

RESOLUTION NUMBER R- 312607
DATE OF FINAL PASSAGE AUG 07 2019

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO CERTIFYING ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 582608/SCH NO. 2016101021, ADOPTING THE FINDINGS, STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND THE MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE MORENA CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN.

WHEREAS, on August 1, 2019, the City Council of the City of San Diego held a public hearing for the purpose of considering adoption of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan, amendments to the General Plan, amendments to the Linda Vista Community Plan, amendments to the Clairemont Mesa Community Plan, amendments to the Land Development Code, associated rezoning actions, and other associated actions (Project); and

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

WHEREAS, the City Council considered the issues discussed in Environmental Impact Report No. 582608/SCH No. 2016101021 (Report) prepared for this Project; NOW,

THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of San Diego, that it is certified that the Report has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), as amended, and the State CEQA Guidelines thereto (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, 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 the City Council in connection with the approval of the Project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to CEQA Section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the City Council hereby adopts the Findings made with respect to the Project, which are attached hereto as Exhibit A.


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, the City Council hereby adopts the Statement of Overriding Considerations with respect to the Project, which is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to CEQA Section 21081.6, the City Council hereby adopts the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program, or alterations to implement the changes to the Project as required by this City Council in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment, which is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Report and other documents constituting the record of proceedings upon which the approval is based are available to the public at the Office of the City Clerk, 202 C Street, San Diego, CA 92101.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Clerk is directed to file a Notice of Determination with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors for the County of San Diego regarding the Project.

APPROVED: MARA W. ELLIOTT, City Attorney

By 

Corrine L. Neuffer
Deputy City Attorney

CLN:als
07/18/2019
Or.Dept: Planning Dept.
Doc. No.: 1950738

Attachments: Exhibit A – Findings
Exhibit B – Statement of Overriding Considerations
Exhibit C – Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program

I certify that the foregoing Resolution was passed by the Council of the City of San Diego, at this meeting of 08-01-2019.

ELIZABETH S. MALAND
City Clerk

By *Linda Irwin*
Deputy City Clerk

Approved: 8/7/19
(date)

Kevin L. Faulconer
KEVIN L. FAULCONER, Mayor

Vetoed: _____
(date)

KEVIN L. FAULCONER, Mayor

EXHIBIT A
CANDIDATE FINDINGS
FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR)
FOR THE
MORENA CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN
PROJECT NUMBER 582608
SCH No. 2016101021

August 2019

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Findings of Fact

The following Candidate Findings are made for the Morena Corridor Specific Plan and associated discretionary actions (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”). The environmental impacts of the Project are addressed in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (“Final PEIR”) dated February 1, 2019 (State Clearinghouse No. 2016101021), which is incorporated by reference herein.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code [PRC] Sections 21000, *et seq.*) and the State CEQA Guidelines (CEQA Guidelines) (14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000, *et seq.*) promulgated therein, require that the environmental impacts of a project be examined before a project is approved. In addition, once significant impacts have been identified, CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require that certain findings be made before project approval. It is the exclusive discretion of the decision maker certifying the environmental impact report (EIR) to determine the adequacy of the proposed candidate findings. Specifically, regarding findings, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
 - 1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
 - 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 - 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.
- (b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- (c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subdivision (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.
- (d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.

- (e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.
- (f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

These requirements also exist in Section 21081 of the CEQA statute. The “changes or alterations” referred to in Section 15091(a)(1) above, that are required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15370, including:

- (a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- (b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.
- (c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.
- (d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
- (e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

Should significant and unavoidable impacts remain after changes or alterations are applied to a project, a Statement of Overriding Considerations must be prepared. The statement provides the lead agency’s views on whether the benefits of a project outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental impacts. Regarding a Statement of Overriding Considerations, CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 provides:

- (f) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental impacts, the adverse environmental impacts may be considered “acceptable.”
- (g) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant impacts which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, 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. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- (h) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

B. Records of Proceedings

For purposes of CEQA and these Findings, the Record of Proceedings for the Project consists of the following documents and other evidence, at a minimum:

- The Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated October 7, 2016, and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the Project;
- The Draft PEIR, dated August 01, 2018;
- The Final PEIR, dated February 01, 2019;
- All written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft PEIR;
- All responses to written comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public review comment period on the Draft PEIR and included in the Final PEIR;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP);
- The reports and technical memoranda included or referenced in the Responses to Comments and/or in the Final PEIR;
- All documents, studies, EIRs, or other materials incorporated by reference in the Draft PEIR and the Final PEIR;
- Matters of common knowledge to the City, including but not limited to federal, state and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings and the Statement of Overriding Considerations; and
- Any other relevant materials required to be included in the Record of Proceedings pursuant to PRC Section 21167.6(e).

II. PROJECT SUMMARY

A. Project Location

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan area is located northwest of downtown San Diego and to the east of Mission Bay and includes approximately 280 acres along Morena Boulevard and West Morena Boulevard between Gesner Street just north of Clairemont Drive and Friars Road. It is located within the Clairemont Mesa Community Plan area (98 acres) and the Linda Vista Community Plan area (182 acres).

Interstate 5 (I-5) and the railroad corridor parallel the Specific Plan area and define the western project boundary. To the north and east, the Specific Plan area is shaped by the sloping topography and residential neighborhood of Bay Park in Clairemont Mesa, the University of San Diego (USD), the Overlook Heights neighborhood, and multi-family and student housing in Linda Vista. To the south is the San Diego River and Friars Road, which separate the Specific Plan area from Old Town San Diego.

B. Project Description and Objectives

Project Description

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan is intended to provide a policy framework and supplemental development regulations to guide future development in the Specific Plan area. The Project identifies changes to the street system intended to improve mobility for all users and identifies proposed changes to the land use map and base zones within the Linda Vista Community Plan, particularly near the future Mid-Coast Light Rail Trolley Stations at Tecolote Road and Clairemont Drive and the existing Morena/Linda Vista Trolley Station. Land use changes near existing and proposed transit/trolley stations are intended to encourage a greater density and intensity of mixed-use residential and commercial land uses and promote transit-oriented development. Although the Specific Plan's policies address land uses within both the Linda Vista and Clairemont Mesa community plan areas, the Specific Plan does not change the adopted land use map or zoning for the Clairemont Mesa Community Plan area.

Project Objectives

The objectives of the Project are as follows:

- Create a focused long-range plan for the Linda Vista Community Plan area intended to promote high residential density and employment opportunities consistent with the City of Villages strategy and the Climate Action Plan (CAP), while deferring such land use planning efforts within the Clairemont Mesa Community Plan area to the City's Community Plan Comprehensive Update for that community.
- Within the Linda Vista community planning area:
 - Establish land uses that facilitate transit-oriented mixed-use development in transit priority areas.
 - Leverage regional transit investment and provide critically needed housing by designating high-density residential and mixed-use development within close proximity to the transit stations.
 - Allow for employment-related land uses near transit and residential use consistent with the General Plan and CAP.
 - Create community villages that enhance pedestrian connectivity within and between neighborhoods.
 - Identify areas within villages for accessible public gathering spaces such as public plazas and outdoor seating.
 - Establish a grid circulation network to increase multi-modal connectivity and safety, improve circulation efficiency, and create more standardized block sizes for multi-modal travel and development feasibility.
- Enhance multi-modal connectivity between neighborhoods; Mission Bay Park; and the Clairemont Drive, Tecolote Road, and Morena/Linda Vista transit stations.
- Create a complete mobility system that promotes access and increases safety for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.

- Identify areas for accessible public gathering spaces and passive recreation opportunities.

III. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

The Project addressed in these Findings is a comprehensive planning document that provides the policy framework and supplemental development regulations to guide transit-oriented development and multi-modal improvements in the Specific Plan area, as described in Chapter 3.0 of the Final PEIR. The Project is intended to further express General Plan and Community Plan policies within the Linda Vista and Clairemont Mesa communities through the provision of site-specific recommendations that implement citywide goals and policies, address community needs, and guide zoning.

Controls on development and the use of public and private property including zoning, supplemental development regulations, and implementation of mobility improvements are included as part of the implementation program for the Project.

The Final PEIR concludes that the Project will have **no significant impacts (direct and/or cumulative)** and require no mitigation measures with respect to the following issues:

1. Agriculture and Forestry Resources
2. Biological Resources
3. Land Use
 - Conversion of Open Space or Farmland
 - Conflicts with the MSCP Subarea Plan
 - Conflicts with an Adopted ALUCP
4. Mineral Resources
5. Population and Housing
6. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
 - Distinctive or Landmark Trees

Less than Significant Impacts

The Final PEIR concludes that the Project would have **less than significant impacts (direct and/or cumulative)** and require no mitigation measures with respect to the following issues:

1. Land Use
 - Conflicts with Applicable Plans (Direct and Cumulative)
2. Transportation and Circulation
 - Alternative Transportation (Direct and Cumulative)
3. Noise
 - Ambient Noise (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Transportation Noise – Rail Noise (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Airport Compatibility (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Noise Ordinance Compliance (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Groundborne Vibration
 - Trolley and Train Operations (Direct and Cumulative)

- Commercial and Industrial Operations (Direct and Cumulative)
- 4. Air Quality
 - Air Quality Standards – Construction Emissions (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Sensitive Receptors (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Odors (Direct and Cumulative)
- 5. Paleontological Resources (Direct and Cumulative)
- 6. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
 - Landform Alteration (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Light and Glare (Direct and Cumulative)
- 7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Greenhouse Gas Emissions (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Conflicts with Plans or Policies (Direct and Cumulative)
- 8. Energy (Direct and Cumulative)
- 9. Health and Safety
 - Wildfire Hazards (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Schools (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Emergency Evacuation and Response Plans (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Hazardous Materials Sites and Health Hazards (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Aircraft Related Hazards (Direct and Cumulative)
- 10. Hydrology / Water Quality
 - Runoff and Drainage Patterns (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Water Quality (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Groundwater (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Flooding (Direct and Cumulative)
- 11. Geologic Conditions
 - Seismic Hazards (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Erosion or Loss of Topsoil (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Geologic Instability (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Expansive Soils (Direct and Cumulative)
- 12. Public Services and Facilities (Direct and Cumulative)
- 13. Public Utilities
 - Water Supply (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Utilities (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Solid Waste and Recycling (Direct and Cumulative)
 -

Impacts that are Less than Significant with Mitigation or Avoided Through Project Changes

