



**Environmental Initial Study/  
Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration**

**Boulevard Drive Storm Drain Improvements Project  
City of La Mesa, County of San Diego, California**

July 1, 2020

This page intentionally left blank

**CITY OF LA MESA  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION**

Project Title: Boulevard Drive Storm Drain Improvements

Lead Agency Name and Address: City of La Mesa Community Development Department  
8130 Allison Avenue La Mesa, CA 91942

Contact Person and Phone Number: Hamed Hashemian  
Engineering Project Manager  
619-667-1153

Project Location: 200 linear feet of Boulevard Drive between 70<sup>th</sup> Street and the Ray and Joan Kroc Center parking lot in the Cities of La Mesa and San Diego

La Mesa General Plan Land Use Designation: Mixed-Use Urban Land Use Designation in the City of La Mesa and within the Multiple Use Designation in the City of San Diego

Applicant Names and Addresses: City of La Mesa Community Department  
8130 Allison Avenue La Mesa, CA 91942

Zoning: Commercial (C), Residential Business (RB), and Multiple Unit Residential (R3) in the City of La Mesa and Commercial Community (CC) in the City of San Diego

Assessor's Parcel Numbers: Not applicable for Boulevard Drive  
4741301600 (Ray and Joan Kroc Center, City of San Diego)

**Project Description:**

The Boulevard Drive Storm Drain Improvements project (Project) involves the construction of an approximately 200-foot-long storm drain box culvert within Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Ray and Joan Kroc Center parking lot. The new storm drain facility would extend from an existing box culvert within Boulevard Drive and connect to an existing downstream box culvert within an easement in the Kroc Center parking lot. The new storm drain would divert high flows that exceed the capacity of the existing off-site channel adjacent to the south through the proposed box culvert.

The storm drain facility would consist of either a single 14-foot by 4-foot, double 8-foot by 4-foot, or similar, box culvert of adequate size to mitigate roadway and associated flooding, beneath the roadways and parking lot. It would be constructed via open trench construction within the roadway (see Figure 3, *Project Site Plan*). Existing utilities would be relocated by the utility

owners in order to accommodate the new storm drain infrastructure. Following construction, Boulevard Drive and the disturbed portions of the Kroc Center parking lot would be repaved.

Project construction would be completed in approximately one year, including utility relocations prior to excavation. Construction phases would consist of utility relocations, excavation of the trench, and concrete pouring work. Approximately 1,000 cubic yards of excavation material is required to dig the trench, which would be approximately 15 feet wide by 10 feet deep.

An initial study in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines has been prepared to determine whether the project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. It has been determined that the project does not have the potential to create a significant adverse effect on the environment based upon project conditions that mitigate impacts to below a level of significance. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has therefore been prepared and can be adopted for this project.

**Community Development Department Determination:**

On the basis of the initial environmental study prepared for the proposal, it has been determined that the project would not have an adverse impact on the environment.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Community Development Department, City of La Mesa

06-17-2020  
Date

## Table of Contents

Determination .....	4
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts .....	5
Environmental Checklist.....	7
1    Aesthetics.....	7
2    Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	8
3    Air Quality.....	10
4    Biological Resources .....	14
5    Cultural Resources .....	16
6    Energy.....	18
7    Geology and Soils .....	19
8    Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	22
9    Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	23
10   Hydrology and Water Quality .....	26
11   Land Use and Planning.....	29
12   Mineral Resources .....	30
13   Noise.....	30
14   Population and Housing .....	32
15   Public Services .....	33
16   Recreation .....	34
17   Transportation.....	35
18   Tribal Cultural Resources.....	37
19   Utilities and Service Systems .....	38
20   Wildfire.....	39
21   Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	40
References .....	42

**List of Appendices**

- Appendix A Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling Calculations
- Appendix B Cultural Resources Study Letter Report

**List of Figures**

1	Regional Location.....	2
2	Project Site Location.....	2
3	Project Site Plan.....	2

**List of Tables**

1	Maximum Daily Construction Emission.....	12
---	--	----

1. Project Title

Boulevard Drive Storm Drain Improvements Project (Project)

2. Lead Agency Name and Address

City of La Mesa  
8130 Allison Ave  
La Mesa, CA 91942

3. Contact Person and Phone Number

Hamed Hashemian  
Engineering Project Manager  
619-667-1153

4. Project Location

The 200 feet of linear improvements extend through both the City of La Mesa and the City of San Diego, with the eastern portion of the site within the City of La Mesa (east of 69<sup>th</sup> Street) and the western end (west of 69<sup>th</sup> Street) within the City of San Diego (see Figure 1, *Project Location*). Specifically, the Project is located within the right-of-way of Boulevard Drive, from approximately 130 feet west of Lois Street, across 69<sup>th</sup> Street to the eastern 69<sup>th</sup> Street entrance of the Salvation Army Ray and Joan Kroc Center (Kroc Center) and within a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot (see Figure 2, *Project Site Location*).

5. Existing Setting

Boulevard Drive is a designated local street that extends for approximately one-third of a mile parallel to University Avenue (an arterial) in the southwestern portion of the City of La Mesa. As the linear Project site approaches and crosses 69<sup>th</sup> Street and the Kroc Center parking lot, the Project extends into the geographic boundaries of the City of San Diego.

The surrounding land uses along Boulevard Drive are predominately commercial and residential. To the north, are a veterinary hospital, the offices for a junk hauling/removal services company, and a Wienerschnitzel fast food restaurant, all of which front University Avenue but can also be accessed from Boulevard Drive. To the south is a multi-unit residential complex, and privately owned and fenced undeveloped parcels that support a seasonal channel and vegetation. To the east is the continuation of Boulevard Drive that is lined with commercial land uses on the north side and residential land uses on the south side. To the west is the terminus of Boulevard Drive at 69<sup>th</sup> Street and the eastern entrance to the Kroc Center, a community center that houses a day care/pre-school, family-support services, and recreational and cultural art facilities.

6. General Plan Designation/Zoning

The Project site has a General Plan designation of Mixed-Use Urban Land Use Designation in the City of La Mesa and within the Multiple Use Designation in the City of San Diego and a zoning designation of Commercial (C), Residential Business (RB), and Multiple Unit Residential (R3) in La Mesa and Commercial Community (CC) in the City of San Diego.

## 7. Description of Project

The Project involves the construction of an approximately 200-foot-long storm drain box culvert within Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. The new storm drain facility would extend from an existing box culvert within Boulevard Drive and connect to an existing downstream box culvert within the Kroc Center parking lot. The new storm drain would divert high flows that exceed the capacity of the existing off-site channel adjacent to the south through the proposed box culvert.

The storm drain facility would consist of either a single 14-foot by 4-foot, double 8-foot by 4-foot, or similar box culvert of adequate size to mitigate roadway and associated flooding beneath the roadways and parking lot. It would be constructed via open trench construction within the roadway (see Figure 3, *Project Site Plan*). Existing utilities would be relocated by the utility owners in order to accommodate the new storm drain infrastructure. Following construction, Boulevard Drive and the disturbed portions of the Kroc Center parking lot would be repaved.

Project construction would be completed in approximately one year, including utility relocations prior to excavation. Construction phases would consist of utility relocations, excavation of the trench, and concrete pouring work. Approximately 1,000 cubic yards of excavation material is required to dig the trench, which would be approximately 15 feet wide by 10 feet deep.

## 8. Required Approvals

The Project would require the approval of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control board (RWQCB), for a potential de-watering permit, and National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit coverage. The City would also be required to approve this IS/MND and associated Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), and issue a traffic encroachment permit. Additionally, coordination and permitting from the City of San Diego would be required, including potentially a batch discharge permit for discharging to the sewer system during de-watering. Coordination with utility providers for relocations of existing utilities, with and private property owners would also be required.



