



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

DATE OF NOTICE: September 26th, 2016

PUBLIC NOTICE OF A DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

The City of San Diego Development Services Department has prepared a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration Report for the following project and is inviting your comments regarding the adequacy of the document. The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration has been placed on the City of San Diego web-site at <http://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/officialdocs/notices/index.shtml> under the "California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Notices & Documents" section. **Your comments must be received by October 17th, 2016**, to be included in the final document considered by the decision-making authorities. Please send your written comments to the following address: **Chris Tracy, AICP Environmental Planner, City of San Diego Development Services Center, 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101** or e-mail your comments to DSDEAS@sandiego.gov with the Project Name and Number in the subject line.

General Project Information:

- Project Name: CARDENAS RESIDENCE CDP/SDP
- Project No. 445629 / SCH No. N/A
- Community Plan Area: La Jolla
- Council District: 1

Project Description:

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT and SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to demolish an existing one-story single-family residence and to construct a two-story 6,071-square-foot single-family residence with 627-square-foot garage, and 1,458-square-feet of decks and covered porch areas on a 11,878 square foot lot. The project would also construct various site improvements, including associated hardscape and landscaping.

The proposed project is located at 8466 El Paseo Grande, in the SF (Single Family) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, within the La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Program, La Jolla Shores Precise Plan, La Jolla Shores Design Manual, Coastal Overlay Zone (Appealable Area), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Sensitive Coastal Overlay Zone, La Jolla Archaeological Study Area, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Beach Impact Area), Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, and Council District 1. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 2 of Ocean Terrace, Map No. 2615.). **The site is not included on any Government Code listing of hazardous waste sites.**

Applicant: Bill Hayer, Hayer Architecture

Recommended Finding: The recommended finding that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment is based on an Initial Study and project revisions/conditions which now mitigate potentially significant environmental impacts in the following area(s): **HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHEOLOGY)**.

Availability in Alternative Format: To request this Notice, the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, and/or supporting documents in alternative format, call the Development Services Department at 619-446-5460 or (800) 735-2929 (TEXT TELEPHONE).

Additional Information: For environmental review information, contact Chris Tracy, AICP at (619) 446-5381. The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and supporting documents may be reviewed, or purchased for the cost of reproduction, at the Fifth floor of the Development Services Center. If you are interested in obtaining additional copies of either a Compact Disk (CD), a hard-copy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, or the separately bound technical appendices, they can be purchased for an additional cost. **For information regarding public meetings/hearings on this project, contact Glenn Gargas at (619) 446-5142.** This notice was published in the SAN DIEGO DAILY TRANSCRIPT and distributed on September 26th, 2016.

SAP No.: 24006206

Kerry Santoro
Deputy Director
Development Services Department



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 445629
SCH No. N/A

SUBJECT: **CARDENAS RESIDENCE SDP/CDP**

- I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: See attached Initial Study.
- II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See attached Initial Study.
- III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following areas(s): **HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY)**. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

- IV. DOCUMENTATION: The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above Determination.

- V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS - PART I
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.

B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART 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:

Qualified Archeologist, Native American 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) # 445629 and /or Environmental Document # 445629, 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.

Not Applicable

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 Preconstruction Meeting |
| Historical Resources (Archeology) | Monitoring Report(s) | Archeological/Historic Site Observation |
| Bond Release | Request for a Bond Release Letter | Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter |

C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS

HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY)

I. Prior to Permit Issuance

A. Entitlements 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 Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring have been noted on the applicable construction documents through the plan check process.

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 archaeological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). If applicable, individuals involved in the archaeological monitoring program must have completed the 40-hour HAZWOPER training with certification documentation.
2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project meet the qualifications established in the HRG.
3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain written 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 (1/4 mile radius) has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from South Coastal Information Center, 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 any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.
3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the ¼ mile radius.

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, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological 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
 - a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.
 - b. The AME 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 site conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

III. During Construction

- A. Monitor(s) Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching
 1. The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. **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 AME.**
 2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.
 3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
 4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE 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 Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources 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.
4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.

C. Determination of Significance

1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.
 - 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.
 - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) which has been reviewed by the Native American consultant/monitor, 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. **Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.**
 - c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.