The Final PEIR identifies the following **direct and/or cumulatively significant impacts which will be avoided or mitigated to below a level of significance** with respect to the following issues:

1. Transportation and Circulation
 - Traffic Circulation – Intersections (Cumulative)

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The Final PEIR identifies the following direct and/or cumulatively significant impacts which are considered **significant and unavoidable because mitigation measures do not exist or are considered not feasible to reduce impacts to less than significant.**

1. Transportation and Circulation
 - Traffic Circulation – Roadway Segments, Intersections, Freeway Segments, Ramp Meters (Direct and Cumulative)
2. Noise
 - Transportation Noise – Vehicle Traffic Noise (Direct)
 - Temporary Construction Noise (Direct)
 - Groundborne Vibration – Construction (Direct)
3. Air Quality
 - Conflicts with Air Quality Plans (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Air Quality Standards – Operational Emissions (Direct and Cumulative)
4. Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources
 - Historic Buildings, Structures, Objects, or Sites (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, or Human Remains (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Tribal Cultural Resources (Direct and Cumulative)
5. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
 - Scenic Vistas or Views (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Neighborhood Character (Direct and Cumulative)

IV. FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

A. Findings Regarding Impacts That Will be Avoided by Project Changes or Mitigated to Below a Level of Significance (CEQA §21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(1))

The City, having independently reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR and the public record for the Project, finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(1) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), that project changes or mitigation is determined to be feasible and would mitigate or avoid the significant impacts on the environment from the Project. The following is a list of those environmental impacts that will be mitigated to below a level of significance, as identified in the Final PEIR:

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Traffic Circulation – Intersections (Issue 1)

Significant Impact

Traffic associated with the proposed Morena Corridor Specific Plan will result in significant cumulative impacts on selected intersections by raising traffic volumes to an unacceptable level of service. These include:

- E. Mission Bay Drive and Clairemont Drive (Impact 6.2-4)
- Morena Boulevard and Jellett Street (Impact 6.2-6)
- Morena Boulevard and Savannah Street (Impact 6.2-7)

Facts in Support of Finding

E. Mission Bay Drive and Clairemont Drive

Signalization of the intersection and restriping the northbound approach to include a dedicated right-turn lane would allow the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS during both peak hours. Additional analysis should be performed at this location to determine if a roundabout is feasible and would improve operations to less than significant. If a roundabout is determined feasible, it may be implemented in-lieu of signalization. The identified significant traffic related impact to this intersection would be fully mitigated with the implementation of this improvement. This improvement was identified as mitigation and has been incorporated into the Specific Plan.

Morena Boulevard and Jellett Street

Signalization of the intersection or restriction of left turn movements from Jellett Street onto Morena Boulevard would allow the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS during both peak hours. Additional analysis should be performed at this location to determine if a roundabout is feasible and would improve operations to less than significant. If a roundabout is determined feasible, it may be implemented in-lieu of signalization. The identified significant traffic related impact to this intersection would be fully mitigated with the implementation of this improvement. This improvement was identified as mitigation and has been incorporated into the Specific Plan.

Morena Boulevard and Savannah Street

Signalization of the intersection or restriction of left turn movements from Savannah Street onto Morena Boulevard would allow the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS during both peak hours. Additional analysis should be performed at this location to determine if a roundabout is feasible and would improve operations to less than significant. If a roundabout is determined feasible, it may be implemented in lieu of signalization. The identified significant traffic related impact to this intersection would be fully mitigated with the implementation of this improvement. This improvement was identified as mitigation and has been incorporated into the Specific Plan.

Rationale and Conclusion

While buildout of the Project would result in significant cumulative impacts at these three intersections described above, implementation of Supplemental Development Regulations (SDRs) SDR-7 and SDR-10 would avoid these impacts through various improvements that would improve intersection operations during the AM and PM peak hours.

B. Findings Regarding Infeasible Mitigation Measures (CEQA §21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(3))

The City, having independently reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR and the public record for the Project finds, pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), that the Project will have significant and unavoidable impacts in the following issue areas:

1. Transportation and Circulation
 - Traffic Circulation – Roadway Segments and Intersections (Direct and Cumulative)
2. Noise
 - Transportation Noise – Vehicle Traffic Noise (Direct)
 - Temporary Construction Noise (Direct)
 - Groundborne Vibration – Construction (Direct)
3. Air Quality
 - Air Quality Standards – Operation (Direct and Cumulative)
4. Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources
 - Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Tribal Cultural Resources (Direct and Cumulative)
5. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
 - Scenic Vistas or Views (Direct and Cumulative)
 - Neighborhood Character (Direct and Cumulative)

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Traffic Circulation – Roadway Segments and Intersections (Issue 1)

Significant Impact

Traffic associated with the Project will result in significant cumulative impacts on selected roadway segments and intersections by raising traffic volumes to an unacceptable level of service. These include:

Roadway Segments

- Clairemont Drive, from I-5 NB Ramps to Denver Street (Impact 6.2-1)
- Denver Street, from Clairemont Drive to Ingulf Street (Impact 6.2-2)
- Morena Boulevard, south of Linda Vista Road (Impact 6.2-3)

Intersections

- Denver Street and Clairemont Drive (Impact 6.2-5)

Facts in Support of Finding

Roadway Segments

Clairemont Drive, from I-5 Northbound Ramps to Denver Street (Impact 6.2-1)

Widening the roadway from a 4-Lane Major Arterial to a 6-Lane Prime Arterial would improve the operations of the segment to LOS C. The identified significant traffic related impact to this roadway segment would be fully mitigated with the implementation of this mitigation measure. However, this mitigation measure is not feasible. Implementation of this mitigation would increase crossing distance for pedestrians by 22 to 24 feet, require a retaining wall, impact planned bicycle facilities, and require right-of-way acquisition from 1 residential development and 3 commercial developments within the Clairemont community. This would be inconsistent with City policies promoting active transportation and the City of Villages growth strategy; and would obstruct the City's efforts to achieve Climate Action Plan (CAP) active transportation mode share goals. In addition, the funding source for the implementation of this mitigation has not been determined. It would be inconsistent with City policies and goals aimed at promoting active transportation mode shares to utilize public funding resources to acquire additional right-of-way to accommodate single-occupancy vehicle trips. Therefore, the measure is infeasible. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Denver Street, from Clairemont Drive to Ingulf Street (Impact 6.2-2)

Improving the roadway from a 2-Lane Collector without Two-Way Left-Turn Lane to a 2-Lane Collector with Two-Way Left-Turn Lane would improve the operations of the segment to LOS D. The identified significant traffic related impact to this roadway segment would be fully mitigated with the implementation of this improvement. However, this mitigation measure is not feasible. There is currently not enough right-of-way along this segment of Denver Street to accommodate this improvement consistent with the City of San Diego Street Design Manual, which requires 54 feet of curb-to-curb width. Implementation of this mitigation measure would increase crossing distance for pedestrians by 14 feet and would require right-of-way acquisition from 5 commercial developments within the Clairemont community. This would be inconsistent with City policies promoting active transportation and the City of Villages growth strategy; and would obstruct the City's efforts to achieve Climate Action Plan (CAP) active transportation mode share goals. In addition, the funding source for the implementation of this mitigation has not been determined. It would be inconsistent with City policies and goals aimed at promoting active transportation mode shares to utilize public funding resources to acquire additional right-of-way to accommodate single-occupancy vehicle trips. Therefore, the measure is infeasible. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Morena Boulevard, south of Linda Vista Road (Impact 6.2-3)

Improving the roadway from a 4-Lane Major Arterial to a 6-Lane Prime Arterial would improve the operations of the segment to LOS E. The identified significant traffic related impact to this roadway segment would be fully mitigated with the implementation of this improvement. However, this mitigation measure is not feasible. Implementation of this mitigation would increase crossing distance for pedestrians by requiring the widening of the existing Morena Boulevard bridge over the San Diego River. Widening the Morena Boulevard bridge would

require the re-alignment of the four I-8 / Morena Boulevard ramps to accommodate the new bridge structure, and the reconstruction of the I-8 Morena Boulevard overpass. This would be inconsistent with City policies promoting active transportation and the City of Villages growth strategy; and would obstruct the City's efforts to achieve Climate Action Plan (CAP) active transportation mode share goals. In addition, the funding source for the implementation of this mitigation has not been determined. It would be inconsistent with City policies and goals aimed at promoting active transportation mode shares to utilize public funding resources to acquire additional right-of-way to accommodate single-occupancy vehicle trips. Therefore, the measure is infeasible. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Intersections

Denver Street and Clairemont Drive (Impact 6.2-5)

Widening the northbound approach to accommodate an additional northbound left-turn lane and widening the southbound approach to include an exclusive right-turn lane would allow the intersection to operate at an acceptable LOS during both peak hours. The identified significant traffic related impact to this intersection would be fully mitigated with the implementation of this improvement. However, this mitigation measure is not feasible. Implementation of this mitigation would increase pedestrian crossing distance by 10-12 feet, create a geometric design issue with a newly created offset, and require right of way acquisition from 2 commercial developments. This would be inconsistent with City policies promoting active transportation and the City of Villages growth strategy; and would obstruct the City's efforts to achieve Climate Action Plan (CAP) active transportation mode share goals. In addition, the funding source for the implementation of this mitigation has not been determined. It would be inconsistent with City policies and goals aimed at promoting active transportation mode shares to utilize public funding resources to acquire additional right-of-way to accommodate single-occupancy vehicle trips. Therefore, the measure is infeasible. The impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Rationale and Conclusion

The Specific Plan identifies bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements that work in concert with the proposed land use. The Specific Plan envisions a balanced mobility network that provides viable options aimed at shifting trips to alternative modes such as: transit, walking, and bicycling, while also accommodating vehicle traffic and minimizing conflicts between travel modes. It is anticipated that providing housing and improving walking and cycling conditions near transit would reduce automobile trips and associated traffic congestion. Therefore, active transportation improvements proposed as part of this Specific Plan are anticipated to stimulate this mode shift.