This project would potentially affect the environmental factors checked, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or is "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

## Determination

Based on this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

*Allyson Kinnard*

Signature

*06.18.2020*

Date

*Allyson Kinnard*

Printed Name

*Senior Planner*

Title

## Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

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

8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

## Environmental Checklist

### 1 Aesthetics

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
- a. The Land Use and Urban Design Element of the La Mesa General Plan identifies specific vistas that contribute to the City's community image. Vistas are described in the La Mesa General Plan as views with a narrow angle characterized by long vertically defined spaces that open to allow sight of a few select elements. The General Plan designates four vistas with the City: the view of Lake Murray from Baltimore Drive; the view from Fletcher Parkway near Baltimore Drive; and two views along La Mesa Boulevard in the downtown village. None of these designated vistas are within or adjacent to the Project site, and the closest designated vista is approximately 1.5 miles to the east.

The City of San Diego General Plan identifies scenic vistas as views from recreation areas and open space and includes views of mountains, bays, rivers, and the ocean. Additionally, the San Diego General Plan contains a series of community plans. The western portion of the Project site is within the College Area Community Plan; there are no scenic vistas identified in the College Area planning boundaries. Thus, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

- b. No designated scenic resources or scenic highways are present within the Project site or adjacent areas. The Project would include excavation within existing roadway rights-of-way and part of a parking lot that would be fully repaved upon Project completion. The 200-foot of linear disturbance is surrounded by commercial land uses to the north and multi-family and an open lot to the south. The western terminus of the storm drain improvements is within the parking lot of the Kroc Center. There are no historic buildings within the development footprint of the improvements or immediately adjacent areas. The nearest designated scenic highway is a two-mile portion of State Route (SR) 125 as it transitions from SR-94 to I-8, approximately three miles north of the Project site. No trees or rock outcrops would be disturbed as all improvements would occur in the existing alignment of

Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and the Kroc Center parking lot. Thus, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

- c. The protection of scenic resources is guided by the La Mesa General Plan and the San Diego General Plan both of which contain goals, objectives, and policies that relate to visual resources as they pertain to development. Additionally, the La Mesa Urban Design Program applies design principles during a review process that are intended to ensure that new development fits into the fabric of the community. The Project involves the excavation and repaving of 200 linear feet within existing roadway rights-of-way and a portion of a parking lot. Once complete, visually, the Project site would be similar to existing conditions. There are no designated scenic visual resources within the Project area, as discussed in items 1.a-b and the Project does not contain, nor would it impact any scenic vistas or resources. Therefore, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.
- d. The Project includes improvements to the existing storm drain that would be located within the right-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. The Project would be located underground, although during construction there would be above ground disturbance. Once excavation is complete and the improvements are installed, the roadways and parking lot would be repaved. Visible elements of the Project are limited to manholes, which would be low to the ground and do not include reflective materials. The Project would not include any elements that would create a new source of substantial light or glare and would have no impact in relation to this issue.

## 2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non- agricultural use?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for or cause rezoning of forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526); or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
- a. A review of the California Department of Conservation (DOC) online California Important Farmland Finder Map query program designates the Project site and surrounding area as Urban Built-Up Land. The Urban Built Up Land designation applies to land that the DOC has identified as being used for a variety of urban uses and contains man-made structures or buildings under construction and the infrastructure required for development that are specifically designed to serve that land. No agricultural resources or operations are located within the vicinity of the Project area. Therefore, the Project would not convert farmland to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- b. The Williamson Act, also known as the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. The Williamson Act is only applicable to parcels within an established agricultural preserve consisting of at least 20 acres of Prime Farmland, or at least 40 acres of land not designated as Prime Farmland. The Williamson Act is designed to prevent the premature and unnecessary conversion of open space lands and agricultural areas to urban uses. As stated in item 2.a, the Project site is located in an area classified by the DOC as Urban and Built-Up Land where neither farmland nor agricultural resources are present. The Project site is not zoned for agricultural use. Additionally, it is not within an established agricultural preserve consisting of at least 20 acres of Prime Farmland or at least 40 acres of land not designated as Prime Farmland. Further, the City of La Mesa General Plan Land Use Map classifies the land Mixed-Use Urban Land and the City of San Diego designates the land within the Project site as Multiple Use Designation. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract. No impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- c. Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) defines “forest land” as land that can support 10 percent native cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. Based on this definition, no forest land occurs within or adjacent to the Project site. Moreover, there is no land zoned as forest land or timberland that exists within the Project site or within its vicinity. There are trees associated with ornamental landscaping scattered throughout the greater Project area; however, there are no concentration of trees that would constitute a forest. The Project’s area of disturbance would occur within the rights-of-way of existing roadways and a parking lot. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or timberland, and no impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- d. As stated in item 2.c above, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use because no forest land exists along the

proposed alignment or the surrounding area. Therefore, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.

- e. As stated in items 2.a and 2.c above, implementation of the Project would not result in the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural use or forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.

### 3 Air Quality

Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--------------

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

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

- a. In San Diego County, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) is the agency responsible for protecting the public health and welfare through the administration of federal and state air quality laws and policies. Included in the SDAPCD's tasks are the monitoring of air pollution, the preparation and implementation of the San Diego County portion of the State Implementation Plan (SIP), and the promulgation of Rules and Regulations. The SIP includes strategies and tactics to be used to attain and maintain acceptable air quality in the County; this list of strategies is called the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and is the applicable air quality plan for the Project area. The SDAPCD Rules and Regulations include procedures and requirements to control the emission of pollutants and prevent significant adverse impacts. Consistency with the RAQS is determined by two standards. The first standard is whether a project would exceed assumptions contained in the RAQS. The second standard is whether a project would increase the frequency or severity of violations of existing air quality standards, contribute to new violations, or delay the timely attainment of air quality standards or interim reductions as specified in the RAQS.

The RAQS relies on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in the County. This information is used to project future emissions and then determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. The CARB mobile source emissions projections and the SANDAG growth projections are based on population and vehicle use trends and land use plans developed by the cities and the County as part of the development of the County's and cities' general plans. As such, projects that propose development consistent with the



growth anticipated by a general plan would be consistent with the RAQS. In addition, the RAQS assumes specific emissions from the operation of certain land uses, including residential, retail, office, institutional, and industrial uses. The Project is an improvement to an existing storm drain and does not directly or indirectly induce growth.

Therefore, because the Project would not affect population growth, the Project would not exceed the assumptions contained in the RAQS. Additionally, the Project does not include any stationary operational sources of air pollutants. Therefore, it would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the RAQS. No impact would occur in relation to this issue.

- b. The Project would generate criteria pollutants in the short-term during construction. The Project's criteria pollutant emissions were calculated using Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District's (SMAQMD's) Roadway Construction Emissions Model version 9.0. The Roadway Construction Emissions Model is an emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform for government agencies, land use planners, and environmental professionals to quantify potential criteria pollutant emissions associated with new road construction, road widening, bridge/overpass construction, and other linear non-roadway projects. To determine whether a project would result in emissions that would violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, a project's emissions are evaluated based on the quantitative emission thresholds established by the SDAPCD.

### Construction Emissions

Construction of the Project would result in temporary increases in air pollutant emissions. These emissions would be generated in the form of fugitive dust emissions (particulate matter [PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>]) and ozone precursor emissions (nitrogen oxides [NO<sub>x</sub>] and reactive organic gas [ROG]). Construction is expected last approximately 12 months.

Construction emissions calculated using the Roadway Construction Emissions Model version 9.0 are included as Appendix A to this IS/MND. The analysis assessed emissions from individual construction activities, including grubbing/land clearing, grading/excavation, drainage/utilities/sub-grade, and paving. The results of the calculations for Project construction are shown in Table 1, *Maximum Daily Construction Emissions*.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The model conservatively includes clearing and grubbing in the assumptions, which for this project refers to the removal of debris within the existing right-of-way.

