*. Prepared for the City of San Diego. May 10, 2012. Accessed October 19, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/water/pdf/uwmp2010.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. San Diego, California: City of San Diego, Development Services Department. Revised January 2011. Accessed September 17, 2012. https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2012. "General Information." *Public Utilities: Wastewater*. Accessed October 29, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/mwwd/general/index.shtml.

City of San Diego. 2013. Water Supply Assessment Report, *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital.* Prepared by the City of San Diego Public Utilities Department. April 25, 2013.

Leppert Engineering Corporation. 2012. Conceptual Waste Management Plan for Kaiser Permanente San Diego KP Central Medical Center. Prepared for Kaiser Permanente. December 3, 2012.

RBF (Consulting). 2012a. *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center Preliminary Water and Sewer Report.* Prepared for Kaiser Permanente. April 4, 2012.

RBF. 2013a. *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center Sewer Study.* Prepared for Kaiser Permanente. January 2013.

RBF. 2013b. *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center Preliminary Drainage Study.* Prepared for Kaiser Permanente. January 2013.

Ruiz. 2013. Phone call with Alejandro Ruiz (Assistant Civil Engineer, Water and Sewer Development Review Section, City of San Diego Public Utilities Department) and E. Lyons (Dudek). May 22, 2013.

San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA). 2013. *Who We Are.* Accessed May 21, 2013. http://www.sdcwa.org/who-we-are.

Section 5.14 – Public Services and Facilities

Citygate 2011. Fire Service Standards of Response Coverage Deployment Study for the City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department Report (commonly referred to as "the Citygate Report"), February 14, 2011. Accessed March 5, 2013: http://www.sandiego.gov/fire/pdf/citygate.pdf

City of San Diego. 2008a. "Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element." In *City of San Diego General Plan, City of Villages*. Adopted March 10, 2008. http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/pdf/generalplan/publicfacilites2010.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2008b. "Recreation Element." In *City of San Diego General Plan, City of Villages*. Adopted March 10, 2008. http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/pdf/generalplan/recreationelement2010.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2012. "San Diego Public Library, Location and Hours." City of San Diego, San Diego Public Library. Accessed June 6, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/public-library/locations/.

City of San Diego. 2011. The Committee of Public Safety and Neighborhood Services of the City Council of the City of San Diego, Revised Actions for Wednesday June 29, 2011. Accessed on February 27, 2013: http://docs.sandiego.gov/ccaction_psns/PSNS_6-29-11_Actions_Rev.pdf

City of San Diego Fire–Rescue Department. 2012a. "Fire Station 28." City of San Diego, San Diego Fire–Rescue Department. Accessed June 5, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/fire/about/firestations/sta28.shtml.

City of San Diego Fire–Rescue Department. 2012b. "Fire Station 39." City of San Diego, San Diego Fire–Rescue Department. Accessed June 5, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/fire/about/firestations/sta39.shtml.

City of San Diego Fire–Rescue Department. 2012c. "Fire Station 36." City of San Diego, San Diego Fire–Rescue Department. Accessed June 5, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/fire/about/firestations/sta36.shtml.

City of San Diego Fire–Rescue Department. 2012d. "Fire Station 45." City of San Diego, San Diego Fire–Rescue Department. Accessed October 10, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/fire/about/firestations/sta45.shtml

City of San Diego Police Department. 2012. "Eastern Division." City of San Diego, San Diego Police Department, Neighborhood Divisions. Accessed June 5, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/police/services/divisions/eastern/index.shtml.

Committee on Public Safety & Neighborhood Services, 2011. Revised Actions for Wednesday, June 29, 2011 meeting. Accessed February 27, 2013. http://docs.sandiego.gov/ccaction_psns/PSNS_6-29-11_Actions_Rev.pdf.

Hubbs, K. 2012. Letter from K. Hubbs (Police Lieutenant, City of San Diego, Office of the Chief of Police) to E. Lyons (Dudek). June 19, 2012.

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers). 2013. Draft *Traffic Impact Analysis.* Prepared for Kaiser Hospital Kearny Mesa. San Diego, California: LLG. May 2013.

National University. 2012. "Spectrum Business Park Campus." National University. Accessed June 6, 2012. http://www.nu.edu/Locations/SanDiego/Spectrum.html.