Although mitigation measures are identified in the Final PEIR that would reduce impacts to local roadways and intersections, those measures are infeasible because 1) Implementation of such roadway improvements would be contrary to achieving the smart growth and mobility goals of the General Plan, Specific Plan, and CAP, and 2) surrounding existing or planned development and/or facilities restrict the ability to obtain sufficient right-of-way to construct some of the identified improvements and maintain existing features such as bicycle facilities and sidewalks. Potential mitigation measures that involve road widening or other automobile-related improvements would create less-favorable conditions for active transportation users as they

could impede implementation of planned pedestrian and bicycle improvements, which is inconsistent with the City's policies directed at increasing active transportation mode shares. It would be inconsistent with City policies and goals aimed at promoting active transportation mode shares to utilize public funding resources to acquire additional right-of-way to accommodate single-occupancy vehicle trips. Therefore, the measure is infeasible. The impacts of the Project on local roadway segments and intersections (Impacts 6.2-1 through 6.2-3 and 6.2-5) would be significant and unavoidable.

NOISE

Transportation Noise – Vehicle Traffic Noise (Issue 2)

Significant Impact

Traffic generated from build-out of the Project would result in vehicular noise in excess of the applicable land use and noise compatibility levels in certain areas, resulting in a potentially significant exterior noise impact for ministerial projects.

Facts in Support of Finding

Noise levels for sensitive land uses would be incompatible (i.e., greater than 70 CNEL) at areas located approximately 540 to 610 feet from I-5. These areas are currently developed; however, implementation of the Project would result in changes to the land uses in these areas, resulting in the introduction of new noise-sensitive land uses (i.e., increased residential uses).

A regulatory framework and review process exist for new discretionary development in areas exposed to high levels of vehicle traffic noise. Implementation of the policies in the General Plan would require future projects to demonstrate that exterior and interior noise levels would be compatible with City standards. Therefore, exterior and interior noise compatibility impacts associated with future discretionary projects, and interior noise compatibility impacts associated with future ministerial projects implemented in accordance with the Project would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations and noise standards. However, in the case of exterior noise impacts to ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise is adequately attenuated. Therefore, exterior noise impacts for ministerial projects located in areas that exceed the applicable land use and noise compatibility level would be significant and unavoidable.

Rationale and Conclusion

Exterior noise impacts associated with future ministerial projects would remain significant and unavoidable as ministerial projects are not subject to a discretionary review and there is no mechanism that would require exterior noise analysis and attenuation for ministerial projects. Therefore, the City is unable to identify a feasible mitigation framework at the program level that would reduce exterior noise impacts for ministerial projects to a less than significant level.

NOISE

Temporary Construction Noise (Issue 5)

Significant Impact

Potential vibration impacts during future construction activity associated with build-out of the Project would be potentially significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and varies depending upon the nature or phase of construction. Construction noise in any one particular area would be short term, but construction equipment can generate maximum noise levels between 70 and 95 dB(A) L_{max} at 50 feet from the source when in operation. Hourly average noise levels would be approximately 83 dB(A) L_{eq} at 50 feet from the center of construction activity when assessing three pieces of common construction equipment working simultaneously, which would attenuate to 75 dB(A) L_{eq} at 120 feet. Due to the developed nature of Specific Plan area, there is a high likelihood that construction activities would take place adjacent to existing structures and that sensitive receptors would be located in proximity (i.e. closer than 120 feet) to construction activities.

Rationale and Conclusion

Implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE 6.3-1 would require implementation of construction noise reduction measures to ensure compliance with City requirements for construction-related noise. Although implementation of Mitigation Measure NOISE 6.3-1 would reduce construction-related noise impacts, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable because it is not feasible to ensure and enforce implementation for all projects that may be developed under with the Specific Plan. As the City is unable to ensure at a program level that all projects incorporate these measures, full implementation of the mitigation is infeasible and the potential vibration impacts during future construction activity would be significant and unavoidable. Nevertheless, Mitigation Measure NOISE 6.3-1 is still included in the Final PEIR and will be included in the MMRP.

NOISE

Groundborne Vibration – Construction (Issue 6)

Significant Impact

Vibration impacts from future construction activities associated with build-out of the Project would be potentially significant.

Facts in Support of Finding

By use of administrative controls, such as scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with least potential to affect nearby properties, perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum and as such would result in a less than significant impact with respect to perception. However, pile driving within 95 feet of existing structures has the potential to exceed a ppv of 0.20 inch per second which is the limit where vibration can begin

to annoy people in buildings and at which there is a risk of cosmetic damage to normal dwellings. While potentially adverse impacts would likely be reduced to less than significant through implementation of standard construction controls and requirements associated with the required permit to deviate from the noise ordinance; at a program level of analysis, it cannot be known with certainty that all potential project level impacts can be reduced to less than significant.

Rationale and Conclusion

In the absence of project-specific information related to construction schedules, equipment, and location of pile driving in relation to structures, the City is unable to identify at a program level a feasible mitigation framework that would ensure all project level vibration impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Thus, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

AIR QUALITY

Air Quality Standards – Operation (Issue 2)

Significant Impact

Build-out of the Specific Plan would result in operational emissions in excess of the assumptions used in the RAQS and would exceed regional air quality standards, resulting a potentially significant impact on air quality.

Facts in Support of Finding

Buildout of the Project would result greater operational emissions compared to buildout of the adopted Community Plan land uses as implementation of the Project would increase density within the Specific Plan area.

Rationale and Conclusion

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ 6.4-2 would require future discretionary projects that exceed the City's daily operational emissions thresholds to incorporate appropriate mitigation, such as installing electric vehicle charging stations and increasing transit accessibility, to reduce potential impacts. Although implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ 6.4-2, in addition to compliance with local, state, and federal regulations, would reduce emissions and potential impacts, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable because it is not feasible to ensure and enforce implementation for all projects that may be developed under the Specific Plan. As the City is unable to ensure that all projects incorporate this measure, full implementation of the mitigation is infeasible and the air quality impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Nevertheless, Mitigation Measure AQ 6.4-2 is included in the Final PEIR and will be included in the MMRP.

HISTORICAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites (Issue 1)

Significant Impact

Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted community plan and current zoning or where mobility improvements/road extensions could require demolition of structures.

Facts in Support of Finding

Implementation of the Project would change land use designations within the Morena Station District, Tecolote Village District, Design District, and Employment District in the Linda Vista Community Plan area, which would permit increased building height and could increase the likelihood of redevelopment in those areas. The Project's proposed mobility improvements would require the acquisition of right-of-way, which could result in the potential demolition of structures within the Morena Station and the Tecolote Village Districts. Therefore, future build-out of the Project could result in potentially significant impacts to potential historical resources located within those areas.

Rationale and Conclusion

The significant impact of the Project would be mitigated partially through regulatory compliance, including conformance with the City's General Plan, combined with federal, state, and local regulations, which provide a regulatory framework for project-level historical resources, evaluation/analysis criteria, and when applicable, mitigation measures for future discretionary projects. All development projects with the potential to affect historical resources such as designated historical resources; historical buildings, districts, landscapes, objects, and structures are subject to site-specific review in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines through the subsequent project review process. Mitigation Measure HIST 6.5-1 provides a framework that would be required of all development projects with the potential to impact significant historical resources of the built environment. This framework outlines requirements for the avoidance and minimization of impacts to historic buildings and structures and required measures such as the preparation of a historic resource management plan, and screening and shielding to protect the character of historical resources.

Although future development would implement Mitigation Measure HIST 6.5-1 and apply relevant policies from the General Plan and adopted Community Plan to reduce impacts to historical resources, the ability of these measures to fully mitigate potential impacts to significant historical resources of the built environment cannot be guaranteed, and thus, full implementation of the mitigation is infeasible. Therefore, potential impacts to historic structures, objects, or sites would be significant and unavoidable. Nevertheless, Mitigation Measure HIST 6.5-1 is still included in the Final PEIR and will be included in the MMRP.

HISTORICAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains (Issue 2)

Significant Impact

Implementation of the Project could adversely impact prehistoric or historic archaeological resources, sacred sites and human remains during construction.

Facts in Support of Finding

A records search conducted for the Project found that while there are no recorded prehistoric or historic archaeological resources within the Specific Plan area, historic, prehistoric, and historic archaeological sites have been recorded within a ¼ mile radius from the Specific Plan boundaries. Given the location of the ethnographic village of *La Rinconada de Jamo* to the northwest of the Specific Plan area, and the possible location of the ethnographic village of *Kotsi/Cosoy/Kosaii/Kosa 'aay* to the south near the Old Town community, it is possible that future development could encounter human remains, archaeological resources, or sacred sites during construction activities. Although there is very little undeveloped land within the Specific Plan area, future development and construction activities associated with the Project could result in the alteration or destruction of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources, objects, or sites and could impact religious or sacred uses; or disturb human remains, particularly considering the proximity of the Old Town community to the south and the recorded archaeological resources to the northwest.

Rationale and Conclusion

All development projects with the potential to affect prehistoric and historic archaeological resources are subject to site-specific review in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines through the subsequent project review process. Additionally, Mitigation Measure HIST 6.5-2 provides a framework that would be required of all development projects with the potential to impact significant archaeological resources. This framework outlines the process of project level reviews conducted by City staff review, requirements for field surveys and archeological testing, archeological monitoring requirements, curation, and required compliance with the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HIST 6.5-2 would reduce impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, sacred sites, and human remains. This mitigation, combined with the policies of the General Plan and the adopted Community Plans promoting the identification, protection, and preservation of archaeological resources, in addition to compliance with CEQA and PRC Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation early in the development review process, and the City's Historical Resources Regulations (San Diego Municipal Code [SDMC] Section 143.0212), which require review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps, would further reduce the program-level impact related to prehistoric and historical archaeological resources. Implementation of this measure would reduce the significance of

impacts, but the impact would remain significant and unavoidable because it is not feasible to ensure and enforce implementation for all projects developed per the Specific Plan. As the City is unable to ensure that all projects incorporate these measures, full implementation of the mitigation is infeasible. Nevertheless, the measures are still included in the Final PEIR and will be included in the MMRP.

HISTORICAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Tribal Cultural Resources (Issue 3)

Significant Impact

Future development proposed by the Project could result in a significant and unavoidable impact to tribal cultural resources.

Facts in Support of Finding

A Sacred Lands check was conducted which indicated that no sacred lands have been identified within the vicinity of the Specific Plan area. However, an archaeological records search identified several key areas that may have a high level of interest to the local Native American community which have not been formally recognized or listed on a local, state or federal register. Given the presence of known and potential tribal cultural resources near the Specific Plan area, future development under the Project could result in significant and unavoidable impacts to tribal cultural resources.