IV. Discovery of Human Remains

If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken:

A. Notification

1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.
2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.

B. Isolate discovery site

1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenance of the remains.
 2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenance.
 3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.
- C. If Human Remains **ARE** determined to be Native American
1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, **ONLY** the Medical Examiner can make this call.
 2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.
 3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.
 4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
 5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:
 - a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission; OR;
 - b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, THEN,
 - c. In order to protect these sites, the Landowner shall do one or more of the following:
 - (1) Record the site with the NAHC;
 - (2) Record an open space or conservation easement on the site;
 - (3) Record a document with the County.
 - d. Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendants is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and items associated and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.
- D. If Human Remains are **NOT** Native American
1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.
 2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98).

3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.

V. 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 CSV and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.
 - b. Discoveries
All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV - Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.
 - c. Potentially Significant Discoveries
If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV-Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.
 - d. The PI shall immediately contact MMC, or by 8AM of 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 and/or weekend 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.

VI. 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 Historical Resources Guidelines (Appendix C/D) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring. **It should be noted that if the PI is unable to submit the Draft Monitoring Report within the allotted 90-day timeframe resulting from delays with analysis, special study results or other complex issues, a schedule shall be submitted to MMC establishing agreed due dates and the provision for submittal of monthly status reports until this measure can be met.**

- a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
 - b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation
The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.
2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
 3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC for approval.
 4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
 5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Artifacts
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
 2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
 3. The cost for curation is the responsibility of the property owner.
- C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
 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.
 3. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection 5.
- D. Final Monitoring Report(s)
1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy 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 and/or release of the Performance Bond for grading until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

The above mitigation monitoring and reporting program will require additional fees and/or deposits to be collected prior to the issuance of building permits, certificates of occupancy and/or final maps to ensure the successful completion of the monitoring program.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Coastal Commission (48)

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Mayor's Office
Councilmember Lightner - District 1
City Attorney's Office (93C)

Development Services:
LDR - Engineering Review
LDR - EAS
LDR - Geology
LDR - Landscaping
LDR - Planning Review

Facilities Financing (93B)
Water Review (86A)
San Diego Central Library (81A)
La Jolla - Riford Library (81L)
Historical Resources Board (87)

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

Carmen Lucas (206)
South Coastal Information Center (210)
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
Save Our Heritage Organization (214)
Ron Christman (215)
Clint Linton (215B)
Frank Brown, Inter-Tribal Cultural Resources Council (216)
Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218)
Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)
Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)
Native American Distribution - Public Notice and Location Map Only (225A-S)
La Jolla Village News (271)
La Jolla Shores Association (272)
La Jolla Town Council (273)
La Jolla Historical Society (274)
La Jolla Community Planning Association - Cindy Greatrex - Chair (275)
UCSD Physical & Community Planning (277)
Brad Werdick - Director La Jolla Shores PDO Advisory Board (279)
La Jolla Light (280)

Patricia K. Miller (283)
Joseph and Machelles Cardenas, Owner(s)


VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- () No comments were received during the public input period.
- () Comments were received but did not address the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document. No response is necessary and the letters are incorporated herein.
- () Comments addressing the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document were received during the public input period. The letters and responses are incorporated herein.

Copies of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program and any Initial Study material are available in the office of the Entitlements Division for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.



MARK BRUNETTE
SENIOR PLANNER
Development Services Department




Date of Draft Report

Date of Final Report

Analyst: CHRIS TRACY, AICP, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

Attachments: Figure 1 – Location Map
Figure 2 – Site Plan
Initial Study Checklist



Location Map

Cardenas Residence SDP-CDP/Project No. 445629 Address - 8466 El Paseo Grande
City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE
No. 1

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: 445629
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 1222 First Avenue, MS-501, San Diego, California 92101
3. Contact person and phone number: Chris Tracy, AICP, Associate Planner / (619) 446-5381
4. Project location: 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla, CA 92037
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Bill Hayer, Hayer Architecture, 915 Camino Del Mar, Suite#100, Del Mar, CA 92014
6. General/Community Plan designation: Residential/Very Low Density Residential (0 - 5 dwelling units per acre).
7. Zoning: LJSPD-SF (La Jolla Shores Planned District- Single-Family)
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT and SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to demolish an existing one-story single-family residence and to construct a two-story 6,071 square-foot (sq. ft.) single-family residence, inclusive of a 627 sq.ft. garage and 1,458 sq.ft. of exterior decks and covered porch areas, on a 11,878 sq.ft. lot. The project would also construct various site improvements, including associated hardscape and landscaping.

