(R-99-151)

# RESOLUTION NUMBER R-\_290607 ADOPTED ON \_\_AUG 0 4 1998

WHEREAS, The City of San Diego, Community and Neighborhood Services, submitted an application to Development Services for a Communities Plan Update, Amendment to the Progress Guide and General Plan, and an amendment to the Mid-City Communities Planned District Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the matter was set for a public hearing to be conducted by the Council of The City of San Diego; and

WHEREAS, the issue was heard by the Council on AUG 0 4 1998; and

WHEREAS, the Council of The City of San Diego considered the issues discussed in Environmental Impact Report LDR No. 98-8207, SCH No. 98031095; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of The City of San Diego, that it is certified that Environmental Impact Report LDR No. 98-8207, SCH No. 98031095, on file in the office of the City Clerk, has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq.), as amended, and the State guidelines thereto (California Code of Regulations section 15000 et seq.), that the report reflects the independent judgment of The City of San Diego as Lead Agency and that the information contained in said report, together with any comments received during the public review process, has been reviewed and considered by this Council in connection with the approval of the Mid-Cities Communities Plan Update and related actions.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to California Public Resources Code section 21081 and California Code of Regulations section 15091, the City Council adopts the findings made with respect to the project, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to California Code of Regulations section 15093, the City Council adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations, a copy of which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference, with respect to the project.

APPROVED: CASEY GWINN, City Attorney

Richard A Duy

Richard A. Duvernay Deputy City Attorney

RAD:lc 07/23/98

Or.Dept:Comm.&Eco.Dev.

R-99-151

Form=eirl.frm

#### **EXHIBIT A**

## FINDINGS (LDR NO. 98-8207)

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

- A. Changes or alternatives have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental impacts identified in the completed environmental impact report.
- B. Such changes or alternatives 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.
- C. Specific economic, social, or other considerations 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 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 decisionmaking body. The Environmental Analysis Section of the City of San Diego Development Services does not recommend that the decisionmaking 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.

## DRAFT FINDINGS FOR THE MID-CITY COMMUNITIES PLAN UPDATE

LDR NO. 98-8207 June, 1998

The findings set forth below pertain to the proposed Mid-City Communities Plan Update (dated June, 1998). The proposed update has been prepared by the City of San Diego Development Services in cooperation with citizen advisory committees, public agencies and other interest.

The June 1998 Mid-City draft Communities Plan Update supersedes the currently adopted Mid-City Community Plan (adopted in 1984). The proposed Plan is consolidated statements of policy for community growth and development over the next twenty years.

As indicated in EIR 98-8207, significant unmitigated environmental impacts could result if the proposed Mid-City Communities Plan Update was adopted and implemented. In response to the environmental impacts addressed in the EIR, the Mid-City Communities Plan Update has been prepared with Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR 98-8207) and the related documents and record for the proposed Mid-City Communities Plan Update, the Council of the City of San Diego has made the following findings pursuant to Section 15093 of the California Administrative Code:

A. The City Council finds that changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts as identified in Final EIR 98-8207.

## 1. MITIGATION MEASURES INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT

## a) TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

Impact: Development according to the Mid-City Communities Plan Update would result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to traffic and circulation within these communities, with regard to the capacity of their roadway systems.

Upon community buildout, a total of four roadway segments are projected to function at LOS E and four segments at LOS F, which are considered to be congested and undesirable, as well as a significant impact on the community's transportation system.

Moreover, it is assumed within the transportation projections that upon community buildout, a total of 3,318 additional dwelling units would occur throughout Mid-City, as allowed by the proposed land use plan. This increase in dwelling units alone could generate approximately 20,000 to 30,000 additional vehicle trips on community roadways, which is considered to be a significant impact on the transportation system.

Finding: The proposed Mid-City Communities Plan Update sets forth transportation goals and recommendations for specific roadway and intersection improvements in an effort to meet the future traffic demand, improve traffic flow, and/or reduce vehicle delay and congestion. The Plan Update also outlines community goals that include the provision of an efficient transit system that features fixed rail, electric buses and intracommunity shuttles; provison of adequate, appropriately located and safe parking; and encouragement of pedestrian facilities and bicycling as effective modes of transportation.

## b) AIR QUALITY

<u>Impact:</u> Adoption of the Mid-Cities Communities Plan Update would create significant direct and cumulative impacts on air quality within the San Diego Air Basin.

<u>Finding:</u> The Plan Update sets forth transportation goals and recommendations to minimize impacts to air quality within the San Diego Air Basin. These measures include the maximizing of mass transit use, providing bikeways and pedestrian facilities, and providing transit nodes through future redevelopment. The Plan Update also recommends roadway and intersection improvements to improve traffic flow, reduce

vehicle delay, and reduce vehicle air emissions.