Rationale and Conclusion

All development projects with the potential to affect tribal cultural resources such as significant archaeological sites with cultural and religious significance to the Native American community are subject to site-specific review in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines through the subsequent project review process. Additionally, Mitigation Measure HIST 6.5-2 provides a framework that would be required of all development projects with the potential to impact significant tribal cultural resources. This framework outlines the process of project level reviews conducted by City staff review, requirements for field surveys and archeological testing, archeological monitoring requirements, curation, and required compliance with the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HIST 6.5-2 would reduce impacts to tribal cultural resources. This mitigation, combined with the policies of the General Plan and the adopted Community Plan policies promoting the identification, protection, and preservation of tribal cultural resources, in addition to compliance with CEQA and PRC Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation early in the development review process, and the City's Historic Resources Regulations (SDMC Section 143.0212), which require review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps, would reduce the program-level impact related to tribal cultural resources. Implementation of this measure would reduce the significance of impacts, but the impact would remain significant and unavoidable because it is not feasible to ensure and enforce implementation for all projects developed per the Project. As the City is unable to ensure that all

projects incorporate these measures, full implementation of the mitigation is infeasible. Nevertheless, Mitigation Measure HIST 6.5-2 is still included in the Final PEIR and will be included in the MMRP.

VISUAL EFFECTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Scenic Vistas or Views (Issue 1)

Significant Impact

Implementation of the Project would have the potential to significantly impact public views within the Linda Vista portion of the Specific Plan area, including implementation of the Transit Oriented Development Enhancement Program (TODEP).

Facts in Support of Finding

Within the Linda Vista portion of the Specific Plan area, height limits would be increased from 30 feet up to 45 feet without a discretionary permit, which would have the potential to alter public views of Mission Bay and the Presidio. Additionally, under the TODEP, a potentially significant impact related to public scenic views could occur as the program would allow new development in certain areas to achieve heights up to 65 or 100 feet with a Planned Development Permit (PDP). Thus, potential impacts related to public views associated with build-out of the Specific Plan land uses within the Linda Vista portion of the Specific Plan area, including implementation of the TODEP, would be significant.

Rationale and Conclusion

The Specific Plan identifies a robust policy framework to address potential adverse effects related to scenic vistas and views and development proposed under the TODEP program would require the processing of a PDP and additional CEQA review. Nevertheless, the proposed change in height limits would still impact public views and the City is unable to identify a feasible mitigation framework beyond the proposed policy and permit framework incorporated into the Project that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

VISUAL EFFECTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

Neighborhood Character (Issue 2)

Significant Impact

A significant impact related to neighborhood character would occur as a result of future development within the Linda Vista portion of the Specific Plan area due to increased heights and development intensity that could conflict with existing neighborhood character.

Facts in Support of Finding

The increase in allowable densities and height within the Linda Vista portion of the Specific Plan area, specifically around the existing and planned transit stations within the Morena Station and Tecolote Village Districts, could alter the existing neighborhood character of the area and result

in an increase in the bulk of buildings compared to the existing condition. Additionally, future development under the TODPEP could further alter neighborhood character due to increased heights and density compared to the existing condition.

Rationale and Conclusion

The Specific Plan identifies a robust policy framework to address potential adverse effects related to neighborhood character and development proposed under the TODPEP program would require the processing of a PDP and additional CEQA review. Future development within the Specific Plan area would be required to be consistent with the development standards for the applicable zone established in the City's Land Development Code and would comply with the Specific Plan's and the City's General Plan policies. Nevertheless, the proposed greater intensity and potential height of development within the Specific Plan area would still impact neighborhood character and the City is unable to identify a feasible mitigation framework beyond the proposed policy and permit framework incorporated into the Project that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

C. Findings Regarding Alternatives (CEQA §21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(3))

Because the Project will cause one or more unavoidable significant environmental impacts, the City must make findings with respect to the alternatives to the Project considered in the Final PEIR, evaluating whether these alternatives could feasibly avoid or substantially lessen the Project's unavoidable significant environmental impacts while achieving most of its objectives (listed in Section II.B above and Section 3.2 of the Final PEIR).

The City, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final PEIR and the Record of Proceedings, and pursuant to PRC Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3), makes the following findings with respect to the alternatives identified in the Final PEIR.

Background

The Final PEIR evaluated the following three project alternatives:

1. No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative;
2. Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative; and
3. Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative.

These three project alternatives are summarized below, along with the findings relevant to each alternative.

No Project/Adopted Plan

Description

Under the No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative, the existing land use designations in the Clairemont Mesa Community Plan and the Linda Vista Community Plan would remain in effect, building heights would continue to be limited to 30 feet (45 feet with a discretionary permit), and

no TODEP provisions that would allow application of greater height and density within the Community Commercial designations in the Tecolote Village and Morena Station districts would be adopted. This alternative would not include any of the mobility improvements included within the Specific Plan, such as roadway extensions, intersection improvements, or pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Because the Specific Plan area is subject to the adopted Clairemont Mesa Community Plan and Linda Vista Community Plan, development may still occur under the No Project Alternative. While the existing community plans would allow for redevelopment of individual parcels, redevelopment at the scale assumed by the proposed Project is not assumed under this alternative.

Potentially Significant Impacts

As stated in Chapter 10.0 of the Final PEIR, this alternative may result in significant effects to:

1. Transportation and Circulation
 - Traffic Circulation – Roadway Segments
2. Noise
 - Transportation Noise – Vehicle Traffic Noise
 - Temporary Construction Noise
 - Groundborne Vibration – Construction
3. Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources
 - Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites
 - Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains
 - Tribal Cultural Resources
4. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
 - Conflicts with Plans or Policies

Finding and Supporting Facts

Compared to the proposed Project, development pursuant to the No Project Alternative would eliminate two significant and unavoidable air quality impacts (conflicts with air quality plans and air quality standards) and two significant and unavoidable visual effects and neighborhood character impacts (scenic vistas or views and neighborhood character). Because the land uses and related operational emissions from housing and employment identified in the current RAQS and SIP are those anticipated in the No Project Alternative, significant and unavoidable air quality impacts would be avoided by this alternative. Significant impacts associated with visual effects and neighborhood character would also be avoided as buildout under the No Project Alternative would not result in greater building height allowances and development intensity.

The No Project Alternative would result in significant roadway impacts at the four roadway segments. When compared to the proposed Project, the No Project Alternative would result in fewer significant impacts to roadway segments; therefore, impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project. However, similar to the proposed Project, implementation of mitigation measures to address these impacts may conflict with community objectives, and/or their implementation is not ensured prior to occurrence of an impact. Therefore, transportation

impacts under this alternative would be significant and unavoidable, but would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

The No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative would result in reduced greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions compared to the proposed project, however, this alternative would not include the proposed mobility improvements that would support increased bicycle, pedestrian, and transit infrastructure and amenities within the Specific Plan area, which would conflict with CAP goals. Additionally, land use changes that would increase density near transit centers would not occur under the No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative. Locating the most intense development in proximity to transit centers enables a greater proportion of the population to benefit from alternative transportation options and ultimately reduce overall vehicle miles traveled and GHG emissions. The absence of the proposed land use and mobility network changes would not implement the City's vision to increase density near transit to support alternative modes of transportation that can ultimately reduce GHG emissions. Thus, the No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative would result in greater impacts than the proposed Project due to its inconsistency with the City's CAP, which would represent a significant impact related to conflicts with plans and policies.

Impacts to historical resources resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified for the Specific Plan, as the extent and areas of disturbance by development would generally be the same and only the type and/or intensity of allowed development would change under the Specific Plan. As with the Specific Plan, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to historical resources at the program level.

Regarding prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources, future development under the No Project Alternative also has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources. Impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified for the Specific Plan, as the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same and only the type and/or intensity of allowed development would change under the Specific Plan. Therefore, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources at the program level.

Noise impacts under the No Project Alternative would also be similar to the anticipated impacts of the Specific Plan because, like the Specific Plan, the adopted Community Plans would permit development that would be subject to ambient noise increases and traffic noise as the planning areas are built out. As detailed in the Project's analysis in Section 6.3, the major source of traffic noise within the Specific Plan area is noise from I-5, which would be similar under the No Project Alternative. Ministerial development could continue to occur under the No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative, which would result in similar impacts due to the existing ambient noise levels (associated with freeway noise) in excess of General Plan's Noise Element Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines. Thus, potential impacts associated with exposure of ministerial development to traffic noise would be significant and unavoidable, the same as the proposed Project.

Finally, the noise impacts of the No Project Alternative relative to temporary construction noise would be similar to the proposed project as well, since construction activities related to implementation of the Specific Plan would potentially generate short-term noise levels in excess of 75 dB(A) L_{eq} at adjacent properties. With regard to construction vibration, pile driving within 95 feet of existing structures has the potential to result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to vibration during construction, the same as the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would result in similar or reduced impact levels for issue areas determined to be significant under the proposed Project, including transportation and circulation, noise, and historical and tribal cultural resources. This alternative would have cumulatively significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation, noise, and historical and tribal cultural resources.

Rationale and Conclusion

The No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative is rejected as infeasible as it would not substantially reduce the significant impacts associated with the Project and it does not meet most of the Project Objectives outlined in Section 3.2 of the Final PEIR. Specifically, it would not promote high residential density and employment opportunities consistent with the City of Villages Strategy and the Climate Action Plan, transit-oriented mixed-use development in transit priority areas, community villages and public gathering spaces, increase multi-modal connectivity and safety, or increased access and safety for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit. Although it would eliminate two significant and unavoidable air quality impacts and two significant and unavoidable visual effects and neighborhood character impacts, it would result in a significant GHG emissions impact by conflicting with plans and policies that aim to reduce GHG emissions. For the above described reasons, the No Project/Adopted Plan Alternative is rejected as infeasible because it would not greatly reduce the significant and unavoidable effects of the proposed Project and it does not meet most of the Project Objectives.

Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative

Description

The Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would revise the proposed Project to reduce the maximum density allowed with a Planned Development Permit in the Tecolote Village District from 109 to 73 dwelling units per acre and would cap the density in the Morena Station District at 54 dwelling units per acre. All other aspects of the proposed Project are assumed to be implemented, including the TODEP provisions that allow building heights of 100 and 65 feet for the Tecolote Village District and for the Morena Station District, respectively, and all mobility improvements.