The proposed project is located at 8466 El Paseo Grande, in the Single Family (SF) Zone of the La Jolla Shores Planned District, within the La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Program, La Jolla Shores Precise Plan, La Jolla Shores Design Manual, Coastal Overlay Zone (Appealable Area), Coastal Height Limit Overlay Zone, Sensitive Coastal Overlay Zone, La Jolla Archaeological Study Area, First Public Roadway, Parking Impact Overlay Zone (Beach Impact Area), Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone, and Council District 1. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 2 of Ocean Terrace, Map No. 2615.). The site is not included on any Government Code listing of hazardous waste sites.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):

None required.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> | Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> | Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> | Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Utilities/Service System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> | Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mandatory Findings Significance |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis.)
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses”, as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or (mitigated) negative declaration. *Section 15063(c)(3)(D)*. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

l) AESTHETICS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is presently developed with an existing single-family residence. A public view to scenic coastal resource (a scenic vista) presently exists along El Paseo Grande. Any adverse impacts from the development of this proposal with respect to the degradation of a scenic vista, will be reduced to below a level of significance with the implementation of the following project Conditions: LDR-Planning Conditions:

“Prior to the issuance of any construction permits, the Owner/Permittee shall record a View Corridor Easement that is 4-feet wide along the northern side setback, and 5-feet, 2-inches wide along the southern side setback, as shown on Exhibit "A," in accordance with SDMC section 132.0403.”

“Open fencing and landscaping may be permitted within the side setback visual corridors provided such improvements do not significantly obstruct public views to the ocean. Landscaping shall be planted and maintained not to exceed 3-feet in height in order to preserve public views.”

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is situated within a developed residential neighborhood. No such scenic resources or state scenic highways are located on, near, or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, no impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is developed with an existing single-family residence. The construction of a single-family residence with an attached garage is compatible with the surrounding development, and permitted by the community plan and zoning designation. The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or the surrounding area. Any impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with the implementation the two project conditions from LDR-Planning as described further within Response l(a) above. No impacts are anticipated.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The project will comply with all current lighting and material glare standards and no significant impacts would occur.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is consistent with the community plan's land use designation, and is located within a developed residential neighborhood. As such, the project site does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any lands identified as Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response to II(a) above. There are no Williamson Act Contract lands on or within the vicinity of the project site. The project is consistent with the existing land use and the underlying zone. The project does not conflict with any agricultural use. No impacts would result.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No designated forest land or timberland occur onsite as the project is consistent with the community plan, and the underlying zone. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response II(c) above. Additionally, the project would not contribute to the conversion of any forested land to non-forest use, as surrounding land uses are built out. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No Impact, Refer to II(a) and (c) above.

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991, and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2009). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (O3). The RAQS relies on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SANDAG, including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in San Diego County and the cities in the county, to project future emissions and then determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by San Diego County and the cities in the county as part of the development of their general plans.

The RAQS relies on SANDAG growth projections based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by the cities and by the county as part of the development of their general plans. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by local plans would be consistent with the RAQS. However, if a project proposes development that is greater than that anticipated in the local plan and SANDAG's growth projections, the project might be in conflict with the RAQS and may contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on air quality.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

The project would construct a single-family residence with an attached garage within a developed neighborhood of similar residential uses. The project is consistent with the General Plan, community plan, and the underlying zoning for residential development. Therefore, the project would be Consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS, and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. As such, no impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Short-term Emissions (Construction)

Project construction activities would potentially generate combustion emissions from on-site heavy duty construction vehicles and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew and necessary construction materials. Exhaust emissions generated by construction activities would generally result from the use of typical construction equipment that may include excavation equipment, forklift, skip loader, and/or dump truck. Variables that factor into the total construction emissions potentially generated include the level of activity, length of construction period, number of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials to be transported on or off-site. It is anticipated that construction equipment would be used on-site for four to eight hours a day; however, construction would be short-term and impacts to neighboring uses would be minimal and temporary.