Construction Phases	Maximum Daily Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	SO <sub>x</sub>	PM <sub>10</sub>	PM <sub>2.5</sub>
Grubbing/Land Clearing <sup>1</sup>	1.3	14.0	10.2	<0.1	1.3	0.7
Grading/Excavation	9.4	106.2	70.2	0.2	5.0	4.1
Drainage/Utilities/Sub-Grade	6.4	69.7	50.6	0.1	3.6	2.8
Paving	1.3	13.1	13.4	<0.1	0.7	0.6
<b>Maximum Daily Emissions</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>190.0</b>	<b>131.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>7.5</b>
<i>Threshold</i>	75	250	550	250	100	55
<b>Significant Impact?</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>

Source: Roadway Construction Emissions Model 9.0 (output data is provided in Appendix A)

<sup>1</sup> The model conservatively includes clearing and grubbing in the assumptions, which for this project refers to the removal of debris within the existing right-of-way.

Note: PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> emission calculations assume 50% control of fugitive dust from water and associated dust control measures if a minimum of water trucks are specified.

ROG = reactive organic gas; NO<sub>x</sub> = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; SO<sub>x</sub> = sulfur oxides;

PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; PM<sub>2.5</sub> = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter

As shown in Table 1, emissions of criteria pollutants related to Project construction would be below the significance thresholds. Therefore, impacts associated with construction emissions would be less than significant in relation to this issue.

### Operational Emissions

Operation of the Project would not result in the generation of criteria pollutant emissions. The Project involves the construction of an approximately 200-foot-long storm drain box culvert below the rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. Following the completion of construction, the site would return to existing conditions. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with operational emissions in relation to this issue.

- c. Sensitive populations (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the general population. Land uses that are considered sensitive receptors typically include residences, schools, playgrounds, childcare centers, hospitals, convalescent homes, and retirement homes. The closest existing sensitive receptors to the Project site are the multi-family residences located adjacent to the south side of Boulevard Drive approximately 25 feet from the roadway right-of-way. An analysis of the Project's potential to expose sensitive receptors to pollutants during construction and operation is provided below.

### Construction Emissions

Diesel particulate matter (DPM) is the primary toxic air contaminant (TAC) that would be emitted during construction and would be generated from the use of diesel equipment required for site grading, excavation, and other construction activities. Health-related risks associated with diesel-exhaust emissions are primarily linked to long-term exposure and the associated risk of contracting cancer.<sup>2</sup> The amount to which the receptors could be exposed, which is a function of concentration and duration of exposure, is the primary factor used to determine health risk. The

<sup>2</sup> The model conservatively assumes site grading, which for this Project, includes re-compaction of the soils to fill the trench and create an even roadway.

generation of TAC emissions during construction would be variable and sporadic due to the nature of construction activity. The entire Project construction period is anticipated to last 12 months. Excavation for the approximately 200-foot-long storm drain box culvert would occur within the right-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. As noted, there are existing multi-family residences within 25 feet of Boulevard Drive. The multi-family residences are adjacent to approximately 90 feet of the entire 200-foot alignment. Due to the short duration and intermittent nature of construction activities, and due to the highly dispersive properties of DPM, project-related TAC emission impacts during construction would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be less than significant in relation to this issue.

### Operational Emissions

As stated above, the Project involves the construction of an approximately 200-foot-long storm drain box culvert within the rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. Following the completion of construction, the site would return to existing conditions and the new storm drain facilities would not generate TAC emissions. Therefore, operation of the Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. There would be no impacts in relation to this issue.

- d. Minor amounts of odor compounds associated with diesel heavy equipment exhaust and volatile organic compounds (VOCs) would be emitted during construction of the Project. The odors of these emissions may be considered objectionable; however, as addressed above in item 3.b, construction emissions would be minor and temporary (based on a comparison of maximum daily emissions during construction and the SDAPCD thresholds). Additionally, construction equipment associated with the Project would be operating at various locations throughout the Project site and improvements would not take place all at once. Odorous hydrocarbons emissions would dissipate beyond the emissions sources and would only be perceptible by receptors in the immediate vicinity of the construction site. Construction-related activities would also be temporary in nature and would cease at the completion of construction. Therefore, construction activities would not result in nuisance odors that would adversely affect a substantial number of people. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

As stated above, the Project involves the construction of an approximately 200-foot-long storm drain box culvert below the rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. Following the completion of construction, the site would return to existing conditions and the new storm drain facilities would not generate odorous emissions. Therefore, the Project would not result in nuisance odors during operation and would have no impact in relation to this issue.

#### 4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. The Project site encompasses approximately 200 linear feet within existing roadway rights-of way and parking lot in an urban and developed area. The Project site is fully paved and does not support habitat for candidate, sensitive, or special status species. Excavation, installation, and repaving activities would occur entirely within the existing alignment of Boulevard Drive, 69 <sup>th</sup> Street, and the Kroc Center parking lot. Materials would be staged, and construction materials stored within the right-of-way of Boulevard Drive and a paved City of La Mesa -owned lot at the intersection of Waite Drive and Murray Hill Road. Therefore, no direct or indirect impact would occur in relation to this issue.				
b. The Project site is fully paved within a developed area and does contain sensitive vegetation. As noted, there is a channel south of the Project site that supports some riparian vegetation; the Project site is completely within the right-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69 <sup>th</sup> Street, and the Kroc Center parking lot and would not disturb any portion of the channel or the riparian vegetation. Stormwater in the Project area is conveyed through existing storm drain infrastructure and the channel that is located south of the Project site. When the capacity of both the existing storm drain and the channel are exceeded, ponding and flooding occurs along Boulevard Drive, 69 <sup>th</sup> Street, and the Kroc Center parking lot. Once				

the intensity of flows lessens, stormwater is contained within the channel outlet located in 69<sup>th</sup> Street. With implementation of the Project, the new box culvert would increase capacity so that stormwater can flow unimpeded and ponding and flooding would be less frequent. The proposed diversion structure would assure that flows would continue to be carried through the channel and provide water to the vegetation and wildlife on the property (see Figure 3). As such there would be no impact to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities. No impact would occur in relation to this issue.

- c. The Project site does not include any wetlands; the off-site channel on the two private lots south of the Project site would not be disturbed by Project-related activities. All disturbance activities (e.g., excavation, installation, repaving) would occur within the current paved alignment of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and the Kroc Center parking lot. Thus, there would be no direct impacts to any protected wetland. With the installation of the storm drain improvements, the current overflow from storm events would be diverted into the box culvert, alleviating ponding and flooding conditions in the Project area. This is not a diversion from the channel, as under current high-flow storm event conditions, the channel cannot accommodate additional flows. As noted in item 4.b above, the proposed diversion structure would allow significant flows to continue to be directed towards the channel. The channel on the private property south of the Project site is a limited feature as it does not continue off the property or connect with any other creek, stream, channel, or water features. Moreover, while there was no jurisdictional delineation to determine the extent or lack of wetlands on the adjacent parcels, the Project is designed such that flows, similar to existing conditions, would continue to serve the existing channel. Thus, the Project would not indirectly impact potential wetlands and no impacts would occur in relation to this issue.
- d. Wildlife corridors usually consist of natural habitat areas that connect wildlife populations. The Project site is located in a highly developed area that lacks any of the features of a wildlife corridor and includes many hinderances, such as an established roadway network that preclude the area from being a corridor or migratory route. The off-site adjacent seasonal channel is present southeast of 69<sup>th</sup> Street and Boulevard Drive, but this feature is fragmented and separated from any other natural setting by the surrounding urban development. Further, no Project-related activities would occur within the channel or the properties supporting the channel. All disturbance would occur within the existing Boulevard Drive and 69<sup>th</sup> Street rights-of way and the Kroc Center parking lot. Construction staging and the storing of equipment would occur within the right-of-way of Boulevard Drive and/or at a City owned lot at the intersection of Waite Drive and Murray Hill Road. Therefore, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- e. There are no La Mesa or San Diego local policies or ordinances, including tree preservation ordinances that are applicable to the Project. All Project-related activities would occur within the existing alignments and rights-of-way for Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and the Kroc Center parking lot. Staging of materials and construction equipment would occur within the rights-of way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and at a City lot at the intersection of Waite Drive and Murray Hill Road. No trees are in the area of disturbance or any of the temporary construction staging areas. Thus, the proposed project would not conflict with any ordinance regarding tree preservation. As discussed in items 4.a-d, the Project would not impact biological resources. No impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- f. The Cities of La Mesa and San Diego are participating agencies in the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Plan (MSCP), The MSCP was developed to preserve a network of habitat and open space, protecting bio-diversity and enhancing the region's quality of life.