Potentially Significant Impacts

As stated in Chapter 10.0 of the Final PEIR, this alternative may result in significant effects to:

1. Transportation and Circulation
 - Traffic Circulation – Roadway Segments, Intersections, Freeway Segments, and Ramp Meters
2. Noise

- Transportation Noise – Vehicle Traffic Noise
 - Temporary Construction Noise
 - Groundborne Vibration – Construction
3. Air Quality
 - Conflicts with Air Quality Plans
 4. Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources
 - Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites
 - Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains
 - Tribal Cultural Resources
 5. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
 - Scenic Vistas or Views
 - Neighborhood Character

Finding and Supporting Facts

Under the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative, a significant roadway segment impact identified under the proposed Project (Clairemont Drive from I-5 NB ramps to Denver Street) would be avoided. Overall, the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative also would not reduce any of the significant transportation impacts identified for the proposed Project. The location of two segments impacts would shift under this alternative; however, the overall number of impacted segments would be the same. This alternative would result in a reduction in the amount of traffic due to the reduced development intensity, which would result in some improvements in delay compared to build-out under the proposed Project; however, the same number of significant impacts as the proposed project would result. Thus, significant impacts of this alternative would be the same as under the proposed Project, with slight improvements in operations.

Air quality impacts under the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to the anticipated impacts under the Specific Plan because, like the Specific Plan, the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would permit development that would be subject to increased emission levels compared to those anticipated under the existing land use plans. While this alternative would result in fewer dwelling units and vehicle trips than allowed under the Specific Plan, the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would also result in greater density than what was anticipated in developing the RAQS and, as such, would conflict with implementation of the RAQS. Therefore, air quality impacts associated with consistency with the RAQS under this alternative would be significant and unavoidable, although overall emissions would be slightly less than the proposed Project.

As with the Specific Plan, future development under the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative also has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to historical resources. The extent of impacts to historical resources resulting from implementation of the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to those identified for the Specific Plan because the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same. Therefore, implementation of the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts related to historical resources at the program level that would be significant and unavoidable, despite adherence to the existing regulatory framework.

Regarding prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources, future development under the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative also has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources. The extent of impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources resulting from implementation of the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to those identified for the Specific Plan, because the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same. Therefore, implementation of the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts related to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources at the program level that would be significant and unavoidable, despite adherence to the existing regulatory framework.

Noise impacts under the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to the anticipated impacts under the Specific Plan because, like the Specific Plan, the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would permit ministerial development that would be subject to ambient noise levels in excess of City standards due to existing transportation noise levels from I-5, resulting in a significant impact.

While the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would result in slightly less development potential, which in turn could lead to a reduction in overall construction noise in comparison to build-out of the Specific Plan, increased construction noise over the existing levels would occur as development occurs under either the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative or the Specific Plan. Future development implemented under both the Mid-Density Alternative and Specific Plan would be required to comply with applicable City and state noise regulations including Title 24 Building Code requirements. The noise impacts of the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative relative to temporary construction noise would be similar to the proposed Project, as construction activities related to implementation of Specific Plan would potentially generate short-term noise levels in excess of 75 dB(A) L_{eq} at adjacent properties, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Furthermore, with regards to construction vibration, pile driving within 95 feet of existing structures has the potential to result in a significant and unavoidable impact related to vibration during construction, the same as the proposed Project.

Finally, the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would implement the same supplemental development regulations and TODEP provisions of the Specific Plan that would allow building heights up to 45 feet by right within Linda Vista and up to 100 and 65 feet within the Tecolote Village and the Morena Station districts, respectively, with a Planned Development Permit. Therefore, this alternative would result in the same significant and unavoidable impacts related to scenic vistas and views and neighborhood character as the Specific Plan.

The Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would result in similar or reduced impact levels for issue areas determined to be significant under the proposed Project, including transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, historical and tribal cultural resources, and visual effects and neighborhood character. This alternative would have cumulatively significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, historical and tribal cultural resources, and visual effects and neighborhood character.

Rationale and Conclusion

The Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative is rejected as infeasible because overall it would not substantially reduce the significant impacts associated with the Project. Although it would avoid one significant roadway segment impact, other significant impacts of the Project would be similar under the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative. While the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would meet the Project Objectives outlined in Section 3.2 of the Final PEIR, it would not achieve them to the same degree as the proposed Project because it would reduce the maximum residential density allowed within the Tecolote Village and the Morena Station Districts. Specifically, it would not promote high residential density and employment opportunities consistent with the City of Villages Strategy and the Climate Action Plan, transit-oriented mixed-use development in transit priority areas, community villages and public gathering spaces, increase multi-modal connectivity and safety, or increased access and safety for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit at as great of a level as the proposed Project. This would result in fewer housing units in a location where increased density is desirable to accommodate the City's housing needs as well as to implement the CAP.

Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative

Description

The Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would revise the proposed Project to cap the maximum density allowed in the Tecolote Village District and the Morena Station District at 54 dwelling units per acre. The TODEP provisions of the proposed Project would not be included in this alternative, because the maximum density of 54 dwelling units per acre is within the density range of the Community Village land use designation, and the building height of 45 feet would be adequate to accommodate low-density housing. This alternative would accommodate up to 3,780 dwelling units and 2,302,165 square feet of non-residential square footage. Additionally, all of the proposed Project's mobility improvements would be implemented.

Potentially Significant Impacts

As stated in Chapter 10.0 of the Final PEIR, this alternative has the potential to significantly impact:

1. Transportation and Circulation
 - Traffic Circulation
2. Noise
 - Transportation Noise – Vehicle Traffic Noise
 - Temporary Construction Noise
 - Groundborne Vibration – Construction
3. Air Quality
 - Conflicts with Air Quality Plans
4. Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources
 - Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites
 - Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains
 - Tribal Cultural Resources

5. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
 - Scenic Vistas or Views
 - Neighborhood Character

Finding and Supporting Facts

The number of units and population in the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to the Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative, and there would likely be similar traffic impacts to roadways and intersections within the Specific Plan area, with only one significantly impacted segment under the proposed project avoided under this alternative (Clairemont Drive, from I-5 NB ramps to Denver Street). Based on the proposed development intensities, it is unlikely that this alternative would reduce any additional significantly impacted roadways or intersections to a less than significant level.

Air quality impacts under the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to the anticipated impacts under the Specific Plan because, like the Specific Plan, the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would permit development that would result in greater emissions than anticipated under the adopted Community Plans. While this alternative would result in fewer dwelling units and would result in fewer vehicle trips than allowed under the Specific Plan, the Low-Density Use Plan Alternative would also result in greater density than what was anticipated in developing the RAQS and, as such, would conflict with implementation of the RAQS. Therefore, air quality impacts associated with consistency with the RAQS would be significant and unavoidable although to a lesser degree than under the proposed Project.

As with the Specific Plan, future development under the Low-Density Land Use Alternative also has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to historical resources. The extent of impacts to historical resources resulting from implementation of the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to those identified for the Specific Plan because the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same. Therefore, implementation of the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts related to historical resources at the program level that would be significant and unavoidable, despite adherence to the existing regulatory framework.

Regarding prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources, future development under the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to prehistoric resources and tribal cultural resources. The extent of impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources resulting from implementation of the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to those identified for the Specific Plan, because the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same. Therefore, implementation of the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts related to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources and tribal cultural resources at the program level that would be significant and unavoidable, despite adherence to the existing regulatory framework.

Noise impacts under the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would also be similar to the anticipated impacts under the Specific Plan because, like the Specific Plan, the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would permit ministerial development that would be subject to noise levels in excess of City standards due to existing transportation noise levels from I-5, resulting in

a significant impact. While the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would result in slightly less development potential, which in turn could lead to a reduction in overall construction noise in comparison to build-out of the Specific Plan, increased construction noise over the existing levels would occur as development occurs under either the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative or the Specific Plan. Similar to the proposed Project, at the program level it cannot be known whether the noise reduction measures would be adequate to reduce noise levels to below a level of significance. Thus, construction noise impacts would therefore be significant and unavoidable under the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative, the same as the proposed Project. Overall, the noise impacts of the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would be similar to the Specific Plan, and both would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to traffic noise exposure, temporary construction noise, and construction vibration.

Finally, the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would also still allow development in excess of 30 feet, up to 45 feet, which could result in a significant and unavoidable impact to public view corridors to Mission Bay and the Pacific Ocean, and neighborhood character. This impact would be reduced compared to the potential impact associated with development up to 100 and 65 feet within the Tecolote Village and the Morena Station Districts associated with the Specific Plan, but at a program level of analysis, the impact would still be considered significant and unavoidable.

The Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would result in similar or reduced impact levels for issue areas determined to be significant under the proposed Project, including transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, historical and tribal cultural resources, and visual effects and neighborhood character. This alternative would have cumulatively significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, historical and tribal cultural resources, and visual effects and neighborhood character.

Rationale and Conclusion

The Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative is rejected as infeasible because overall it would not substantially reduce the significant impacts associated with the Project and would not achieve the Project Objectives to the same extent as the Project. Although it would avoid one significant roadway segment impact, other significant impacts of the Project would be similar under the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative. While the Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative would meet the Project Objectives outlined in Section 3.2 of the Final PEIR, it would not achieve them to the same degree as the proposed Project because it would not allow high densities in proximity to the existing and planned transit stations within the Tecolote Village and the Morena Station districts due to the elimination of the TODEP, which would allow increased building heights to achieve the highest planned densities near transit. Furthermore, this alternative would also achieve the goals and objectives of the CAP to a lesser degree than the proposed Project. Specifically, it would not promote high residential density and employment opportunities consistent with the City of Villages Strategy and the Climate Action Plan, transit-oriented mixed-use development in transit priority areas, community villages and public gathering spaces, increase multi-modal connectivity and safety, or increased access and safety for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit at as great of a level as the proposed Project.

EXHIBIT B
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
(PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21081(b))
FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR)
FOR THE
MORENA CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN

PROJECT NUMBER 582608

SCH No. 2016101021

August 2019

This page intentionally left blank.

EXHIBIT B
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS
FOR THE MORENA CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN
(PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE §21081(b))

Pursuant to §21081(b) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines §§15903 and 15043, CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks, when determining whether to approve the Morena Corridor Specific Plan and associated discretionary actions (hereinafter referred to as the “Specific Plan” or the “Project”), as defined in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). This Statement of Overriding Considerations is specifically applicable to the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in Chapter 6 of the Final PEIR. As set forth in the Findings, the Project will result in unavoidable adverse impacts related to transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, historic and tribal cultural resources, and visual effects and neighborhood character.