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with land clearing and grading operations. Due to the nature and location of the project, construction activities are expected to create minimal fugitive dust, as a result of the disturbance associated with grading. The project would demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a single-family residence with attached garage. Construction operations would include standard measures as required by the City of San Diego grading permit to reduce potential air quality impacts to less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant, and would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts related to short term emissions would be less than significant.

Long-term Emissions (Operational)

Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to any change caused by a project. The project would produce minimal stationary source emissions. Once construction of the project is complete, long-term air emissions would potentially result from such sources as fireplaces, heating, ventilation, and cooling (HVAC) systems, and other motorized equipment typically associated with residential uses. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and is permitted by the community plan and zone designation. Based on the residential land use, project emissions over the long-term are not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts would be less than significant.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

Overall, the project is not expected to generate substantial emissions that would violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

As described above in response III(b), construction operations may temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants. However, construction emissions would be temporary and short-term in duration. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMP's) would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Short-term (Construction)

Odors would be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment and architectural coatings. Such odors are temporary and generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect a substantial number of people. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Long-term (Operational)

Typical long-term operational characteristics of the project are not associated with the creation of such odors nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. The project would construct a single-family residence with attached garage. Residential dwelling units, in the long-term operation, are not typically associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, project operations would result in less than significant impacts.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located in a developed urban setting fronting La Jolla Shores Beach and the Pacific Ocean. No biological resource impacts would be expected as construction would take place on the existing pad area. No impacts are anticipated, and as such, no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response IV (a) above. The project site is urban developed and currently supports non native landscaping. Additionally, the project site is presently developed with an existing single-family residence and located within a residential neighborhood. The project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other identified community. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site does not contain any federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood. No impacts would result. Also refer to response IV (a) above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No formal and/or informal wildlife corridors are on or near the project site, as the project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood. Therefore, no impacts would result. Also refer to response IV (a) above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Conflict with any local policies or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

The project would not conflict with any local policies and/or ordinances protecting biological resources such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response IV(e) above. The project site is located within a developed urban neighborhood and is not within, nor adjacent to, the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Therefore no impacts would result.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises. Before approving discretionary projects, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (Sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (Sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

Archaeological Resources

Many areas of San Diego County, including mesas and the coast, are known for intense and diverse prehistoric occupation and important archaeological resources. The region has been inhabited by various cultural groups spanning 10,000 years or more. The project site is located on the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Sensitivity map. Furthermore, the project site is located within an area of La Jolla Shores that requires special considerations due to the area's archaeological sensitivity with respect to the Spindrift archaeological site and the high potential for project grading to impact unknown prehistoric resources including human remains.

A record search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database was reviewed by qualified archaeological City staff to determine presence or absence of potential resources within the project site. Although no recorded archaeological sites were located within or

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

adjacent to the project site, there is a potential for the project to impact archaeological resources due to the project's location within the Spindrift archaeological site and redevelopment of the site. Therefore, mitigation measures related to historical resources (archaeology) is required.

All potential impacts related to the presence of archeological resources at the site would be reduced and addressed through the purview of a qualified Native American monitor. Monitoring by this individual would occur at all stages of ground-disturbing activities at the site. Furthermore, a Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), would be implemented to address this issue specifically. With implementation of the historical resources monitoring program, potential impacts on historical resources would be reduced to less than significant.

Built Environment

The City of San Diego reviews projects requiring the demolition of structures 45 years or older for historic significance in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA Section 21084.1 states that "A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may cause a significant effect on the environment." Historic property (built environment) surveys are required for properties which are 45 years of age or older and which have integrity of setting, location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

The existing structure on the project site was identified as 54 years in age. Therefore, building records and a photographic survey for the project site were submitted and reviewed by Plan-Historic staff. City staff determined that the property and/or structure is not an individually designated resource and is not located within a designated historic district. In addition, the property does not meet designation criteria as a significant resource under any adopted criteria. Therefore, no impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response V (a) above.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, La Jolla, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975), and the "Faulting and Bluff Geologic Evaluation Report - Proposed Lusardi Residence" (CET, Inc., February 12, 2007), the project site is primarily underlain with alluvium slopewash and the highly sensitive Bay Point Formation.

