

(R-88-1390)

RESOLUTION NUMBER R- 270337

ADOPTED ON FEB 09 1988

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of The City of San Diego, that it is hereby certified that the information contained in ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 86-0509, in connection with the Stonecrest Project, on file in the office of the City Clerk, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended, and the State guidelines thereto, and has been reviewed and considered by this Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Council of The City of San Diego, that pursuant to California Public Resources Code Section 21081, the City Council hereby adopts the findings (attached hereto as Exhibit "A") made with respect to the feasibility of the mitigating measures and project alternatives contained within ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. EQD-86-0509 for Stonecrest, on file in the office of the City Clerk.

APPROVED: JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney

By 

John K. Riess
Deputy City Attorney

JKR:wk
01/05/88
Or.Dept:E&D
R-88-1390
Form=r.eirf

FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that no public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been completed which identifies one or more significant effects thereof unless such public agency makes one or more of the following findings:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, such project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects thereof as identified in the completed environmental impact report.
- (2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
- (3) Specific economic, social, or other consideration make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

(Sec. 21081 of the California Environmental Quality Act)

CEQA further requires that, where the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR, but are not at least substantially mitigated, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record (Sec. 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines).

The following Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations have been submitted by the project applicant as candidate findings to be made by the decision making body. The Environmental Quality Division does not recommend that the discretionary body either adopt or reject these findings. They are attached to allow readers of this report an opportunity to review the applicant's position on this matter.

EXHIBIT "A"

FEB 09 1988

R- 270337

**CANDIDATE FINDINGS AND
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

**StoneCrest Specific Plan and
Associated Discretionary Actions**

(EQD No. 86-0509)

The following findings are made relative to the conclusions of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the proposed StoneCrest Specific Plan in the City of San Diego (EQD No. 86-0509). The discretionary actions associated with the proposed project include adoption of the StoneCrest Specific Plan, amendment of the Progress Guide and General Plan, amendment of the Serra Mesa Community Plan (either by the concurrent adoption of the new Kearny Mesa Community Plan or by amendment prior to the adoption of the new Kearny Mesa Community Plan), rezoning from M-1A, R1-40,000 and R1-5000 zones to M-1B, as modified by the StoneCrest Specific Plan, adoption of a Reclamation Plan, and adoption of a Tentative Map for the entire Specific Plan area. The current sand and gravel extraction activities pursuant to existing permits, including an existing H.R. Permit (No. 138) will be phased out in conjunction with the proposed development and project grading and reclamation.

The project proposes the phased development of a 318-acre site with 4.3 million square feet of a mixture of uses including office, research and development, light industrial, hotel, commercial, community, recreational, natural open space, developed open space, courtyards or common amenities for each Planning Area, landscaping, and Light Rail Transit facilities. The project also proposes a new interchange on Interstate 15 between Friars Road and Aero Drive, as well as major local street system improvements and provisions for the future extension of the San Diego Trolley through the property.

The following findings are made pursuant to Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of Title 14 of the California Administrative Code.

R- 270337

FINDINGS

A. Public Resources Code Section 21081(a).

The City Council and Planning Commission, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR for the proposed StoneCrest Specific Plan and associated discretionary actions, and having reviewed and considered the information in the public record, find that changes have been incorporated into the project which mitigate or avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts thereof, as identified in the FEIR. Specifically:

Land Use

Impact. Approximately one-third (100 acres) of the project site is designated as open space in the Serra Mesa Community Plan. The proposed grading plan would result in the loss of 15 acres of open space to provide developable area along the western canyon bottom.

Finding. The project proposes to preserve the undisturbed upper portion of the westerly slopes (approximately 70 acres) through placement in a negative open space easement. The area along the toe of the slopes has been disturbed by previous grading associated with the current mining activities.

Landform Alteration/Visual Quality

Impact. In order to prepare the site for development, the project proposes 7.5 million cubic yards of balanced grading. Resultant manufactured slopes would vary in height with a maximum slope height of 125 feet (Planning Area 5). Visual quality impacts are anticipated due to the extent of the 125-foot high slope.

Finding. The project proposes variable slope ratios (i.e. 2:1 to 3:1) and would hydroseed and plant containerized species on all manufactured slopes. A three-year monitoring and maintenance plan would also be implemented as described in the Specific Plan. These measures would provide mitigation of visual quality impacts.