The City Council of the City of San Diego, having:

- (i) Independently reviewed the information in the Final PEIR and the Record of Proceedings;
- (ii) Made a reasonable and good faith effort to eliminate or substantially lessen the significant impacts resulting from the Project to the extent feasible by adopting recommended mitigation measures identified in the Final PEIR; and
- (iii) Balanced the benefits of the Project against the significant environmental impacts, chooses to approve the Project, despite its significant environmental impacts, because, in its view, specific economic, legal, social, and other benefits of the Project render the significant environmental impacts acceptable.

The following statement identifies why, in the City Council's judgment, the benefits of the Project outweigh the unavoidable significant impacts. Each of these benefits serves as an independent basis for overriding all significant and unavoidable impacts. Any one of the reasons set forth below is sufficient to justify approval of the Project. Substantial evidence supports the various benefits and such evidence can be found in the preceding sections, which are incorporated by reference into this section, the Final PEIR, or in documents that comprise the Record of Proceedings in this matter.

1. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan further expresses the policies of the General Plan by establishing transit-oriented villages that capitalize on the Mid-Coast Blue Line Trolley extension.

Together with the General Plan, the Morena Corridor Specific Plan provides site-specific recommendations that implement City-wide goals and policies by allowing for transit-oriented development (TOD) and multi-modal improvements, and guide zoning in the Specific Plan area where land use changes are proposed. Additionally, San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (Regional Plan), prepared by the San Diego Regional Association of Governments (SANDAG), provides a blueprint for how the San Diego region will grow. It includes a Sustainable Communities Strategy, which includes a call to focus housing and job growth in urbanized areas where there is existing and planned transportation infrastructure, including transit. The Regional Plan also includes a Smart Growth Concept Map, which identifies the Morena Corridor Specific Plan area as a Smart Growth Opportunity Area where higher density, transit-oriented mixed-use development is encouraged.

Implementation of the land uses outlined in the Morena Corridor Specific Plan will create five planning districts, including mixed-use villages, which will further the City of Villages Strategy by allowing for greater density and intensity of use, with enhanced access to regional transit and the surrounding area. The Project will establish the Tecolote Village District near the future Tecolote Trolley Station, and the Morena Station District near the existing Morena/Linda Vista Station. To create these villages, the Project contains policies that promote mixed-use development and a balance of housing, shopping, and employment with access to walking, biking, or transit opportunities. The Specific Plan proposes to increase the capacity for new housing within the area by 5,630 units as compared to the adopted Linda Vista Community Plan. The range of densities within the Specific Plan area presents an opportunity to provide a range of housing opportunities, housing typologies, and affordability levels.

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan will also implement citywide mobility goals contained in the Mobility Element of the General Plan by featuring policies that promote the establishment of a Complete Streets network that would capitalize on access to transit; provide greater walkability and an improved pedestrian environment; and encourage traffic calming, bicycle facilities, and parking improvements. Specific mobility improvements are recommended along local roads within the Specific Plan area to establish new pedestrian, bicycle, and multi-use connections where none currently exist, with a particular focus on improving non-motorized connections to the to the trolley stations.

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan will implement the urban design concepts in the General Plan by including specific design guidelines and policies for the Project area that are consistent with the envisioned character, while providing the design framework to create new development and redevelopment featuring consistent neighborhood character. The Specific Plan also establishes direction for village design, community gateways and linkages, streetscapes and pedestrian orientation.

Consistent with the goals of the Economic Prosperity Element of the General Plan, the Morena Corridor Specific Plan will promote economic prosperity by retaining lands for industrial uses, enhancing commercial and office development opportunities in the vicinity of the freeway and transit, and creating more jobs and housing for the local and regional economy.

Consistent with the Recreation Element of the General Plan, the Project includes policies for future park and recreation facilities within the Specific Plan area that would provide flexibility in the placement of parks and increase the amount of park space in the community, with facilities including the proposed Tecolote Linear Park. The Specific Plan also identifies multi-modal connectivity enhancements that would improve access to Mission Bay Park.

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan builds on the General Plan Conservation Element by proposing policies which include implementing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements in a transit priority area (TPA) to increase walking and bicycling opportunities; supporting higher density/intensity housing and employment development within TPAs to increase transit ridership and decrease reliance on single-occupancy vehicles; and incorporating low impact development (LID) practices into building design and site plans to protect water quality. In addition, by encouraging higher development intensities within TPAs and in proximity to the current Morena/Linda Vista trolley station and future Tecolote and Clairemont Drive stations, the Morena Corridor Specific Plan will help implement the goals and objectives of the Climate Action Plan (CAP) and the Regional Plan by increasing employment and housing opportunities near transit, promoting transit, walking and bicycling.

2. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan supports the General Plan's City of Villages Strategy, Climate Action Plan, Housing Element, and the SANDAG Regional Plan's Sustainable Communities Strategy by encouraging additional housing options, increased density, and mixed uses near transit and employment centers. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan will increase a mix of housing units that are needed to address the region's housing shortage and directs the growth within TPAs consistent with the City's CAP.

By designating much of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan area for Community Village uses, the Project will provide capacity for higher density residential housing and mixed-use development. Currently, there are 969 multi-family dwellings and 27 single-family residential units within the Morena Corridor Specific Plan area. Buildout of the Project area could result in approximately 7,016 dwelling units, which is a 5,630-unit increase over the 1,386 units currently projected in the adopted Linda Vista Community Plan. Thus, the Project area's total housing stock ultimately would increase as compared to existing and currently planned levels. This increased growth would be directed within TPAs, advancing the City of Villages Strategy, the CAP, and the Regional Plan.

3. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan provides a policy framework that expands upon and further implements planning concepts expressed in the Linda Vista Community Plan with regard to land use, circulation, mobility and recreation.

Similar to the adopted Linda Vista Community Plan, the Morena Corridor Specific Plan encourages mixed-use development adjacent to transit stations, including the recognition that TOD should incorporate pedestrian-oriented design features and affordable housing. The creation of villages with a mix of land uses that are co-located and integrated with a network of pedestrian and bicycle friendly links to the existing and future trolley stations in the plan area will also promote the use of transit, consistent with the transportation goals expressed in the adopted Linda Vista Community Plan. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan supports the urban design goals of the Linda Vista Community Plan, such as safe pedestrian linkages between public spaces and residences; and the Specific Plan recommends the use of street trees, and other landscape and design elements that enhance the appearance of the community.

4. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan supports employment and economic growth opportunities.

Major employment uses in the Morena Corridor Specific Plan include industrial, commercial, and commercial office uses. The Project will allow industrially-designated lands to continue to provide employment and economic growth opportunities. The Project integrates residential with commercial and employment opportunities, including office, retail, commercial service, shopkeeper units, and flex-space, into new mixed-use villages, along transit corridors and near the existing Morena/Linda Vista trolley station and the future Tecolote and Clairemont Drive trolley stations to allow residents and employees of the community to utilize transit for their transportation needs. Future residential development will provide support for new commercial opportunities that will encourage employment and economic growth while providing additional commercial and retail services within walking and bicycling distance for community residents. With the expansion of the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) Trolley service within the Project area by 2021, employment opportunities in the Mission Valley and Downtown communities will be further connected to the Morena Corridor Specific Plan area, expanding non-vehicular access to jobs in the region.

5. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan promotes a Complete Streets strategy by providing a balanced street environment that addresses the needs of all users including public transit users, pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan mobility policies focus on creating a balanced, multi-modal transportation network that meets the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and transit users for safe and efficient travel, in a manner that is suitable to the community and consistent with the General Plan's multi-modal/complete streets policies. The Specific Plan identifies specific bicycle and pedestrian facility improvements that target locations where street improvements, transportation system management techniques, and traffic calming projects should be implemented and expanded to increase street capacity, reduce congestion and speeding, and improve neighborhood livability. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan envisions a more balanced mobility network that provides viable options aimed at shifting from vehicle trips to transit, walking, and bicycling, while still accommodating vehicle traffic and minimizing conflicts between the

various travel modes. Studies have shown that bringing origins and destinations closer together and improving walking and cycling conditions can reduce automobile trips and associated traffic congestion. Therefore, the land use plan and active transportation improvements proposed as part of the Project may stimulate this mode shift.

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan focuses growth and development on and adjacent to transit corridors. The Project includes multi-modal goals and policies that support high frequency transit services; transit-oriented villages that co-locate commercial, employment, and residential uses; and safe and integrated bicycle and pedestrian networks. It also identifies pedestrian and bicycle improvements to increase connectivity within the community to transit and to adjacent communities.

The Specific Plan identifies a pedestrian route network and includes policies addressing connectivity, amenities, and safety to encourage walking as a viable mode of transportation. The Project recommends the installation of non-contiguous sidewalks, marked crosswalks, pedestrian countdown timers at signalized intersections, and pedestrian-scale lighting and the removal of accessibility barriers to promote pedestrian safety and connectivity. The Project also encourages development to be pedestrian-oriented and include enhanced public realm spaces with plazas, paths, street trees and landscaping, and other pedestrian amenities to further promote walking as a mode of transportation.

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan supports the implementation of separated bicycle facilities, and new and enhanced bicycle connections and facilities. To enhance the safety, comfort, and accessibility for all levels of bicyclists, the Morena Corridor Specific Plan recommends bicycle parking, and bicycle facilities including buffered bicycle lanes, cycle tracks, and bicycle boulevards. Overall, the Specific Plan bicycle network adds connections and access that provide a more comprehensive and complete network for bicyclists.

The Specific Plan contains policies that support expanded and enhanced transit services within the community and to adjacent communities. It supports coordination with SANDAG and MTS to provide improved transit amenities such as unique shelter designs, lighting, shade trees, trash receptacles, bicycle-share station, wider sidewalks, and improved signage. In addition, the Specific Plan encourages coordination with SANDAG and Caltrans to consider a potential pedestrian/bicycle bridge over I-5 to expand on non-vehicular access from the community and transit stations to Mission Bay Park.

6. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan includes trip reduction strategies contained in the Climate Action Plan.