According to the Grading and Drainage Plan, Sheet A 0.2a, grading operations would entail approximately 130 cubic yards of cut with a maximum cut depth of two feet below existing grade. Additionally, the project would require 180 cubic yards of fill and 50 cubic yards of import with a

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

maximum fill depth of three feet.

As a guideline dependent on grading history, paleontological monitoring may be required if project grading meets or exceeds the City's Thresholds of 1,000 cubic yards to 10 feet in depth. This project falls below this threshold; therefore, the project does not have the potential to disturb or destroy paleontological resources and therefore, does not exceed the threshold for paleontological monitoring. No impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Disturb and human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response V (a) above. Although no known burial sites are known to be on the site, there is a potential for buried archaeological resources, including human remains, to be on-site. Please see Section V of the MND and the Initial Study.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The project site contains a known earthquake fault, which is the Scripps Fault. The project would be required to comply with seismic requirement of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts based on regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant. Additional background on this subject area is as follows:

Per "Addendum 03 – Response to City of San Diego Cycle Review Comments, Cycle Type 4 – Submitted (Multi-Discipline): LDR-Geology, for Proposed Cardenas Residence, 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla, California (CTE, June 10 , 2016):

From review of the previous investigations and/or reports, it appears that geologic hazards at the site are primarily limited to those caused by violent shaking from earthquake generated motion waves, and potential differential settlement of the Quaternary undocumented fill and unsuitable Quaternary Slopewash soils at the site.

However, it is our professional opinion that these potential geologic hazards will be mitigated, provided the recommendations in the above referenced reports are incorporated into the design and construction of the project, and grading and construction of site improvements are conducted

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

in accordance with the 2013 California Building Code (CBC)."

And, information concerning this issue area was documented under PTS 191344 "Cardenas Residence":

"The eastern half of the site is located in Geological Hazard Zones 12 (potentially active faults (Scripps Fault)), while the western portion is in Zone 48 (generally stable broad beach areas) and the middle portion in Zone 52 (favorable geologic structure, low risk to development) per the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study. Two geotechnical reports (Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation -March 2006; and Faulting and Bluff Geologic Evaluation - February 2007; both by CTE, Inc.); were provided for the previous Lusardi Residence and a third report was created specifically for the Cardenas Residence (CTE, November, 2, 2009) to answer City Geology Staff questions and to determine if a concealed portion of the Scripps Fault is present on-site. It was determined that existing and proposed development is not located on a fault. The site was also determined to be outside the defined Sensitive Coastal Bluff Zone per the City's Coastal Bluffs and Beaches & Steep Slopes Guidelines. Compliance with the City's Geological Engineering Staff would ensure that new structures would be built to reduce the potential for geologic impacts from regional hazards to a level below significance."

There was no new information that was provided that changed this prior determination related to this issue area. All geologic issues would be less than significant and mitigation is not required with the incorporation of proper engineering design features.

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to VI(a).

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to VI(a).

| | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to VI(a).

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to VI(a).

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

Refer to VI(a).

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to VI(a).

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Not Applicable, as the project does not propose such structures.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The construction of a single dwelling unit is consistent with the land use and designated zone and would not be expected to have a significant impact related to greenhouse gases. Potential impacts from greenhouse gas emissions are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project as proposed would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions in that it would be constructed in an established urban area with services and facilities available. In addition, the project is consistent with the underlying zone and land use designation.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would demolish an existing single-family residence and construct a single-family residence with an attached garage. Construction of the project may require the use of hazardous material (fuel, lubricants, solvents, etc.) that would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. Although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction, they are not anticipated to create a significant public hazard. Once constructed, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials on or through the project site is not anticipated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response VIII(a) above. Construction of a single-family residence with an attached garage within a neighborhood of similar uses would not be associated with such impacts. Therefore, no significant impacts related to this issue were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to responses VIII(a) and VIII (b) above. The project site is not within one quarter mile of a school. Future risk of releases of hazardous substances would not occur as a result of project operations because it is anticipated that future on-site operations would not require the routine use or transport of acutely hazardous materials.