Impact. Development of the project site with medium-high rise structures finished with reflective materials could result in adverse visual/glare impacts on motorists traveling along I-15.

Finding. The Specific Plan contains guidelines which would limit the use of exterior reflective materials. In particular, exterior materials would be required to have less than 25 percent reflectivity. Other non-reflective materials are recommended in the design guidelines of the Specific Plan.

Transportation

Impact. The proposed project would generate an additional 58,680 average daily traffic (ADT) onto the surrounding community and regional transportation network.

Finding. The project proposes a Transportation Phasing Plan which permits development to proceed with the implementation of identified traffic improvements (see Attachment).

The Transportation Phasing Plan would provide mitigation of direct impacts; however, significant cumulative traffic impacts would still result.

Biology

Impact. The project proposes to channelize Murphy Canyon Creek along the site's eastern boundary in order to allow development of the freeway interchange. Approximately 2.25 acres of riparian habitat would be destroyed.

Finding. A riparian replacement plan would be implemented as part of the project which would replace the riparian habitat at a 2.5:1 ratio (acre replaced to acre lost). The replacement plan would be concentrated along the toe of the westerly slopes and along the perimeter of the existing desilting basin located at the southeast corner of the site. A five-year maintenance and monitoring program would be provided to ensure the successful establishment of the replacement program.

Geology/Soil Erosion.

Impact. The project proposes extensive grading on the 302.5-acre site, including the reclamation of the sand and gravel extraction area to a reusable condition. Based on the extent of grading and existing soil conditions, adverse soil erosion impacts could result.

Findings. The project proposes a Reclamation Plan which would provide temporary landscape measures and the use of siltation basins during grading to avoid soil erosion impacts. Additional landscaping is proposed as part of the Specific Plan.

Paleontology.

Impact. The project site is underlain with Mission Valley Formation and Friars Formation which have a medium to high resource potential. The proposed grading could result in the loss of significant paleontological resources.

Finding. The project proposes a paleontological monitoring program which would mitigate impacts to sensitive paleontological resources. The monitoring program would be made a condition of the Tentative Map.

Air Quality

Impact. The proposed project would result in incremental but significant air quality impacts due to traffic-related emissions. In particular, the intersections of Aero Drive at southbound I-15 (A.M. peak hour), Aero Drive at Street A (P.M. peak hour) and Aero Drive at Murphy Canyon Road (A.M. and P.M. peak hours) would experience a Level of Service D indicating delays to approaching vehicles at the intersections.

Finding. Partial mitigation of air quality impacts would be provided with the implementation of a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) program including participation in the development of transit alternatives.

B. Public Resources Code Section 21081(b).

The City Council and Planning Commission, having each reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR for the proposed StoneCrest Specific Plan and associated discretionary actions, and having reviewed and considered the information contained in the public record, find there are no changes or alterations to the project that would substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project that are the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and should be adopted by such other agency.

C. Public Resources Code Section 21081(c).

The City Council and Planning Commission, having each reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR for the proposed StoneCrest Specific Plan and the associated discretionary approvals, and having reviewed and considered the information contained in the public record, find that there are specific economic, social, or other considerations which make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives which are identified in the FEIR.

1. No Project Alternative.

The No Project Alternative has been defined as the assumed continuation of existing operations of the Daley Corporation sand and gravel excavations and related construction materials activities.

The project site is currently designated by the existing Serra Mesa Community Plan Land Use Map for sand and gravel operations, light industrial development, and open space. The Serra Mesa Community Plan Natural Resources Element divides the sand and gravel resource areas in the community into four Natural Resource Planning Unit (NRPU's). The StoneCrest project site, now operated by Daley Corporation, is NRPU #4. When resources are depleted, the Community Plan recommends reuse of the project site for light industrial and office uses, with limited retail commercial serving the industrial parks. This Plan recommends against residential uses; however existing zoning permits up to 400 dwelling units in that portion of the project site within the H.R. zone and approximately 237 additional dwelling units on the remainder of the project site.