The MSCP covers 85 species and the core biological resource areas are identified within the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Areas. The Project site is not within a preserve or core biological area of the MSCP or contains species protected by a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.

## 5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. The Project site includes approximately 200 linear feet of disturbance within the existing rights-of-way of paved roadways and parking lot. Extending beyond the 200 feet, parts of the paved roadway would be used for the staging.				

HELIX conducted a cultural resources analysis for the Project that included a review of historic aerial photographs and maps, a records search, a Sacred Land file (SLF) search (discussed in Section 18, Tribal Cultural Resources of this IS/MND), and a site reconnaissance. The findings of the study are summarized herein and the study in its entirety is included as Appendix B, Cultural Resources Study Letter Report, of this IS/MND.

### Historic Aerial Photograph Review

A review of aerial photography indicates that by 1964, Boulevard Drive appears paved and commercial buildings are located on the north side of Boulevard Drive with additional buildings under construction. In addition, numerous buildings have been constructed to the north and east of the Project area. By 1968, several businesses are located on the north side of University Avenue. Additionally, a neighborhood has started to form north of University Avenue as well. The 1971 historic aerial indicates all open space in the area of the Project has been developed. A grocery store occupied the current site of the Kroc Center from approximately 1980 and 1989; by 2004 the grocery store had been replaced by the current Kroc Center building and parking lot.

### Record Search

In February 2020 HELIX conducted a record search at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC), located at San Diego State University. The search encompassed a one-mile radius from the Project center point and included a review of site documentation, maps, and cultural resources reports on file at SCIC. As part of the records search, HELIX reviewed the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and

the list of California Historic Landmarks. In all, there were 31 cultural resources studies conducted within the search radius. One study included the Project site; however, no field work was included as part of that study. A second study directly adjacent to the Project site did not include field work. No cultural resources were recorded in either study. Of the remaining 29 studies, 12 resources (not within the Project site) were recorded, all of which were historic buildings.

### Site Reconnaissance

A field site visit of the Project site was performed on February 25, 2020. The survey was conducted by walking the Project area and visually inspecting areas of visible ground. The whole property was highly disturbed. No cultural material, including historical resources, was observed during the site visit. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

Due to the highly disturbed nature of the Project site and the absence of recorded cultural sites within the Project area, the possibility for subsurface resources is unlikely. However, there is still a possibility for buried, unknown cultural resources to occur. Impacts to subsurface resources from implementation of the Project could result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure CR-1 below reduces cultural resources impacts to less than significant.

### **Mitigation Measure CR-1**

Prior to the issuance of encroachment permits the Project applicant shall prepare a cultural resources monitoring program that shall be reviewed and approved by the City of La Mesa Planning Department. The program shall include the retention of a qualified archaeologist and a Native American (NA) monitor. The archaeological and NA monitors shall attend a preconstruction meeting with the construction manager and be in attendance during initial ground disturbing activities at the Project site. The monitors shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing activities.

The archaeological and NA monitors shall have the authority to temporarily halt or redirect grading and other ground-disturbing activity if cultural resources are encountered. If significant cultural material is encountered, the monitors shall coordinate with City staff to develop and implement appropriate mitigation measures.

If the monitors determine that their presence is not warranted fulltime, their schedule shall be adjusted accordingly. If the excavations undertaken for the culvert are determined to be within modern fill or other soils with little potential to contain cultural material, monitoring may be reduced or ceased.

- b. Given the high degree of previous development, the likelihood that intact cultural deposits are located within the Project area, is low. However, there is still a possibility for buried, unknown archaeological resources to occur. Thus, the Project has the potential to have a significant impact to archeological resources. Mitigation measures CR-1 would reduce potential archeological impacts to less than significant.
- c. Due to the lack of burial sites recorded within the Project site, and within the immediate vicinity, it is unlikely that human remains would be disturbed during construction of the Project. However, although unlikely, the discovery of human remains during Project construction is always a possibility. If human remains are found during Project construction, these finds shall be handled in accordance with State of California Health and Safety Code

Section 7050.5. This code section states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has decided of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98 and requires that in the event of unearthed remains, the County Coroner shall be notified of the find immediately. Thus, with adherence as required to the California Health and Safety Code, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

## 6 Energy

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
Would the project:				
a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a. As is typical of any construction, the Project would temporarily consume energy for the operation of construction equipment and vehicles. During construction, standard methods of excavation and concrete pouring are planned. Construction activities do not include methods of construction which would result in inefficient or unnecessary use of energy resources. Post construction, no energy resources are needed in order to continuously operate the Project. Periodic maintenance energy resources would be negligible and would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

b. Several levels of government have implemented regulatory programs in response to reducing greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) emissions, which consequently serve to increase energy efficiency. Several state agencies, including CARB, California Energy Commission, California Public Utilities Commission, CalRecycle, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and the Department of Water Resources have developed regulatory and incentive programs that promote energy efficiency. Many of the measures are generally beyond the ability of any future development to implement and are implemented at the utility provider or the manufacturer level.

Locally, the City of La Mesa adopted its Climate Action Plan (CAP) in March 2018, which provides the framework for reducing the City's GHG emissions and consequently improving energy efficiency. Often local energy conservation plans and goals, such as those in the City's CAP are devised based upon the anticipated land uses within a planning area as outlined in planning documents including a City's General Plan or Zoning Ordinance. The Project does not conflict with the General Plan or Zoning Ordinance land uses. The installation of storm drain improvements would ultimately decrease maintenance as the City would not need to respond to flooding and ponding events that have occurred at the Project site.

The Project does not conflict with any state or local plans for renewable energy efficiency. The Project would employ standard methods of construction and does not propose to create



a Project condition post construction whereby increased energy demand would be created. Thus, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

## 7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a.i. Seismically induced surface or ground rupture occur when movement on a fault deep within the earth breaks through to the surface as a result of seismic activity. Fault rupture almost always follows pre-existing faults, which are zones of weakness. Sudden displacements are more damaging to structures because they are accompanied by shaking. Under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the California State Geologist identifies areas in the State that are at risk from surface fault rupture. The Alquist-Priolo Act's main purpose is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults; that requires the State Geologist				

to establish regulatory zones, known as Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, around the surface traces of active faults and to issue appropriate maps that identify these zones. The Project is not located within a designated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and does not include the construction of any habitable structures. Thus, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.