Construction of the project may require the use of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.), which would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. Further, the project would be required to comply with all federal, state and local requirements associated with hazardous materials; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

A hazardous waste site records search was completed in February 2016, using Geotracker; the

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

records search showed that no hazardous waste sites exist onsite or in the surrounding area. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Activities associated with the necessary grading, demolition, and construction would not increase the potential to result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in areas surrounding the project site. Long-term operation of the residential unit would not interfere with the operations of any airport. The project site is not located within any airport land use plan, the airport environs overlay zone, or airport approach overlay zone. The project site is also not located within two miles of any airport. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response VIII(e) above. The project site is not in proximity to any private airstrip. Therefore, no significant impacts will occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No roadway improvements are proposed that would interfere with circulation or access, and all construction would take place on-site. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood. There are no wildland areas or other areas prone to wildfire within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) must be utilized. Implementation of these BMP's would preclude any violations of existing standards and discharge regulations. The project is within the La Jolla Area of Special Biological Significance (ASBS) and is subject to all requirements of the Final Compliance Plan for La Jolla ASBS dated September 20, 2014 related to storm water quality standards. This will be addressed through the project's Conditions of Approval; therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project does not require the construction of wells. The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood with existing public water supply infrastructure. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area. There are no streams or rivers located on-site and thus, no such resources would be impacted through the proposed grading activities. Although grading would be required for the project, the project would implement BMPs to ensure that substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site would not occur. See IX(a) for additional discussion. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

The project would implement low impact development principles ensuring that a substantial increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff resulting in flooding on or off-site, or a substantial alteration to the existing drainage pattern would not occur. Streams or rivers do not occur on or adjacent to the project site. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would comply with all City storm water quality standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMP's would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that the project runoff is directed to appropriate drainage systems. Due to the nature of the project, any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff that would require new or expanded facilities. See IX(a) for additional discussion. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would comply with all City storm water quality standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMP's would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The developed portion of the project is identified to lie within Flood Zone "X" and the project would incorporate design features to address any concerns related to this issue area. Type "X" Areas are determined to be outside 500-year floodplain determined to be outside the 1% and 0.2% annual chance floodplains. As such, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

See Response (IX)(g). As such, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project does not have the scale or features that would physically divide the community. The project site is an infill site located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is consistent with the General Plan's and Community Plan's land use designation. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development. Construction of a single-family residence with attached garage would not affect adjacent properties and is consistent with surrounding land uses. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See response X (b) above. The project is compatible with the area designated for residential development by the General Plan and Community Plan, and is consistent with the existing underlying zone and surrounding land uses. Construction of the project would occur within an urbanized neighborhood with similar development. Furthermore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, community plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No conflict would occur and thus, no impacts would result.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project?

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. The urbanized and developed nature of the project site and vicinity would preclude the extraction of any such resources. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

See response XI (a) above. The project site has not been delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no such resources would be affected with project implementation. Therefore, no significant impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Short Term

Short-term noise impacts would be associated with onsite demolition, grading, and construction activities of the project. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area, but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Sensitive receptors (e.g. residential uses) occur in the immediate area and may be temporarily affected by construction noise; however, construction activities would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City's Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise), which are intended to reduce potential adverse effects resulting from construction noise. With compliance to the City's construction noise requirements, project construction noise levels would be reduced to less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

Long Term

For the long-term, typical noise levels associated with residential uses are anticipated, and the project would not result in an increase in the existing ambient noise level. The project would not result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Diego General Plan or Noise Ordinance. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See response XII (a) above. Potential effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with City restrictions. Pile driving activities that would potentially result in ground borne vibration or ground borne noise are not anticipated with construction of the project. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not significantly increase long-term (ambient) noise levels. The project would not

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

introduce a new land use or significantly increase the intensity of the allowed land use. Post-construction noise levels and traffic would be generally unchanged as compared to noise with the existing residential use. Therefore, no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels is anticipated. A less than significant impact would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would not expose people to a substantial increase in temporary or periodic ambient noise levels. Construction noise would result during grading, demolition, and construction activities, but would be temporary in nature. Construction-related noise impacts from the project would generally be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area, but would no longer occur once construction is completed. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the San Diego Municipal Code, Article 9.5, Noise Abatement and Control. Implementation of these standard measures would reduce potential impacts from an increase in ambient noise level during construction to a less than significant level, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The project site is also not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would result, and no mitigation measures are required.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located in a developed residential neighborhood, and is surrounded by similar residential development. The project site currently receives water and sewer service from the City,