Impacts:

If the mining operation continues until 1995, as anticipated by the Serra Mesa Community Plan, there would be no increase in traffic or air pollution resulting from increased development. There would be no disturbance of existing riparian habitat, Black-tailed Gnatcatcher habitat, designated open space, or areas in the H.R. Zone. Aggregate resources might continue to be extracted from the site and would be available as construction materials for on-going development in the region or due to economics, the site may be abandoned and superficially restored. The landform would continue to change as a result of on-going mining operations. Views from surrounding land uses would continue to deteriorate. Dust and noise from the mining activities would continue to affect the adjacent residential uses.

Findings:

1. The No Project Alternative is economically infeasible because continued resource extraction may not remain a viable use due to changes in competitive factors in the marketplace. Specifically, in western San Diego County areas, aggregate material sells for an average of \$4.00/ton which is \$1.00/ton more than the state average of \$3.00/ton. The cost to produce aggregate at the project site is currently as high as \$5.00/ton. In addition, the material produced from the project site contains upwards of 60% waste material. Because of these factors, the cost per useable ton of product is not competitive with quarries producing a higher yield and broader range of product. Consequently the No Project Alternative is not economically feasible.

2. Delayed Project Alternative.

The Delayed Project Alternative is defined as the deferral of redevelopment of the site as proposed in the

Specific Plan until the year 1995. The present mining uses could continue, as now, under the existing perpetual mining permit, or as a nonconforming use if the Kearny Mesa Community Plan is adopted.

Impacts:

If the project site is reclaimed and redeveloped after 1995 according to the existing Serra Mesa Community Plan, the future environmental impacts would be the same as those described in this FEIR for the proposed project, with the possible exception of the transportation-related impacts. Development of the site after 1995 would result in similar traffic generation and related air quality and noise impacts, however these impacts and associated mitigations of these impacts would be delayed.

Findings:

1. Delayed redevelopment of the site would not necessarily assure continued extraction of the sand and gravel resources. If mining operations ceased before 1995 and reuse of the full site were nevertheless prohibited by City, as defined by this alternative, the property owner would suffer financial injury by being precluded any effective use of the site. If extraction of the aggregate resources ceased before 1995, the extent of reclamation would depend upon the nature and extent of the permitted reuse. Absent any permitted reuse, only minimum reclamation could economically be provided because the site would not generate sufficient revenue to support the extensive high quality reclamation proposed by the redevelopment.

3. Development Without a Freeway Interchange.

If the project site were developed without the proposed freeway interchange, then the yield of the proposed development would have to be lower. According to the Transportation Phasing Plan, at the first stage of roadway improvements approximately 340,000 square feet of office, 170,000 square feet of research and development, and 5,000 square feet of supporting commercial/retail uses could be developed at the StoneCrest project site without causing significant operational problems along Aero Drive. The improvements necessary for this type of development during the first stage are described in the Transportation Phasing Plan and on page 219 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR"). As a second stage of development, further improvements to Aero Drive would be necessary. With such improvements, it would be possible to construct a total of 1,072,000 square feet of development. Therefore, assuming that this alternative would include improvements to Aero Drive without the I-15 interchange, the density of

development would be limited to 1,072,000 square feet. This would be 3.3 million square feet less than the proposed project, and would equate to a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of .092, where traditional industrial and commercial zoning would permit an FAR of between 1.0 and 2.0. StoneCrest proposes an FAR of only .40. Development intensity without a freeway interchange would therefore render over 75% of the site undeveloped.

Impacts:

Under this alternative, the proposed development would be substantially limited and the environmental impacts described in the FEIR resulting from the proposed project would be substantially reduced, if not eliminated. Traffic impacts, including impacts to I-15, would be less than they would be with the proposed project and as a result, air quality impacts would be substantially reduced. In addition, it is possible that a project of lower density could avoid interfering with the existing riparian habitat in Murphy Canyon Creek, especially at the south end of the channel and the Black-tailed Gnatcatcher habitat area along the northwest portion of the site.

If the project site were developed at the density allowed without the proposed freeway interchange, then approximately 25% of the total proposed development could be constructed. Development under this alternative would be consolidated into the northwest quadrant of this site to minimize infrastructure costs (e.g., streets, sewer and water extensions, etc.). If only the northwest quadrant of the site is improved, then the rest of the site could continue to be mined and reclaimed to the minimum standards required by the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA).