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan implements actions identified in the CAP, Strategy 3: Bicycling, Walking, Transit & Land Use, related to bicycling, walking, transit and land use strategies to increase multi-modal opportunities and reduce fuel consumption and vehicle miles traveled. These concepts are consistent with the General Plan and City of

Villages Strategy and include a focus on increased development capacity in TPAs. Strategy 3 in the CAP includes the following land use plan-related actions:

- Action 3.1: Implement the General Plan’s Mobility Element and the City of Villages Strategy in Transit Priority Areas to increase the use of transit;
- Action 3.2: Implement pedestrian improvements in Transit Priority Areas to increase commuter walking opportunities;
- Action 3.3: Implement the City of San Diego’s Bicycle Master Plan to increase commuter bicycling opportunities; and
- Action 3.6: Implement transit-oriented development within Transit Priority Areas.

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan furthers the CAP by: (1) applying and implementing land use designations, residential densities, and zoning to encourage TOD in a TPA; (2) providing policies and planned improvements to support transit operations and access; (3) designing a planned multi-modal mobility network that includes robust pedestrian and bicycle facilities that connect people to transit while implementing the Bicycle Master Plan and (4) including policies for the installation of roundabouts or traffic circles as needed to reduce fuel consumption within the Specific Plan area.

The Specific Plan will direct growth, development, and redevelopment into compact villages near transit with densities along commercial corridors ranging up to 54 dwelling units per acre with the ability to obtain densities up to 109 dwelling units per acre in the proposed Tecolote Village, and ranging up to 54 dwelling units per acre with the ability to obtain densities up to 73 dwelling units per acre in the proposed Morena Station District (consistent with Strategy 3, Action Items 3.1 and 3.6). The proposed mobility network reflects the intent of Strategy 3, Action Items 3.2 and 3.3 by complementing the transit-supportive density proposed in the village with planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities that provide improved access/connections to transit corridors and the San Diego Trolley service, improving connections between transit and recreational opportunities/amenities within a regional park (i.e., Mission Bay), supporting higher density/intensity housing and employment development to increase transit ridership; and increasing multi-modal opportunities and reduced reliance on single occupancy vehicles. The Morena Corridor Specific Plan also includes policies that encourage the installation of roundabouts or traffic circles where appropriate, which will facilitate Strategy 3, Action Item 3.5 of the CAP.

Additional strategies within the CAP also relate to efficiency in water and energy use, waste management, and climate resiliency. While these issues are primarily addressed through City-wide programs, the Specific Plan includes area-specific policies designed to promote sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions consistent with the General Plan and CAP. The Specific Plan policies promote sustainable building techniques that encourage the replacement of existing ornamental lawns with water-wise landscaping, the use of recycled water or graywater systems for landscape irrigation; and encourage composting for landscaping waste and compatible food waste and/or participating in commercial food waste recycling programs. The Morena Corridor

Specific Plan also includes policies related to urban forestry that relate to climate resiliency. For example, Project policies encourage the increase of the area's overall tree canopy within the public right-of-way and in developments to provide air quality benefits and urban runoff management, and the addition or replacement of street trees to fill existing gaps and provide continuous, regularly spaced tree canopies to enhance the pedestrian and bicycle environment and minimize solar heat gain.

I. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the City Council finds that the adverse, unavoidable environmental impacts are outweighed by the above-referenced benefits, any one of which individually would be sufficient to outweigh the adverse environmental effects of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan. Therefore, the City Council adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations.

EXHIBIT C

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (PEIR)

FOR THE

MORENA CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN

PROJECT NUMBER 582608

SCH # 2016101021

August 2019

This page intentionally left blank.

EXHIBIT C

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

MORENA CORRIDOR SPECIFIC PLAN
CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NO. 582608
SCH NO. 2016101021

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is designed to ensure compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 during implementation of mitigation measures. The MMRP for the Morena Corridor Specific Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) is under the jurisdiction of the City. This MMRP identifies at a minimum: the department responsible for the monitoring, what is to be monitored, how the monitoring shall be accomplished, the monitoring and reporting schedule, and completion requirements. A record of the MMRP will be maintained at the offices of the City of San Diego (City) Planning Department, which is currently located at 9485 Aero Drive, San Diego, CA 92123. All mitigation measures contained in the Final PEIR No. 582608/SCH No. 2016101021 shall be made conditions of approval of the project as may be further described below.

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION			
Freeway Segments			
I-5 NB and SB from Grand Avenue/Garnet Avenue to Old Town Avenue	TRANS 6.2-8: The SANDAG San Diego Forward 2050 Revenue Constrained Network includes operational improvements and the construction of managed lanes along this segment. These improvements are anticipated to be implemented by the year 2050.	Specific Plan buildout will occur over the planning horizon and traffic improvements (mitigation) will be prioritized and implemented based upon need and ability to secure full funding.	Caltrans/DSD
I-8 EB from Morena Boulevard and Hotel Circle	TRANS 6.2-9: The SANDAG San Diego Forward 2050 Revenue Constrained Network includes operational improvements along this segment. These improvements are anticipated to be implemented by the year 2050.	Specific Plan buildout will occur over the planning horizon and traffic improvements (mitigation) will be prioritized and implemented based upon need and ability to secure full funding.	Caltrans/DSD
Ramp Meters			
I-5 NB On-Ramp/Clairemont Drive	TRANS 6.2-10: The City of San Diego shall coordinate with Caltrans to address ramp capacity at impacted on-ramp locations. Improvements could include additional lanes, interchange reconfigurations, Transportation Demand	Specific Plan buildout will occur over the planning horizon and traffic improvements (mitigation)	Caltrans/DSD

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<p>Management (TDM), etc.; however, specific capacity improvements are still undetermined, as these are future improvements must be defined more over time. Furthermore, implementation of freeway improvements in a timely manner is beyond the full control of the City since Caltrans has approval authority over freeway improvements. Additionally, the proposed project includes a variety of transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities that may help to reduce single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel, which can help improve ramp capacity.</p>	<p>will be prioritized and implemented based upon need and ability to secure full funding.</p>	
<p>I-5 SB On-Ramp/Sea World Drive/Tecolote Road</p>	<p>TRANS 6.2-10, as described above.</p>	<p>Specific Plan buildout will occur over the planning horizon and traffic improvements (mitigation) will be prioritized and implemented based upon need and ability to secure full funding.</p>	<p>Caltrans/DSD</p>
NOISE			
<p>Construction activities related to implementation of the Specific Plan would potentially generate short term noise levels in excess of 75 dB(A) Leq at adjacent properties</p>	<p>NOISE 6.3-1: At the project-level, future development projects will be required to incorporate feasible mitigation measures. Typically, noise can be reduced to comply with City standards when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise-generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically one year) or less.</p>	<p>Mitigation will be implemented as future projects develop.</p>	<p>DSD</p>

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
<p>and could expose sensitive land uses to significant noise levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M. Construction is not allowed on legal holidays as specified in Section 21.04 of the San Diego Municipal Code, with exception of Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday, or on Sundays. (Consistent with Section 59.5.0404 of the San Diego Municipal Code). • Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. • Locate stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., compressors) as far as possible from adjacent residential receivers. • Acoustically shield stationary equipment located near residential receivers with temporary noise barriers. • Utilize "quiet" air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists. • The contractor shall prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with adjacent residential land uses so that construction activities can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance. • Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will 		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem.		
AIR QUALITY			
Operational emissions associated with build-out of the Specific Plan would be greater than the anticipated operational emissions associated with buildout of the adopted Community Plans and accounted for in the RAQS. Thus, the Specific Plan would conflict with implementation of the RAQS and would have a potentially significant impact on regional air quality.	AQ 6.4-1 Within six months of the certification of the Final Program Environmental Impact Report, the City shall provide a revised land use map for the Specific Plan area to SANDAG to ensure that any revisions to the population and employment projections used by the San Diego APCD in updating the RAQS and the SIP will accurately reflect anticipated growth due to the proposed Specific Plan.	Within six months of the certification of the Final PEIR.	City Planning Department
Operational emissions associated with build-out of the Specific Plan would be greater for all	AQ 6.4-2 For future individual discretionary development projects that would exceed daily operational emissions thresholds established by the City of San Diego, the City shall require the incorporation of appropriate mitigation to reduce	Mitigation will be implemented as future projects develop.	DSD

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
<p>pollutants when compared to the adopted land uses and the assumptions used to develop the RAQS; thus, overall build-out of the Specific Plan area would result in a potentially significant operational emissions impact.</p>	<p>such impacts. Examples of potential measures include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of electric vehicle charging stations; • Improvement of walkability design and pedestrian network; • Increasing transit accessibility and frequency by incorporating Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routes included in the SANDAG Regional Plan; • Limiting parking supply and unbundling parking costs; and • Lowering parking supply below Institute of Traffic Engineers rates and separating parking costs from property costs. 		
HISTORICAL AND TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES			
<p>Implementation of the Specific Plan could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning or where mobility</p>	<p>HIST 6.5-1: Historic Buildings, Structures, and Objects</p> <p>Prior to issuance of any permit for a development project implemented in accordance with the project that would directly or indirectly affect a building/structure in excess of 45 years of age, the City shall determine whether the affected building/structure is historically significant. The evaluation of historic architectural resources shall be based on criteria such as age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in the Historical Resources Guidelines.</p> <p>Preferred mitigation for historic buildings or structures shall be to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the</p>	<p>Mitigation will be implemented as future projects develop.</p>	<p>DSD</p>

<p>Potential Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure</p>	<p>Timeframe of Mitigation</p>	<p>Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility</p>
<p>improvements/road extensions could require demolition of structures.</p>	<p>resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm to the resource shall be taken. Depending upon project impacts, measures shall include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparing a historic resource management plan; • Adding new construction that is compatible in size, scale, materials, color, and workmanship to the historical resource (such additions, whether portions of existing buildings or additions to historic districts, shall be clearly distinguishable from historic fabric); • Repairing damage according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation; • Screening incompatible new construction from view through the use of berms, walls, and landscaping in keeping with the historic period and character of the resource; and • Shielding historic properties from noise generators through the use of sound walls, double glazing, and air conditioning. <p>Specific types of historical resource reports, outlined in Section III of the Historical Resources Guidelines, are required to document the methods to be used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources, to identify potential impacts from a project, and to evaluate the significance of any historical resources identified. If potentially significant impacts to an identified historical resource are identified, these reports will also recommend</p>		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance, where possible. If required, mitigation programs can also be included in the report.		
<p>Implementation of the Specific Plan could adversely impact prehistoric or historic archaeological resources, sacred sites and human remains during construction.</p>	<p>HIST 6.5-2: Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources</p> <p>Prior to issuance of any permit for a future development project implemented in accordance with the project that could directly affect an archaeological or tribal cultural resource, the City shall require that the following steps be taken to determine (1) the presence of archaeological or tribal cultural resources and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources which may be impacted by a development activity. Sites may include, but are not limited to, residential and commercial properties, privies, trash pits, building foundations, and industrial features representing the contributions of people from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Sites may also include resources associated with prehistoric Native American activities.</p> <p>Initial Determination</p> <p>The environmental analyst will determine the likelihood for the project site to contain historical resources by reviewing site photographs and existing historic information (e.g., Archaeological Sensitivity Maps, the Archaeological Map Book, and the City's "Historical Inventory of Important Architects, Structures, and People in San Diego") and may conduct a site visit, as needed. If there is any evidence that the site contains archaeological or tribal cultural resources, then an archaeological evaluation consistent with the City</p>	<p>Mitigation will be implemented as future projects develop.</p>	<p>DSD</p>