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

and no extension of infrastructure to new areas is required. As such, the project would not substantially increase housing or population growth in the area. No roadway improvements are proposed as part of the project. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is currently developed with an existing single-family residence, and no such displacement would occur in that the project would construct a single-family residence with attached garage. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See response XIII(b) above. No impacts would result.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i) Fire Protection | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where fire protection services are already provided. The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence. Construction of the project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area, and would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities and impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Police Protection | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area within the City of San Diego where police protection services are already provided. Construction of the project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services to the area or create significant new demand for such services. Additionally, the project would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. Any impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii) Schools | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where public school services are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. Any impacts would be less than significant, and no

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| v) Parks | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks, or other recreational facilities, over that which presently exists. Construction of the project is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for parks or other offsite recreational facilities. Any impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| vi) Other public facilities | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. Construction of the project would not require the construction of new, or expansion of, existing governmental facilities. No impacts would result.

XV. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would construct a single-family residence with attached garage and therefore, not adversely affect the availability of and/or need for new or expanded recreational resources. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services, and would not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the use of available parks or facilities such that substantial deterioration occurs, or that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to satisfy demand. As such, no significant impacts related to recreational facilities have been identified, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

See response to XIV(a) above. The project does not propose recreation facilities, nor does it require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. No impacts would result.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Construction of the project would not change existing circulation patterns on area roadways; however, a temporary minor increase in traffic may occur during construction. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is not expected to cause a significant short-term or long-term increase in traffic volumes, and thus, would not adversely affect existing levels of service along area roadways. Therefore, impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response XVI(a) above. Construction of the project would not generate additional vehicular traffic nor would it adversely affect any mode of transportation in the area. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. Impacts are considered less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not result in a change to air traffic patterns in that the structures would be less than 30 feet in height, due to height restrictions within the Coastal Zone. Therefore, the project would not create a safety risk. The project site is not located within any ALCUPs or near any private airstrips. No impacts would result.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not alter existing circulation patterns on El Paseo Grande. No design features or

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

incompatible uses that would increase potential hazards are proposed. The project would not affect emergency access to the project site or adjacent properties. Access would be provided to the project site via El Paseo Grande. Driveway design for the project is consistent with City design requirements to ensure safe ingress/egress from the properties. Additionally, the project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood and is not an incompatible use that would create hazardous conditions. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is consistent with the underlying zone and would not result in inadequate emergency access. The project design would be subject to City review and approval for consistency with all design requirements to ensure that no impediments to emergency access occur. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not alter the existing conditions of the project site or adjacent facilities with regard to alternative transportation. Construction of the project would not result in design measures or circulation features that would conflict with existing policies, plan, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impacts would result.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Implementation of the project would not interrupt existing sewer service to the project site or other surrounding uses. No increase in demand for wastewater disposal or treatment would be created by the project, as compared to current conditions. The proposed residential unit is not anticipated to generate significant amounts of wastewater. Wastewater facilities used by the project would be operated in accordance with the applicable wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). Additionally, the project site is located in an urbanized and developed area. Adequate services are already available to serve the project. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

See response XVII(a) above. Adequate services are available to serve the project site. Additionally, the proposed residential unit would not significantly increase the demand for water or wastewater treatment services and thus, would not trigger the need for new treatment facilities. Impacts would

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage systems and therefore, would not require construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project was reviewed by qualified City staff who determined that the existing facilities are adequately sized to accommodate the proposed development. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project does not meet the CEQA significance threshold requiring the need for the project to prepare a water supply assessment. The existing project site currently receives water service from the City, and adequate services are available to serve the proposed residential dwelling units without requiring new or expanded entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Construction of the project would not adversely affect existing wastewater treatment services. Adequate services are available to serve the project site without requiring new or expanded entitlements. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Construction debris and waste would be generated from the demolition of the existing single-family residence and the construction of the single-family residence with attached garage. All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have adequate capacity to accept the limited amount of waste that would be generated by the project.