Findings:

1. The reduced level of development would not be economically feasible because certain basic and significant costs must still be incurred to provide the infrastructure which inherently has the capacity to serve more than the one-quarter development assumed in this alternative. The combined effects of these costs include the following:

(a) Development of the northwest quadrant alone would be uneconomical in that the high cost of public circulation infrastructure required may render finished building prices up to ten percent higher per square foot than those in adjacent projects such as Murphy Canyon Gateway, and other competing sites in the Kearny Mesa area. The difference in finished building prices is due to the fact that competing projects in the Kearny Mesa area will not have to bear the costs of improving major arterials and widening of free-

way overcrossings. These competing projects typically only bear the costs of the new, local streets which directly serve their frontages. The complete build-out of the proposed project provides a much larger base over which these costs may be spread, thus reducing the relative increase in finished building prices to a level where the economic risks are manageable.

(b) The undeveloped portion of the site under this alternative must be reclaimed upon cessation of mining. The costs of this reclamation constitute an additional cost not attendant to competing projects in Kearny Mesa and as a result would further increase the site developer's cost of buildings beyond that described in (a) above. This increase would, at minimum, include costs of mining equipment removal, installation and maintenance of erosion control measures, safety improvements, slope stabilization and possible rehabilitation of approximately 1,000,000 cubic yards of saturated soil.

(c) The sheer size and comprehensive master-planning of the proposed project enables it to cohesively plan and provide substantial natural and developed open space, common amenities, and coordinated reclamation (including landform alteration, slope and soils stabilization, interim and final revegetation), and to spread the substantial front-end costs over all future buildings so as to remain competitive with comparable projects. The same degree and quality of front-end landform and reclamation work cannot be sustained under this alternative, given the assumed yield reduction of over 75%.

4. Development Consistent with the Adopted Community Plan.

Development of the site under this alternative would result in the continuation of mining operations on the eastern half of the site, new light industrial development on approximately one-quarter of the site, and retention of the steep westerly slope as open space. Future redevelopment could also occur consistent with the recommendations of the Natural Resource Planning Unit No. 4 (NRPU4) which identifies future reuse of the site with light industrial, office, retail, service, commercial and commercial recreation uses.

Impacts:

Because industrial uses would occur on a limited portion of the site, as opposed to mixed land uses on the entire site, the traffic impacts would be significantly lower than those resulting from the proposed project. Likewise, air quality impacts would be reduced. Development under this alternative would not necessarily avoid the impact on

biological resources (Black-tailed Gnatcatcher habitat) since this area is designated for sand and gravel extraction uses.

Findings:

1. Continuation of mining activities over the majority of the site may no longer be an economical use of the site. In the western San Diego County area, aggregate sells for an average of about \$4.00/ton after washing, sizing and stockpiling. This price is high compared to the state average of approximately \$3.00/ton (Mineral Land Classification: Special Report No. 153). The higher price is a result of the lower overall quality of aggregate deposits within the Western San Diego P-C Region which requires more extensive preparation prior to marketing. The cost to produce aggregate at the project site is currently as much as \$5.00/ton (McNamara, pers. comm. 1987).

2. Development of only a portion of the site with industrial uses adjacent to heavy industrial sand and gravel mining could result in an unmarketable industrial park.

3. The current quarry use generates high levels of dust and noise which conflict with adjacent residential uses. Continuation of mining operations on a majority of the site would prolong this incompatibility.

D. Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The City Council and Planning Commission, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR, and having reviewed and considered the public record, find that the following factors support approval of the project despite any significant impacts identified in the FEIR and make the following statement of overriding considerations:

1. The proposed project would replace a quarry operation with a mixture of land uses consistent with the Serra Mesa Community Plan, as amended, the current draft of the proposed Kearny Mesa Community Plan, and unanimously endorsed by the Kearny Mesa Community Planning Group. The current use generates high levels of truck traffic, dust and noise which conflict with adjacent residential uses and which over the years has generated numerous community complaints. Under the project alternatives, the existing adverse impacts to the adjacent residents resulting from the quarry operations would continue.