San Diego Unified School District. 2012. "Attendance Area 2011–12 Maps for Elementary Schools, Junior High/Middle Schools, and High Schools." Accessed June 5, 2012.

Trame, L. 2012. Email from L. Trame (Assistant Fire Marshal, San Diego Fire Department) to E. Lyons (Dudek). October 3, 2012.

Chapter 6.0 – Cumulative

City of San Diego. 2009. "Official Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map," City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department. Grid Tile: 28. February 24, 2009. Accessed September 14, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/fire/pdf/maps/grid28.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. City of San Diego, Development Services Department. January 2011. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2012. "General Information." *Public Utilities: Wastewater*. Accessed October 29, 2012. http://www.sandiego.gov/mwwd/general/index.shtml.RBF (Consulting). 2013. *Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Hospital Medical Center Preliminary Drainage Study*. Prepared for Kaiser Permanente. January 2013.

Chapter 7.0 – Effects Found Not To Be Significant

California Department of Conservation. 2008. "San Diego County Important Farmland 2008" [map]. 1:120,000. Sacramento, California: California Department of Conservation.

California HealthCare Foundation. 2010. *California Hospital Facts and Figures 2010*. California HealthCare Foundation. April 2010. http://www.chcf.org/~/media/MEDIA%20LIBRARY%20Files/PDF/C/PDF%20CaliforniaHospitalFactsFigures2010.pdf.

City of San Diego. 2010. "Conservation Element." In *City of San Diego General Plan, City of Villages*. Adopted March 10, 2008. www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/#genplan.

County of San Diego. 2003. "Williamson Act Map" [map]. County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. December 18, 2003.

Dudek. 2012. *Negative Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Kaiser Permanente San Diego Central Medical Center Project, San Diego County, California.* Encinitas, California: Dudek. August 2012.

NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service). 2012. "California Revised Storie Index." Web Soil Survey. U.S. Department of Agriculture, NRCS. Accessed August 6, 2012. http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx.

Chapter 8.0 – Mandatory Discussion Areas

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendix A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

City of San Diego. 2011. *California Environmental Quality Act, Significance Determination Thresholds*. City of San Diego, Development Services Department. January 2011. http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/pdf/news/sdtceqa.pdf.

Chapter 9.0 – Alternatives

14 CCR 15000–15387 and Appendix A–L. Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, as amended.

LLG (Linscott Law & Greenspan Engineers). 2013. Kaiser San Diego Central Medical Center - Project Alternatives Traffic Assessment. Memorandum from John Boarman and Narasimha Prasad, LLG to Skyler Denniston, Kaiser Permanente and Shawn Shamlou, Dudek. June 19, 2013.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

CHAPTER 12.0 CERTIFICATION PAGE

City of San Diego

Jeff Peterson, Development Project Manager
Elizabeth Shearer-Nguyen, Environmental
Lesley Henegar, Long Range Planning
Raynard Abalos, Planning Review
Thomas Bui, LDR-Engineering Review
Farah Mahzari, LDR-Transportation Development
Ann French Gonsalves, LDR-Transportation Development
Glen Spindell, Landscaping
Ron Carter, Fire-Plans Officer
Jim Quinn Geology
Alejandro Ruiz, PUD- Water and Sewer
Charlotte Strong-Williams, Facilities Planning
Robin Shifflet, Parks and Recreation
Jeffrey Oakley, Plan-Historic
Ted Recidoro, BDR-Structural
Larry Trame, San Diego Fire Department
Warren Lovell, San Diego Police Department

Dudek

Shawn Shamlou, AICP, Senior Project Manager
Asha Bleier, AICP, LEED-AP BD+C, Environmental Analyst
Vipul Joshi, Senior Ecologist
Emily Lyons, Environmental Planner
Brian Grover, Environmental Planner
Jennifer Longabaugh, Environmental Planner
Austin Melcher, Research Assistant
Melanie Tylke, Research Assistant
David Deckman, Director of Air Quality Services
Nicole Peacock, PE, PG, REA, Environmental Engineer/Geologist
Mike Komula, Acoustician
Lesley Terry, GIS Analyst
Andrew Greis, GIS Technician
Becky Golden-Harrell, Technical Editor
Amy Seals, Technical Editor
Hannah Westwood, Publications Production Lead

Sheila Sapalicio, Publications Assistant
Micah Hale, Registered Professional Archaeologist

Kaiser Permanente

Skyler X. Denniston
Joe Stasney