- a.ii. The closest fault to the Project site is the Rose Canyon Fault, which is approximately 10 miles west of the site. Like most of southern California, the Project site is susceptible to strong seismic shaking during an earthquake. The Project includes improvements to the existing storm drain system and does not include any Project features that would involve placing people or structures at risk in the event of an earthquake. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.
- a.iii. Liquefaction is a soil phenomenon in which water-saturated soils lose strength when subject to the forces of intense and prolonged ground shaking. Liquefaction is more likely to occur in loose to moderately saturated soils with poor drainage, such as silty sands or sands and gravel containing impermeable sediments. The presence of a shallow groundwater table can also increase the susceptibility of liquefaction during seismic events. Overall, the groundwater table in La Mesa is high. The U.S. Department of Agriculture soil survey indicate that soils within La Mesa are derived from sedimentary rock that have a low infiltration rate (Department of Natural Resources 2020). Generally, the soils are gravelly loam with a subsoil layer of gravelly clay. At a level of two to three feet below ground is a layer of impervious clay, which tends to expand and contract. The susceptibility of the Project site to ground failure or liquefaction is unknown as there is no area-wide mapping of the potential for liquefaction or ground failure. However, the combination of a high groundwater table and the clayey, impermeable soils create geologic conditions that may be prone to liquefaction.

The Project is required to comply with the California Building Code (CBC) and the City's Grading Ordinance, both of which provide site preparation and design specifications for reducing soil related risks. Specifically, the City of La Mesa Grading Ordinance (Ordinance No. 2002-2718) states, that in part, the City Engineer shall not issue a grading permit in any case where the City Engineer finds that the work, as proposed by the applicant, will damage any private or public property or create an unreasonable hazard to person or property. Thus, with the required compliance with the City's Grading Ordinance, there would be no impacts in relation to this issue.

- a.iv. The Project includes the installation of new storm drain infrastructure within existing paved roadways and a parking lot. The area of disturbance is limited to roughly 200 linear feet of flat pavement. The Project would require excavation to a depth of approximately 10 feet of level terrain and does not include any disturbance to unstable geologic units that would create landslide conditions. Once complete, the area of improvement would be repaved. The Project would not change the existing geological condition of the Project area and would not result in the development of above ground structures. Therefore, the Project would not result in or expose people to potential impacts involving landslides or mud flows. No impacts would occur in relation to this issue.
- b. The Project includes the disturbance of approximately 200 linear feet. Soil exposed by construction activities could be subject to erosion if exposed to heavy rain, winds, or other storm events. There is the potential for soil erosion or loss of topsoil during construction

activities as the ground is cleared and graded. While 200 linear feet is not quite one-acre (0.918 acres), it is likely that the excavation and installation of storm drain infrastructure would impact an area equal to or greater than one acre of land and thus, the Project would require a NPDES Construction General Permit and be required to submit a Notice of Intent to the RWQCB for the preparation a SWPPP. Generally, a SWPPP demonstrates how water quality during and post construction would be maintained in accordance with mandated objectives. Often this is achieved by employing Best Management Practices (BMPs) (see Section 10, Hydrology and Water Quality). Many BMPs designed to protect water quality also serve to reduce soil erosion and loss of topsoil. Prior to the issuance of an encroachment permit, the City requires that an applicant demonstrates proof of coverage under the NPDES Construction General Permit and a complete SWPPP. Moreover, as required by the City of La Mesa Grading Ordinance (No. 2002-2718), all grading plans shall include an erosion control plan designed to limit erosion of all disturbed portions of the property and to eliminate the transport of soil onto adjacent properties, or into streets, storm drains, or drainage ways.

Once operational, the intent of the Project is to reduce the amount of ponding and flooding that occurs during storm events by directing flows into a box culvert. This would reduce the amount of unrestrained flow from the off-site channel southeast of Boulevard Drive towards 69<sup>th</sup> Street and the Kroc Center parking lot. A reduction in unrestrained flows would reduce the amount of sediment captured and carried resulting in erosion and loss of topsoil.

Therefore, with the Project's construction phase compliance with the NPDES General Construction Permit and the SWPPP, and operational improvements, impacts would be less than significant.

- c. The Project includes improvements to the existing storm drain infrastructure within Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. All improvements would occur below surface and once complete, Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and the disturbed portion of the parking lot would be repaved. Similar to the existing infrastructure, the storm drain improvements would be installed at a depth of approximately 10 feet below ground surface. As discussed in item 7.a.iii, the site soils may be susceptible to liquefaction. However, the installation of the improvements would be in accordance with the CBC, which includes measures to reduce geologic impacts. Conversely, the capture and diversion of stormwater to the box culverts in comparison to the current conditions of ponding and flooding would serve to reduce any unstable soil conditions by reducing the amount of surface water flow. Regardless, the Project site is located in an area that is flat with little topographic variation in the immediate affected area. Thus, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.
- d. According to the General Plan Safety Element, soils in the City of La Mesa have a high shrink-swell potential (City 2012). Adherence to the CBC and the City's Grading Ordinance would reduce hazards related to expansive soils. Specifically, the Grading Ordinance States, "The City Engineer shall not issue a grading permit in any case where the City Engineer finds that the work, as proposed by the applicant, will damage any private or public property, or interfere with any existing drainage course in a manner which may cause damage to any adjacent property, or create an unreasonable hazard to person or property". Thus, with the required adherence to the CBC and the Grading Ordinance, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

- e. The Project does not involve the installation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems. Therefore, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- f. The disturbance area for the Project is entirely within the rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center Parking lot. Trenching would occur to a depth of about 10 feet. Studies conducted in the area indicate that the site is primarily composed of fill material with a combination of cobble, slurry, and sand to a depth of four feet and conglomerate at a depth of about 10 feet (City of La Mesa 2020). The lack of natural undisturbed soils would preclude the presence of paleontological resources. Thus, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

## 8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. The Project site is within the SDAPCD regulatory boundaries. Similar to other air quality management districts, the SDAPCD has not yet developed GHG emission thresholds to be used in CEQA analyses. CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b) states that a lead agency should consider the following factors, among others, when assessing the significance of impacts from GHG emissions on the environment: (1) the extent to which the project may increase or reduce GHG emissions as compared to the existing environmental setting; (2) whether the project’s emissions would exceed a threshold of significance that the lead agency has determined applies to the project; and (3) the extent to which the project complies with regulations or requirements adopted to implement a statewide, regional, or local plan for the reduction or mitigation of GHG emissions.

The most common GHG related to human activity is carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), followed by methane and nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>). Emissions of GHGs besides CO<sub>2</sub> are converted to their carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e), which is a consistent methodology for comparing GHG emissions achieved by normalizing various GHG emissions to a consistent measure. CO<sub>2</sub> has a global warming potential (GWP) of one. By comparison, the GWP of Methane is 21 and the GWP of NO<sub>x</sub> is 310. The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has proposed 25,000 metric tons (MT) of CO<sub>2</sub>e on an annual basis as the minimum level of GHG emissions that would require additional environmental analysis to determine whether a project would result in a significant impact (CEQ 2010).

For the purposes of this analysis, implementation of the Project would result in a significant impact if it would generate total GHG emissions that would exceed 25,000 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e on an annual basis. Due to the global nature of the assessment of GHG emissions and the effects of climate change, impacts can currently only be analyzed from a cumulative context.