2. The project site is presently "blighted" from a visual perspective, due to the quarry operations. The proposed project would eliminate visual blight through coordinated grading of the entire 318 acre site during the

initial phases of development. This expansive reclamation will initially alter the existing landform, itself, creating view corridors and stabilizing existing unstable slopes and saturated soil, and will be followed by interim and final stages of landscaping, the latter occurring at or before final development. (Approximately 75 percent of the site will be reclaimed, with the remainder being retained as natural open space). No project alternative can assure the comprehensive and expansive reclamation provided by the proposed project, either because mining operations may continue, or because the yield associated with each project alternative cannot economically support the same degree of reclamation, whether developed as a single project or as a series of smaller, separate projects by different owners. Under all project alternatives, reclamation could be limited to the minimum requirements of state law (e.g., erosion control, removal of mining equipment, revegetation, and minimum grading).

3. Under existing permits (H.R. Permit No. 138) and zoning, the on-site natural canyons could be filled and developed with dwelling units in an area where approximately 70 acres of natural open space would be retained by the proposed project.

4. The StoneCrest project would generate an estimated 16,500 permanent jobs at build-out, and an estimated 4,200 construction jobs over the period of project development. This direct employment would support significant total employment of an estimated 92,230 jobs over the life of the project, yielding over \$2.5 billion in personal income. The No Interchange Alternative would provide an estimated 4,380 permanent jobs and an estimated 995 construction jobs, which would support a project of total employment of 19,880 jobs over the life of the project, with an estimated total personal income of \$508 million. The No Project Alternative would only generate an estimated total employment of 1,136 jobs over the possible life of continued quarry operations, with total estimated personal income of \$31 million.

5. The proposed project provides substantial new public revenues which would not occur under other alternatives. The annual fiscal impacts at buildout (in 1987 dollars) of the proposed project, and the no project and development without freeway interchange alternatives are summarized below.

	<u>Proposed Project</u>	<u>No Freeway Interchange Alternative</u>	<u>No Project Alternative</u>
City Revenue	\$2,637,003	\$ 571,195	\$36,760
City Costs	\$1,969,303	\$ 511,822	\$28,598
Surplus (Deficit)	\$ 667,700 Surplus	\$59,373 Surplus	\$ 8,162 Surplus

Thus, the City and other governmental agencies and districts will not receive revenue from sale taxes, transient occupancy taxes or school impact fees (except fees payable for the 400 residential dwelling units permitted under existing zoning). Accordingly, an important source of public funds for educational and other social programs will be lost, resulting in a general negative impact on the general public health, safety and welfare.

6. The StoneCrest project will generate school impact fees under State law estimated at \$1,075,000.00 (4,300,000 square feet x \$0.25 per sq/ft). These fees would be reduced corresponding to the lower yields associated with each project alternative.

7. Dedications of on-site right-of-way and station areas would not be provided and the proposed on-site Light Rail Transit (LRT) improvements, including the LRT station, would not be provided for. The City or MTDB would be forced to expend funds for acquisition of the necessary right-of-way and construction of required LRT facilities for the proposed LRT extension within the project site, thereby diverting funds which might otherwise be used by the City or MTDB for other important programs, or delaying indefinitely the northward extension of the LRT from the Stadium. The proposed project includes the applicant's agreement not to oppose inclusion in a future assessment district to fund provision of LRT facilities in the I-15 corridor. This agreement would not be given under the No Project Alternative, therefore the public financial benefit of this agreement will be lost.

8. The paleontological salvage program provided by the proposed project would not be implemented. This could result in destruction of potential paleontological resources within sensitive rock units.

TRANSPORTATION PHASING PLAN
FOR STONECREST

Phase	Stonecrest Threshold Development Amount (Not to Exceed)	Improvements to be Assured Prior to Any Final Maps for this Phase*
1	160,000 Sq.Ft. Office 90,000 Sq.Ft. R & D 5,000 Sq.Ft. Retail	<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Improvements on Aero Drive (and intersecting streets) and at the I-15/Aero Drive Interchange as depicted in Figure VII-5, includes restriction of all left turns at the east intersection with Murphy Canyon Road by construction of a raised median.o Construction of new StoneCrest Access, called North Light Avenue, between Aero Drive and southern extent of development.o Construction of Daley Center Drive between Aero Drive and southern extent of development.
2	340,000 Sq.Ft. Office 170,000 Sq.Ft. R & D 5,000 Sq.Ft. Retail	<ul style="list-style-type: none">o Further improvements on Aero Drive and intersecting streets and at the I-15/Aero Drive Interchange as depicted in Figure VII-6.o Southerly extension of North Light Avenue to southern extent of development.o Southerly extension of Daley Center Drive to southern extent of development.