### c) <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u>

Impact: Future development and redevelopment to occur throughout Mid-City, as proposed by the land use plan within the Communities Plan Update, could directly impact known and unknown prehistoric and historic archaeologic resources. Disturbance and damage to cultural resources often occurs during the excavation operations for a project, where unknown subsurface resources are uncovered. Redevelopment activities could also take place on properties which have not been previously surveyed for cultural remains.

<u>Finding</u>: In compliance with cultural resources requirements of the City of San Diego, future development/redevelopment projects may require additional archaeological archival research, intensive surveys, excavations, resource evaluations of discovered remains, or archaeological monitoring. All future projects which may alter or impact a designated, or eligible, historic site would undergo environmental review and review by the City's Historic Site Board.

The proposed Plan Update encourages the preservation of historic structures through identification, designation, tax relief, tax breaks and other neighborhood physical improvement and financing measures. It recommends the expansion of the Greater Mid-City Historic Oversight Program and the provision of economic incentive(s) to assist property owners in maintaining historic properties.

#### d) <u>LAND USE</u>

Based on proposed types and locations of land uses within the Communities Plan Update, there is a potential for significant direct land use impacts to occur in relation to the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan.

Finding: Future development and redevelopment to occur within the communities of Mid-City should adhere to general planning policies and design guidelines outlined within the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. According to the Subarea Plan, expansion of existing permitted uses within the Plan's Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) would need to be in compliance with applicable land use regulations and should provide measures to minimize impacts on the MHPA including lighting, noise, or uncontrolled access. Expansion of uses should be generally restricted to the existing approved development areas.

Land uses adjacent to the MHPA shall be managed to ensure minimal impacts to the MHPA and shall adhere to the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines in Section 1.4.3. of the Subarea Plan. This section includes guidelines for drainage, toxics, lighting, noise, barriers, invasive plant species, brush management and grading/land development.

## e) <u>PUBLIC FACILITIES-PARKS</u>

Impact: Even with provision of recommended park acreage within the Communities Plan Update of mini/neighborhood, community and resource-based park land, deficiencies would still remain, based on City of San Diego park standards.

Finding: The Plan Update recommends that the provision of new and expanded park facilities occur in accordance with City standards: one neighborhood park, of no less than 10 acres per every 5,000 residents that serve an area no greater than one-half mile in radius; one community park, of no less than 20 acres per every 25,000 residents that serve an area no greater than one and one-half mile in radius; one resource-based park that is located at the site of distinctive scenic or natural or cultural features, with the size and development to determined by the specific resource involved, expected use, available land, and location; and mini-parks at scattered locations (multi-purpose mini-parks of at least 15,000 square feet recommended in the Plan Update).

The Update recommends the evaluation of all vacant and publicly owned land, including streets and unimproved rights-of-way for potential use as park or recreation facilities.

- B. The City Council finds that there are no changes or alterations within the responsibility of another public agency which are necessary to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. The control of air pollutants from confined point sources are the responsibility of the Air Pollution Control District. On-board control of motor vehicle air pollutants are the responsibility of the State Air Resources Board.
- C. The City Council finds that specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the project alternatives identified in Final EIR 98-8207 to reduce the significant impacts to traffic and circulation, air quality, cultural resources, land use and public facilities-parks.

## TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION

<u>Impact:</u> Future development according to the Mid-City Communities Plan Update would result in significant direct and cumulative impacts to traffic

and circulation within these communities, in relation to the capacity of their roadway systems.

#### 2. AIR QUALITY

Impact: Adoption of the Communities Plan Update would create significant direct and cumulative impacts on air quality within the San Diego Air Basin, primarily through the increase of vehicle trips on community roadways.

### 3. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Impact: Future development/redevelopment with the communities of Mid-City could directly impact known and unknown prehistoric and historic archaeological resources. Disturbance and damage to cultural resources often occurs during excavation operations for a project, where unknown subsurface resources are uncovered.

#### 4. LAND USE

Impact: Future development/redevelopment of residential and commercial uses adjacent canyon rim areas could directly impact land uses as they relate to the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan and its Multiple Habitat Planning Area.

#### 5. PUBLIC FACILITIES-PARKS

Impact: Implementation of the propose Communities Plan Update would still result in significant deficiencies of park land, with regard to mini/neighborhood parks, community parks, and resource-based parks.

<u>Finding</u>: Environmental Impact Report 98-8207 addresses two project alternatives which reduce some of the significant unmitigated impacts associated with the proposed Mid-City Communities Plan Update. The environmental benefits of each of these alternatives and the reasons for their rejection are described below:

#### a) NO PROJECT

Adoption of the "No Project" alternative would allow the continued implementation of the goals and recommendations of the existing Mid-City Community Plan.