Therefore, this analysis applies to both direct and cumulative project impacts. Due to the nature of the Project, GHG would only be generated during construction. Based on comparison to other similarly sized projects, the Project is estimated to generate 1,351 MT of annual CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions, which is less than the CEQ recommended threshold of 25,000 MT of annual CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions. Following construction, the proposed Project would not include any components that would generate GHG emissions. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

- b. On June 1, 2005, Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 proclaimed that California is vulnerable to climate change impacts. To avoid or reduce climate change impacts, EO S-3-05 calls for a reduction in GHG emissions to the year 2000 level by 2010, to year 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Additionally, both the City of San Diego and the City of La Mesa have a Climate Action Plan (CAP). As discussed in item 8.a above, the Project would generate 1,351 MT of annual CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions, which is less than the CEQ recommended significance threshold of 25,000 MT annual CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions. The Project would not generate GHG emissions during operation. Therefore, the Project would not result in GHG emissions levels that would conflict with the State's ability to meet the emissions reduction goal of EO S-3-05, or interfere with the City of San Diego's CAP or the City of La Mesa's CAP. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

## 9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

a. Materials and waste are generally considered hazardous if they are poisonous (toxicity), can be ignited by open flame (ignitability), corrode other materials (corrosivity), or react violently, explode, or generate vapors when mixed with water (reactivity). The term “hazardous material” is defined in the State Health and Safety Code (Chapter 6.95, Section 25501[o]) as any material that, because of quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment. Hazardous waste is defined as any hazardous material that is abandoned, discarded, or recycled, as defined in the State Health and Safety Code (Chapter 6.95, Section 25125). The transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, as well as the potential releases of hazardous materials to the environment, are closely regulated through many state and federal laws.

The operation of construction equipment at the Project site would involve the transportation and use of limited quantities of fuel, oil, sealants, and other hazardous materials related to construction. The use of hazardous materials and substances during construction would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety requirements for handling, storage, and disposal. Once operational, the improvements themselves would not involve any routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Routine maintenance may require equipment that would require fuel for operation. This would be limited and subject to regulation. Thus, with adherence to the required regulations, impacts would be less than significant in relation to this issue.

b. During Project construction, the use of construction equipment would require fuels, oil, sealants, and other hazardous materials related to construction. As with most construction, there is the possibility of accidental release of a hazardous substance during typical construction activities. However, as discussed under item 7.b, a SWPPP would be prepared and implemented, in compliance with the requirements of the RWQCB. The SWPPP would identify BMPs for hazardous materials handling and controlling runoff discharged from the site during Project construction. Additionally, the transport and use of such hazardous materials would cease following construction. Therefore, with the adherence to required regulations, impacts would be less than significant in relation to this issue.

c. There is a preschool and a charter school that operate on the Kroc Center campus, both within one quarter mile of the Project site. The preschool is within approximately 220 feet and the charter school is approximately 1,000 feet from the proposed limits of disturbance in the parking lot. As discussed in item 9.a above, any transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be limited to typical equipment used during construction or routine maintenance and the operation of which is subject to regulations. Post construction, the storm drain improvements would not involve any transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would they emit hazardous emissions. Therefore, impacts are less than significant in relation to this issue.

- d. Government Code 65962.5 stipulates that the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the Department of Health Services (DHS), the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), and any local enforcement agency, as designated by Section 18051, Title 14 of the CCR, identify and update annually a list of sites that have been reported to have certain types of contamination. The DTSC EnviroStor database and the SWRCB Geo Tracker databases were consulted to identify if the Project site or any surrounding nearby properties are on any list compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5 (DTSC, SWRCB 2019).

A review of the EnviroStor database did not identify any portion of the Project site; however, it did map a single site at 7006-7020 University Avenue., approximately 475 feet northeast of the Project site<sup>3</sup> EnviroStor reported a discharge of gasoline and a subsequent soil investigation at this listed site. A closure letter was requested in 2000; however, the EnviroStor database does not report a closure date. A review of the Geotracker database also did not identify any portion of the Project site; however, three properties within approximately 400 to 476 feet northeast of the Project site were mapped.<sup>4</sup> The properties included: (1) 6990 University Avenue, a discharge of gasoline with no contamination or remedial action reported, case closed in 1985; (2) 7006 University Avenue, a discharge of gasoline, potential contamination to groundwater (with uses other than drinking water), case closed in 1993; and (3) 7025 University Avenue, a leaking underground storage tank site, discharge of gasoline, potential contamination to groundwater (with other uses than drinking water), case closed in 2002.

Given that no portions of the Project site are listed on any governmental database compiled pursuant to Government Code 65962.5 and that the sites that are listed within a reasonable search radius are not active cases, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

- e. The Project area is located approximately six miles southwest of Gillespie Field Airport, and approximately seven miles southeast of the Montgomery Field Airport. The proposed alignment is not located within the Airport Influence Area or within any safety zone or noise contour of either airport, as defined in their Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2010). Therefore, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- f. The Project would involve trenching within the rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot for a length of approximately 200 feet. This would require that portions of the roadway and parking lot be periodically closed, and traffic would at times be re-directed during the estimated one-year of construction. During construction of the Project, heavy construction vehicles could potentially affect emergency response in the area or emergency evacuation procedures in the event of an emergency (e.g., vehicles traveling behind the slow-moving truck). However, such delays would be brief and infrequent. Moreover, Boulevard Drive is a local street that does not carry a large volume of traffic. To further, along this portion of Boulevard Drive, the commercial land uses main access is via University Avenue and the residential land uses vehicular access is via 70<sup>th</sup> Street. A traffic control plan would be required to be prepared and approved by the City Engineer in accordance with the application for the required traffic encroachment permit.

---

<sup>3</sup> Using an approximate mid-point of the Project site, a 1,000-foot radius was established for the search criteria.

<sup>4</sup> Using an approximate mid-point of the Project site, a 1,000-foot radius was established for the search criteria.

This Plan would include the appropriate measures to assure that emergency access and response procedures would not be hindered by the Project.

Additionally, Boulevard Drive runs parallel to University Avenue, an arterial street that provides two lanes of traffic in both the east and west directions in the vicinity of the Project. Traffic that would normally traverse Boulevard Drive would be able to access University Avenue as an alternative route. Likewise, the Kroc Center has multiple entrances and there are four additional ingress/egress points located along University Avenue and Aragon Drive. Thus, impacts would be less than significant in relation to this issue.

- g. The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) classifies lands in accordance to whether a very high fire hazard is present so that public officials are able to identify measures that will retard the rate of fire spread and reduce the intensity of uncontrolled fire through vegetation management and building standards. The designation of being within a very high or high fire severity hazard zone is based upon a combination of fuels, terrain, weather, and other relevant factors. According to the County of San Diego online Wildfire Hazard Map, the Project site is located in an area that is not located in a very high fire hazard severity zone, thus, no impact would occur in relation to this issue (San Diego 2020).

## 10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i. result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



- d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?
- e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

a. Discharges of pollutants to navigable waters of the United States and discharges of any non-point or point source runoff to navigable water of the United States is illegal without an NPDES permit. Each of the State's nine RWQCBs issue NPDES permits under the federal Clean Water Act. As discussed under item 7.b, the Project would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit and submit a SWPPP that outlines the intended practices to reduce pollutants in the stormwater to the maximum extent practicable during construction. The SWPPP must include erosion-control and sediment-control BMPs. Additionally, the SWPPP is also required to contain waste management and non-stormwater control BMPs that reduce the potential for construction-related stormwater pollutants. Typical construction-related BMPs might include temporary soil stabilization (e.g., straw mulch, wood mulch, drainage swales), temporary sediment control (e.g., silt fence, sediment track, fiber rolls, sandbag barrier), de-watering, vehicle equipment maintenance and cleaning, and tire cleaning.

Moreover, the project shall include an erosion control plan designed to limit erosion of all disturbed portions of the property and to eliminate the transport of soil onto adjacent properties, streets, storm drains, or drainage ways.