Long-term operation of the proposed residential unit is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with residential use. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts are considered to be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The project would not result in the generation of large amounts of solid waste, nor generate or require the transport of hazardous waste materials, other than minimal amounts generated during the construction phase. All demolition activities would comply with any City of San Diego requirements for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Historical Resources (Archaeology). As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable futures projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, notably with respect to Historical Resources (Archaeology), which may have cumulatively considerable impacts. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Other future projects within the surrounding neighborhood or community would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts.

| Issue | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|-------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The demolition of the existing single-family residence and construction of a single-family residence with attached garage is consistent with the setting and with the use anticipated by the City. It is not anticipated that demolition or construction activities would create conditions that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. Impacts would be less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plans: La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan, La Jolla Shores Precise Plan, La Jolla Shores Design Manual
- Site Specific Report: Proposed Site Exhibit, Architectural Drawings

II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

- City of San Diego General Plan
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973
- California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997)
- Site Specific Report:

III. Air Quality

- California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990
- Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD
- Site Specific Report:

IV. Biology

- City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996
- City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997
- Community Plan - Resource Element
- California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001

___ California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California, "January 2001

___ City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines

___ Site Specific Report:

V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources)

X City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines

X City of San Diego Archaeology Library

___ Historical Resources Board List

___ Community Historical Survey:

___ Site Specific Report:

VI. Geology/Soils

X City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study

___ U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975

X Site Specific Report(s): "Addendum 03 – Response to City of San Diego Cycle Review Comments, Cycle Type 4 – Submitted (Multi-Discipline): LDR-Geology, for Proposed Cardenas Residence, 8466 El Paseo Grande, La Jolla", CTE Inc, June 10, 2016.

X Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, "Proposed Lusardi Residence, 8466 El Paseo Grande", CTE Inc, March 24, 2006.

X Faulting and Geologic Evaluation, "Proposed Lusardi Residence, 8466 El Paseo Grande", CTE Inc, February 12, 2007.

X Site Specific Report(s): "Cardenas Residence, Coastal Development Permit And Site Development Permit Mitigated Negative Declaration Project No. 191344/ SAP No. 24000089" April 21, 2010.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

___ Site Specific Report:

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing
- San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
- FAA Determination
- State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized
- State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- Site Specific Report:

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

- Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map
- Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html
- Site Specific Report: Drainage Study "Cardenas Residence", prepared by Christensen Engineering and Surveying, July 26, 2015 (Revised June 10, 2016)
- Site Specific Report: "Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for 8466 El Paseo Grande - Cardenas, PTS 445629", Christensen Engineering & Survey, July 10, 2016, Revised July 22, 2016.

X. Land Use and Planning

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plans: La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan, La Jolla Shores Precise Plan, La Jolla Shores Design Manual
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- FAA Determination
- Other Plans:

XI. Mineral Resources

___ California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification

___ Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps

___ Site Specific Report:

XII. Noise

X City of San Diego General Plan

___ Community Plan

___ San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps

___ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps

___ Montgomery Field CNEL Maps

___ San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes

___ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG

___ Site Specific Report:

XIII. Paleontological Resources

X City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines

X Deméré, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996

X Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 200, Sacramento, 1975

___ Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977

___ Site Specific Report:

XIV. Population / Housing

X City of San Diego General Plan

X Community Plans: La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan, La Jolla Shores Precise Plan, La Jolla Shores Design Manual

Series 11/Series 12 Population Forecasts, SANDAG

Other:

XV. Public Services

City of San Diego General Plan

Community Plans: La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan, La Jolla Shores Precise Plan, La Jolla Shores Design Manual

XVI. Recreational Resources

City of San Diego General Plan

Community Plans: Community Plans: La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan, La Jolla Shores Precise Plan, La Jolla Shores Design Manual

Department of Park and Recreation

City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map

Additional Resources:

XVII. Transportation / Circulation

City of San Diego General Plan

Community Plans: Community Plans: La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan, La Jolla Shores Precise Plan, La Jolla Shores Design Manual

San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG

San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG

Site Specific Report:

XVIII. Utilities

City of San Diego General Plan

Site Specific Report:

XIX. Water Conservation

____ Sunset Magazine, New Western Garden Book, Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine

Created: REVISED - October 11, 2013