<p>Potential Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure</p>	<p>Timeframe of Mitigation</p>	<p>Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility</p>
	<p>Guidelines would be required. All individuals conducting any phase of the archaeological evaluation program must meet professional qualifications in accordance with the City Guidelines.</p> <p>Step 1</p> <p>Based on the results of the Initial Determination, if there is evidence that the site contains a historical resource, preparation of a historic evaluation is required. The evaluation report would generally include background research, field survey, archaeological testing, and analysis. Before actual field reconnaissance would occur, background research is required, which includes a records search at the SCIC at San Diego State University. Site records from the San Diego Museum of Man are now included in the data provided by the SCIC; however, in some instances, supplemental research at the Museum of Man may be required. A review of the Sacred Lands File maintained by the NAHC must also be conducted at this time. Information about existing archaeological collections should also be obtained from the San Diego Archaeological Center and any tribal repositories or museums.</p> <p>In addition to the records searches mentioned above, background information may include, but is not limited to, examining primary sources of historical information (e.g., deeds and wills), secondary sources (e.g., local histories and genealogies), Sanborn Fire Maps, and historic cartographic and aerial photograph sources; reviewing previous</p>		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<p>archaeological research in similar areas, models that predict site distribution, and archaeological, architectural, and historical site inventory files; and conducting informant interviews. The results of the background information would be included in the evaluation report.</p> <p>Once the background research is complete, a field reconnaissance must be conducted by individuals whose qualifications meet the standards outlined in the City Guidelines. Consultants are encouraged to employ innovative survey techniques when conducting enhanced reconnaissance, including, but not limited to, remote sensing, ground penetrating radar, and other soil resistivity techniques as determined on a case-by-case basis. Native American participation is required for field surveys when there is likelihood that the project site contains prehistoric archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties. If through background research and field surveys historical resources are identified, then an evaluation of significance, based on the City Guidelines, must be performed by a qualified archaeologist.</p> <p>Step 2</p> <p>Where a recorded archaeological site or Tribal Cultural Resource (as defined in the PRC) is identified, the City would be required to initiate consultation with identified California Indian tribes pursuant to the provisions in PRC Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2., in accordance with Assembly Bill 52. It should be noted that during the consultation process,</p>		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<p>tribal representative(s) will be directly involved in making recommendations regarding the significance of a tribal cultural resource that also could be a prehistoric archaeological site. A testing program may be recommended, which requires reevaluation of the project in consultation with the Native American representative, which could result in a combination of project redesign to avoid and/or preserve significant resources as well as mitigation in the form of data recovery and monitoring (as recommended by the qualified archaeologist and Native American representative). The archaeological testing program, if required, shall include evaluating the horizontal and vertical dimensions of a site, the chronological placement, site function, artifact/ecofact density and variability, presence/absence of subsurface features, and research potential. A thorough discussion of testing methodologies, including surface and subsurface investigations, can be found in the City Guidelines. Results of the consultation process will determine the nature and extent of any additional archaeological evaluation or changes to the proposed project.</p> <p>The results from the testing program shall be evaluated against the Significance Thresholds found in the Guidelines. If significant historical resources are identified within the Area of Potential Effects, the site may be eligible for local designation. However, this process would not proceed until such time that the tribal consultation has been concluded and an agreement is reached (or not reached) regarding significance of the resource and appropriate mitigation measures are identified. When appropriate, the final testing</p>		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<p>report must be submitted to Historical Resources Board staff for eligibility determination and possible designation. An agreement on the appropriate form of mitigation is required prior to distribution of a draft environmental document. If no significant resources are found, and site conditions are such that there is no potential for further discoveries, then no further action is required. Resources found to be non-significant as a result of a survey and/or assessment will require no further work beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation site forms and inclusion of results in the survey and/or assessment report. If no significant resources are found, but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicate there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring is required.</p> <p>Step 3</p> <p>Preferred mitigation for historical resources is to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm shall be taken. For archaeological resources where preservation is not an option, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program is required, which includes a Collections Management Plan for review and approval. When tribal cultural resources are present and cannot be avoided, appropriate and feasible mitigation will be determined through the tribal consultation process and incorporated into the overall data recovery program, where applicable, or</p>		

<p>Potential Significant Impact</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure</p>	<p>Timeframe of Mitigation</p>	<p>Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility</p>
	<p>project specific mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project. The data recovery program shall be based on a written research design and is subject to the provisions as outlined in CEQA Section 21083.2. The data recovery program must be reviewed and approved by the City's Environmental Analyst prior to distribution of a draft CEQA document and shall include the results of the tribal consultation process. Archaeological monitoring may be required during building demolition and/or construction grading when significant resources are known or suspected to be present on a site, but cannot be recovered prior to grading due to obstructions such as, but not limited to, existing development or dense vegetation.</p> <p>A Native American observer must be retained for all subsurface investigations, including geotechnical testing and other ground-disturbing activities, whenever a Native American tribal cultural resource or any archaeological site located on City property or within the Area of Potential Effects of a City project would be impacted. In the event that human remains are encountered during data recovery and/or a monitoring program, the provisions of PRC Section 5097 must be followed. In the event that human remains are discovered during project grading, work shall halt in that area and the procedures set forth in the California PRC (Section 50987.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5), and in the federal, state, and local regulations described above shall be undertaken. These provisions will be outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in a subsequent project specific environmental document.</p>		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<p>The Native American monitor shall be consulted during the reparation of the written report, at which time they may express concerns about the treatment of sensitive resources. If the Native American community requests participation of an observer for subsurface investigations on private property, the request shall be honored.</p> <p>Step 4</p> <p>Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared by qualified professionals as determined by the criteria set forth in Appendix B of the Guidelines. The discipline shall be tailored to the resource under evaluation. In cases involving complex resources, such as traditional cultural properties, rural landscape districts, sites involving a combination of prehistoric and historic archaeology, or historic districts, a team of experts will be necessary for a complete evaluation.</p> <p>Specific types of historical resource reports are required to document the methods (see Section III of the Guidelines) used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources; to identify the potential impacts from proposed development and evaluate the significance of any identified historical resources; to document the appropriate curation of archaeological collections (e.g., collected materials and the associated records); in the case of potentially significant impacts to historical resources, to recommend appropriate mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts to below</p>		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<p>a level of significance; and to document the results of mitigation and monitoring programs, if required.</p> <p>Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared in conformance with the California Office of Historic Preservation "Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format" (see Appendix C of the Guidelines), which will be used by environmental staff in the review of archaeological resource reports. Consultants must ensure that archaeological resource reports are prepared consistent with this checklist. This requirement will standardize the content and format of all archaeological technical reports submitted to the City. A confidential appendix must be submitted (under separate cover) along with historical resources reports for archaeological sites and tribal cultural resources containing the confidential resource maps and records search information gathered during the background study. In addition, a collections management plan shall be prepared for projects that result in a substantial collection of artifacts and must address the management and research goals of the project and the types of materials to be collected and curated based on a sampling strategy that is acceptable to the City. Appendix D (Historical Resources Report Form) may be used when no archaeological resources were identified within the project boundaries.</p> <p>Step 5</p>		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	<p>For Archaeological Resources: All cultural materials, including original maps, field notes, non-burial related artifacts, catalog information, and final reports recovered during public and/or private development projects must be permanently curated with an appropriate institution, one that has the proper facilities and staffing for ensuring research access to the collections consistent with state and federal standards, unless otherwise determined during the tribal consultation process. In the event that a prehistoric and/or historic deposit is encountered during construction monitoring, a collections management plan would be required in accordance with the project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The disposition of human remains and burial-related artifacts that cannot be avoided or are inadvertently discovered is governed by state (i.e., Assembly Bill 2641 [Coto] and California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001 [Health and Safety Code 8010-8011]) and federal (i.e., Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [U.S. Code 3001-3013]) law, and must be treated in a dignified and culturally appropriate manner with respect for the deceased individual(s) and their descendants. Any human bones and associated grave goods of Native American origin shall be turned over to the appropriate Native American group for repatriation.</p> <p>Arrangements for long-term curation of all recovered artifacts must be established between the applicant/property owner and the consultant prior to the initiation of the field reconnaissance. When tribal cultural resources are present, or nonburial related artifacts associated with tribal cultural</p>		

Potential Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Timeframe of Mitigation	Monitoring, Enforcement, and Reporting Responsibility
	resources are suspected to be recovered, the treatment and disposition of such resources will be determined during the tribal consultation process. This information must then be included in the archaeological survey, testing, and/or data recovery report submitted to the City for review and approval. Curation must be accomplished in accordance with the California State Historic Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collection (dated May 7, 1993) and, if federal funding is involved, Title 36 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 79. Additional information regarding curation is provided in Section II of the Guidelines.		
Implementation of the Specific Plan could adversely impact tribal cultural resources.	HIST 6.5-2 , as described above.	Mitigation will be implemented as future projects develop.	DSD

Passed by the Council of The City of San Diego on AUG 01 2019, by the following vote:

Councilmembers	Yeas	Nays	Not Present	Recused
Barbara Bry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Jennifer Campbell	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chris Ward	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Monica Montgomery	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Mark Kersey	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Chris Cate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scott Sherman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vivian Moreno	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Georgette Gómez	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Date of final passage AUG 07 2019.

(Please note: When a resolution is approved by the Mayor, the date of final passage is the date the approved resolution was returned to the Office of the City Clerk.)

AUTHENTICATED BY:



KEVIN L. FAULCONER
Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.

ELIZABETH S. MALAND
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

By Ginda Brwin, Deputy

Office of the City Clerk, San Diego, California

Resolution Number R- 312607