Once operational, the intent of the Project is to reduce the amount of ponding and flooding that occurs during storm events by directing flows into a box culvert. This would reduce the amount of unrestrained flow from the off-site channel southeast of Boulevard Drive towards 69<sup>th</sup> Street and the Kroc Center parking lot. A reduction in unrestrained flows would reduce the amount of sediment captured and carried resulting in erosion and loss of topsoil. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

b. The groundwater table within the Project area is high and it is anticipated that during construction, de-watering would be required. The City would be required to obtain a de-watering permit from the RWQCB or obtain a batch discharge authorization. These authorizations are used to approve non-routine, short duration discharges of water to the sewer system. Either process would include the appropriate measures to safeguard against any impacts to groundwater recharge and there would not result in a long-term diversion of groundwater for recharge. Impacts would be less than significant in relation to this issue.

c.i. The existing drainage pattern in the Project area would be altered. Presently, during storm events, flows exceed the capacity of the system and the off-site channel resulting in ponding and flooding in the Project area. Additionally, currently, the unrestrained flows capture and carry sediments resulting in localized erosion and siltation. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements that are intended to alleviate the current flooding and ponding conditions while maintaining flows in the off-site channel. Thus, the Project would reduce the amount of erosion and siltation in comparison to the current conditions. Moreover, the storm drain improvements would occur within the existing paved rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the paved Kroc Center parking lot. Excavation and trenching would occur within the paved Project footprint with repaving occurring once the installation is complete. There would be no net

- increase in impervious surfaces. Thus, the Project would have a beneficial impact in relation to this issue. For purposes of this IS/MND and CEQA, this is considered a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.
- c.ii. There would be no net increase in impervious surfaces, although the drainage pattern of the area would be altered as a result of the installation of the Project-related underground storm drain improvements. As noted in the Project Description and discussed above under item 10.c.i, the objective of the Project is to alleviate the current ponding and flooding conditions that occur both on and off-site. Thus, the Project would have a beneficial impact in relation to this issue. For purposes of this IS/MND and CEQA, this is considered a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.
  - c.iii. The Project would not impede flows but would result in improvements to accommodate the current high flows during storm events. In contrast, currently flows during storm events exceed the capacity of the storm drain system and the off-site channel resulting in ponding and flooding in the Project area. Thus, the Project would redirect flows into the proposed box culvert that would connect to the existing infrastructure. However, since this alteration of the drainage pattern is an intended improvement and lessens the current adverse conditions, the Project would have a beneficial impact. For purposes of this IS/MND and CEQA, this is considered a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.
  - c.iv. The Project would not impede but it would redirect flows. The installation of the storm drain improvements is intended to alleviate the current ponding and flooding conditions that occurs during storm events. Flows that currently are not accommodated by the existing infrastructure or the adjacent channel would be captured and redirected through the proposed infrastructure improvements. This is considered a beneficial impact. Therefore, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.
  - d. The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) online Flood Insurance Rate Maps designate the Project site as in an area of minimal flood hazard and is not in a mapped floodplain or flood hazard zone. The Project would relieve the current ponding and flooding conditions that occur within the Project area. This would subsequently result in reducing the risk of pollutants being captured and carried by unrestrained flows during storm events. An event associated with a tsunami would occur as a result of an oceanic disturbance, likewise, a seiche event would occur if there was a disturbance to an inland body of water. The Project site is located approximately 12 miles from the Pacific Ocean and 2 miles from Lake Murray. Therefore, given distance and topography, it is unlikely that the Project site would experience inundation from either a tsunami or seiche. Thus, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.
  - e. The Project is located within the San Diego River Valley Basin and the regulatory boundaries of the RWQCB. The RWQCB is responsible for the adoption and implementation of water quality control plans, issuance of discharge permits, and performs other functions in relation to regulating the region's water quality. Project-related activities would be required to comply with the RWQCB Basin Plan. Adherence would be achieved through the implementation of a SWPPP, an erosion control plan, and by instituting BMPs during construction, thus ensuring the Project would not conflict with or obstruct the RWQCB Basin Plan.

In relation to sustainable groundwater management, the Project site is located within the larger San Diego River Valley Basin that is comprised of four contiguous sub-basins. The San Diego River Valley Basin has multiple users, is not adjudicated, and currently does not have an overall groundwater basin management plan. To comply with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act and the California Statewide Groundwater Elevation Monitoring Program, in 2015, several local jurisdictions and water agencies formed a cooperative to monitor groundwater. Currently the San Diego River Valley Basin is not exhibiting signs of overdraft or being at risk of overdraft.

Given the high groundwater table within the Project Area, de-watering would be required during construction. As discussed in item 10.b, this would entail the City either obtaining a permit from the RWQCB or a batch discharge authorization. Additionally, either process would include the appropriate measures to safeguard against any impacts to groundwater recharge. Moreover, these activities would be temporary. Thus, impacts are less than significant in relation to this issue.

## 11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a linear feature, such as an interstate highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge that would impact mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying area. The Project would result in Boulevard Drive, 69 <sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot being either partially or fully closed during portions of the one-year construction period. This would result in local traffic being diverted, most likely towards University Avenue, via 69 <sup>th</sup> and Lois Streets. The commercial businesses (Wienerschnitzel fast food restaurant, a veterinary office, and a junk hauling/removal business) all have entrances accessible via University Avenue. The primary access to the apartment complex parking lot is via Lois Street although there is also a narrow exit only drive that directs traffic to Boulevard Drive. The existing access to the Kroc Center via 69 <sup>th</sup> Street may also be temporarily inaccessible during construction; however, there are two other entrances along University Avenue, one signal controlled, and two entrances from Aragon Drive on the western portion of the Kroc Center property. Thus, this would not physically divide the community as there is adequate circulation network alternatives to access all land uses adjacent to Boulevard Drive and the area of construction. Therefore, there would be no impact in relation to this issue.				
b. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within existing roadway rights-of-way and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. The improvements would assist the La Mesa in achieving its goals for storm water quality and safety (risk of flooding) as set				

forth in its General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element and Safety Element. Minimizing uncontrolled storm water flows and the associated pollutants and sedimentation also assists in meeting area-wide water quality goals. The Project does not conflict with the City of San Diego General Plan and associated College Area Community Plan. Conversely, the San Diego General Plan and College Area Plan emphasize a need to plan and expand public utilities to maximize environmental and community benefits (General Plan Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element Policy PF-M.4) Thus, the Project would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. There would be no impact in relation to this issue.

## 12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. The California Geological Survey has designated the Project site and surrounding area as Mineral Resource Zone 2 (MRZ-2). MRZ-2 are areas that have a high resource potential. However, the La Mesa General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element states that the City does not have any mineral resources (City 2012). The entire Project footprint is within an area that presently supports existing roadways and parking lot and once the Project is constructed, the roadways and parking lot would be returned to its existing state. Additionally, the Project site is not being used for mineral resource extraction, and mineral resource extraction would be an incompatible use with the site's current zoning and adjacent residential land uses. Thus, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.</p>				
<p>b. Please refer to response to item 12.a above. No impact would occur in relation to this issue.</p>				

## 13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- c. For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- a. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within the existing rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot. Construction activities would include excavation and trenching within the roadways and parking lot and would require the use of heavy trucks. Noise-sensitive land uses in the Project area include the multi-family residential development that is within the jurisdiction of the City of La Mesa and the preschool on the Kroc Center campus, which is in the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego.

As identified in Section 10.80.100 of the La Mesa Municipal Code, the operation of construction equipment is prohibited during the nighttime hours in residential and CN (Neighborhood Commercial) zones or within 500 feet of them between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. and anytime on Sunday unless a special permit has been issued. The La Mesa Municipal Code does not include daytime noise standards for construction equipment.

As noted, the western portion of the Project site is within the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego. Section 59.5.0404 of the City of San Diego Municipal Code pertains to construction noise and states, "it shall be unlawful for any person, including The City of San Diego, to conduct any construction activity so as to cause, at or beyond the property lines of any property zoned residential, an average sound level greater than 75 decibels during the 12-hour period from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. According to the Federal Highway Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM), the operation of an excavator is based on a maximum ( $L_{MAX}$ ) noise level of 80.7 dBA at 50 feet. The assumed hourly operations are for 40 percent of the time for an hourly noise level of 76.7 dBA  $L_{EQ}$  at 50 feet. The nearest noise-sensitive land use (within the City of San Diego), the preschool, is approximately 220 feet from the area of disturbance. If the excavator worked for 6 hours out of the 12-hour day, the noise level at a distance of 220 feet would be 63.9 dBA  $L_{EQ}$  (12-hour), which is less than the 75 dBA  $L_{EQ}$  (12-hour) limit.