This alternative is infeasible for the following reasons:

Under this alternative, the identified impacts to traffic and circulation, air quality, cultural resources, land use and public facilities-parks, as a result of non-implementation of the goals and recommendations included within the proposed Plan Update. No Project would not implement many of the transportation improvements, as recommended, to alleviate congested roadways and intersections, or require the incorporation of pedestrian, bicycle and transit-oriented development standards within the communities of Mid-City.

Implementation of the existing Plan would result in a continuation of community planning for eight separate neighborhoods, a continuation of higher residential densities as allowed by the existing land use plan, and a concomitant continuation of serious deficiencies in public facilities throughout Mid-City.

This alternative would result in the addition of 10,000 residential dwelling units upon community buildout, resulting in 60,000 to 90,000 additional vehicle trips on Mid-City roadways. It would not implement the new construction of nine elementary schools and the expansion of several others, to alleviate current school overcrowding and the need to bus students to schools outside Mid-City.

Continuation of the existing 1984 Community Plan would not implement the addition of park land to help alleviate the serious deficiency that now exists with this particular public facility. Most significantly, the existing Plan would not recommend a land use plan which lowers permitted residential densities that would allow for "catching up" with the existing deficiencies in public facilities.

As a result, the No Project alternative could result in more extensive adverse impacts to traffic/circulation, air quality, cultural resources, land uses and public facilities-parks.

## b) Increasing Residential and Commercial Densities

This alternative would be to allow more intensive residential and commercial growth to occur within the "Commercial and Mixed-Use" designated areas, located west of 54<sup>th</sup> Street generally one-half block north and south of El Cajon Boulevard and one-half block north and south of University Avenue.

This increase of residential and commercial development/redevelopment could be achieved by further rezonings and/or the implementation of Transfer Development Rights (TDRs). With the use of TDRs, the boundary of one-half block north and south of El Cajon Boulevard and

University Avenue west of 54<sup>th</sup> Street, would be specifically designated as "receivable areas" for the use of residential and commercial TDRs. The use of TDRs would be available for improvements to historic structures within these areas as well.

This alternative would specify a recommended residential density of 43 du/ac, instead of the 29 du/ac recommended within the Communities Plan Update. This increase in residential density allowance could add approximately 2,600 additional units to the 3,318 dwelling units already proposed to occur within the Plan Update's land use plan. Thus a total of 5,918 dwelling units could be developed within Mid-City with this alternative.

The most significant advantage of this more intensive use in residential and commercial uses fronting onto both El Cajon Boulevard and University Avenue, supports an important community goal of concentrating new higher density development along transportation corridors with the highest densities at nodes. Higher densities at community nodes would encourage the utilization of mass transit and other forms of transportation, thus partially mitigating significant impacts to traffic and circulation.

## This alternative is infeasible for the following reasons:

The disadvantages associated with this alternative would be a continuation of potential adverse impacts to cultural resources, land uses, and public facilities-parks, caused by increased development and the added populations it would bring.

#### **EXHIBIT B**

## STATEMENT OF DRAFT OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE MID-CITY COMMUNITIES PLAN UPDATE

LDR No. 98-8207 June, 1998

The decisionmaker, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, after balancing the benefits of the proposed Mid-City Communities Plan Update against the unavoidable adverse impacts of the project on traffic and circulation, air quality, cultural resources, land use, and public facilities-parks, which would occur from implementation of the Plan, not withstanding the mitigation measures incorporated within the project, determines that the impacts are acceptable due to the following:

- 1. The recommended draft of the Mid-City Communities Plan should be adopted rather than the "Alternatives for Significant Unmitigated Impacts." The "No Project" alternative would result in continuation of the 1984 Mid-City Community Plan with its higher densities, resulting in greater impacts with respect to traffic/circulation, air quality, cultural resources, land use, and public facilities-parks than would result from the recommended Plan. The "Increasing Residential and Commercial Densities" alternative would result in a lower density than the 1984 Plan, but higher than the recommended Plan Update, and it would also result in greater environmental impacts.
- 2. The recommended Plan permits a relatively small amount of new development, most of which will occur with the redevelopment of commercial areas in the form or mix-use, residential, commercial, and light manufacturing development. While 2,007 dwelling units can be added as infill to residential areas, another 1,964 units will be lost in residential areas as redevelopment occurs to add recommended schools, parks, and other non-residential development. An additional 3,275 units can be added to commercial areas compared to 52,510 existing units communitywide. The capacity of both residential and non-residential development is less than a 10 percent increase over existing development.
- 3. The recommended redevelopment is needed for the stabilization of neighborhood to encourage home ownership and enhance the overall health and vitality of the community. Redevelopment will help eliminate the more deteriorated structures while providing more adequate housing, increased job opportunities, critically needed economic development of the community, and a level of intensity more appropriate for a transportation corridor.