P-270337

Phase	Stonecrest Threshold Development Amount (Not to Exceed)	Improvements to be Assured Prior to Any Final Maps for this Phase*
-----		-----
3	680,000 Sq.Ft. Office 340,000 Sq.Ft. R & D 12,000 Sq.Ft. Retail 40,000 Sq.Ft. Health Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Southerly extension of North Light Avenue to southern extent of development. o Southerly extension of Daley Center Drive to southern extent of development. o Full construction of I-15 between I-8 and I-805 to freeway standards programmed in the annual element/budget year of the current STIP. o Construction of StoneCrest Boulevard between North Light Avenue and Daley Center Drive. o Further improvements along Aero Drive (and intersecting streets) as indicated in Figure VII-7.
4	980,000 Sq.Ft. Office 580,000 Sq.Ft. R & D 22,000 Sq.Ft. Retail 40,000 Sq.Ft. Health Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All necessary approvals and funding assurance satisfactory to the City Engineer for new interchange at StoneCrest Boulevard and I-15, with appropriate weaving sections, grading, and auxiliary lanes (full construction programmed in the annual element/budget year of the current STIP). o Construction of StoneCrest Boulevard between I-15 and Daley Center Drive.

R- 270337

Phase -----	Stonecrest Threshold Development Amount (Not to Exceed) -----	Improvements to be Assured Prior to Any Final Maps for this Phase* -----
4 Cont.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Southerly extensions of North Light Avenue and Daley Center Drive to southern extent of development. o Full construction of the easterly extension of Route 52 to SR 125 programmed in the annual element/budget year of the current STIP.
5	1,150,000 Sq.Ft. Office 1,065,000 Sq.Ft. R & D 52,000 Sq.Ft. Retail 40,000 Sq.Ft. Health Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of internal roadways as needed. o Realignment of the portion of Murphy Canyon Road south of Aero Drive to an alignment to coincide with the recently realigned northern leg.
6	2,520,000 Sq.Ft. Office 1,235,000 Sq.Ft. R & D 87,000 Sq.Ft. Retail 40,000 Sq Ft. Health Club 400 Room Hotel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Development of internal roadways as needed. o Completion of Santo Road between Friars Road and Aero Drive.

PHASE 6 COMPLETES THE BUILD-OUT OF STONECREST

Notes:

- * o Transportation Improvements shall be completed or under contracts or bonded or scheduled in the City Capitol Improvements Program for the current year or programmed in the STIP for the current year to the satisfaction of the City Engineer before exceeding the allowable levels of development. Improvements required by this phasing plan for approval of a final map are expected to be in place or under construction when building permits are issued under the final map. The City may, based on need, cease the issuance of building permits from the approved or subsequent final maps until the improvements are in place and open to traffic.

270337

- o Caltrans intends to install ramp meters on all on-ramps to I-15 as well as to other freeways in San Diego. The ramps at the new StoneCrest Boulevard interchange are to be metered. At the time the interchange is constructed, other on-ramps in the area would need to be metered to preclude motorists from using non-metered ramps.
- o Route 52 is expected to have a very beneficial effect on I-15 operations in the peak periods. While long-term traffic projections for I-15 assume Route 52 as part of the transportation network, Route 52 is assumed not to be in place for Phases 1, 2, and 3 of StoneCrest.
- o A strong Transportation System Management (TSM) program is recommended for StoneCrest, in fact, for Kearny Mesa as a whole. A TSM program should be initiated very early in the development program.
- o No development shall be allowed in Planning Areas 5 and 6 prior to Phase 5.

K-270327

336 (b)

FEB 09 1988

Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on.....
by the following vote:

Council Members	Yeas	Nays	Not Present	Ineligible
Abbe Wolfsheimer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ron Roberts	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gloria McColl	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Wes Pratt	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Ed Struiksma	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J. Bruce Henderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Judy McCarty	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Bob Filner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mayor Maureen O'Connor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AUTHENTICATED BY:

MAUREEN O'CONNOR

Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR

City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

(Seal)

By *Jana M. Martin*, Deputy.

Office of the City Clerk, San Diego, California

Resolution Number *R-270337* Adopted *FEB 09 1988*

RECEIVED
CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
1988 JAN 28 PM 6:00
SAN DIEGO, CALIF.