Construction activities associated with the Project would comply with the applicable regulations for construction. Therefore, temporary increases in noise levels from construction activities would be less than significant.

Once operational the Project would not result in noise impacts, except for periodic maintenance. Any maintenance would be temporary and would be restricted to the hours set forth in the La Mesa or San Diego Municipal Codes. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in relation to this issue.

- b. The primary potential for generation of groundborne vibration would occur during construction, specifically the use of a vibratory roller primarily used in areas that would be paved. According to Caltrans' Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, the distinctly perceptible vibration annoyance potential criterion is defined as 0.04 inches/second (in/sec) peak particle velocity (PPV) for continuous/frequent intermittent sources (Caltrans 2013). Due to its mobile nature, the use of a vibratory roller during construction would occur at an average distance of approximately 200 feet from the nearest

off-site residential land uses. At a distance of 200 feet, a vibratory roller would create a PPV of 0.02 in/sec, which is below the threshold defined by Caltrans. As a guide, major construction activities within 200 feet may be potentially disruptive to sensitive operations (Caltrans 2002).

Major construction is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations (50 CFR 402.2) as a construction project which significantly affects the quality of the human environment. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in noise and vibration levels than others, depending on the population groups and the activities involved. Generally, land uses such as hospitals, libraries, and places of worship are considered the most sensitive. The closest vibration-sensitive land use is Alvarado Hospital, located approximately one mile north of the project site, which is farther than the 200-foot guideline for vibration impacts from major construction impacts. The residential and pre-school land uses along the proposed alignment, which are considered less sensitive would nonetheless experience vibrations during construction. As noted, the pre-school is 220 feet from the Project's area of disturbance; however, the residential land uses are approximately 25 feet from the right of way of Boulevard Drive. Not all construction activities would create vibration and as construction activities move farther west, the distance would serve to reduce the vibration impacts. Lastly, construction is limited to the hours between 7 am and 7 pm and once the Project is complete, there would be no vibration impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant in relation to this issue.

- c. The Project site is approximately six miles southwest of Gillespie Field Airport and seven miles southeast of Montgomery Field. The Project is not located within the Airport Influence Area or within any safety zone or noise contour of either airport, as defined in their Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2010). Therefore, because the Project site is not located within an airport land use plan, it would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels. No impact would occur in relation to this issue.

## 14 Population and Housing

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements in response to the existing condition in which the current infrastructure and off-site channel cannot adequately capture and transmit storm water during storm events. As a result, localized ponding and flooding occurs in the Project area. The Project would place a box culvert in the rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69 <sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the Kroc Center parking lot connecting to the				

existing storm drain infrastructure in the area. The Project is intended to alleviate the current conditions and not to accommodate additional flows from future development. Thus, the Project would not induce substantial unplanned growth either directly or indirectly. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

- b. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements. The Project footprint is contained entirely within the alignment of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of the existing Kroc Center parking lot. No people or houses would be displaced and there would be no need for replacement housing. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

## 15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
v. Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within existing roadway rights-of-way and a portion of a parking lot to accommodate the existing storm event flows that exceed the capacity of the current infrastructure and off-site channel. Construction is anticipated to occur over a one-year period, after which the roadways and disturbed portion of the parking lot would be repaved. Post-Project there would be no perceptible difference to the surrounding environment, with the exception that during storm events, there no longer would be localized ponding and flooding. The Project does not involve the alteration or provision of any new government facilities and it does not result in the need for any additional facilities. During construction, there is the potential that fire or police services would respond to a service call in the event of an accident. This could be handled by existing resources. Given that the Project does not directly or indirectly induce population growth, there would be no impact to schools, parks, or other public facilities, such as a library, community center, or senior center. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

- i. Please see response to item 15.a. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.
- ii. Please see response to item 15.a. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.
- iii. Please see response to item 15.a. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.
- iv. Please see response to item 15.a. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.
- v. Please see response to item 15.a. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

## 16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within existing roadway rights-of-way and a portion of a parking lot to accommodate the existing storm event flows that exceed the capacity of the current infrastructure and off-site channel. Construction is anticipated to occur over a one-year period, after which the roadways and disturbed portion of the parking lot would be repaved. Post-project there would be no perceptible difference to the surrounding environment, with the exception that during storm events, there no longer would be localized ponding and flooding. The Project would not impact the use of any recreational facility, nor would it result in an increased demand for recreational facilities. Thus, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.</p>				
<p>b. Please see response to item 16.a. The proposed Project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Thus, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.</p>				



## 17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within existing roadway rights-of-way and a portion of a parking lot to accommodate the existing storm event flows that exceed the capacity of the current infrastructure and natural channel. Construction is anticipated to occur over a one-year period, after which the roadway and disturbed portion of the parking lot would be repaved. During construction, Boulevard Drive and a portion of 69 <sup>th</sup> Street both local streets, may be temporarily obstructed. There are sidewalks on both the north and south sides that may not be accessible. However, Boulevard Drive runs parallel to University Avenue, which is approximately 100 feet north of Boulevard Drive. University Avenue accommodates two lanes of traffic east and west and also has sidewalks along both the north and south sides of the road. Therefore, temporary detours around the one-block of Boulevard Drive that would be affected by Project construction would not prevent access to the Project area. Moreover, there are no transit stops within the Project site and the nearest transit service bus stops located on both the eastbound and westbound University Avenue are approximately 125 feet from the intersection of 69 <sup>th</sup> Street and Boulevard Drive. These transit stops would not be affected by the Project. There are currently no bicycle facilities within or directly adjacent to the Project site. The nearest bicycle facilities are the Class II bike lanes along 70th Street North approximately 400 feet northeast of the Project; these lanes would not be affected by the Project. Additionally, the eastern access to the Kroc Center may be temporarily obstructed; however, there are four additional ingress/egress points, two along University Avenue and two along Aragon Drive. Post-Project there would be no perceptible difference to the surrounding environment. All forms of circulations would occur in the same manner as present. Thus, the Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.				
b. In September 2013, the Governor’s Office signed Senate Bill (SB) 743 into law, starting a process that fundamentally changes the way transportation impact analyses are conducted under CEQA. In response to the passage of SB 743, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) was required to amend the CEQA Guidelines to provide a new approach to evaluating traffic impacts. These changes include the elimination of auto delay, level of service, and similar measurements of vehicular roadway capacity and traffic congestion as the basis for determining significant impacts. The mandate of SB 743 was to devise an alternative traffic impact evaluation criterion that would promote the reduction of GHG				

emissions as well as foster the development of multi-modal transportation networks and a diversity of land uses. SB 743 further suggested that a measurement such as vehicle miles traveled (VMT) would be an appropriate method to evaluate traffic impacts (§15064.3). VMT is defined as a measurement of miles traveled by vehicles within a specified region and for a specified time period. VMTs are calculated based on individual vehicle trips generated and their associated trip lengths. Jurisdictions have until July 2020 to finalize and adopt significance thresholds in relation to VMT.

The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements and with the exception of construction-related traffic during the approximate one-year construction period and any regular or emergency maintenance, there is no traffic associated with the Project. As shown in Appendix A, Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Calculations, it is assumed that the Project would require two haul truck round-trips per day for a one-year period. Thus, no further analysis of traffic generation was quantitatively conducted. The San Diego Traffic Engineers' Council/Institute of Traffic Engineers (SANTEC/ITE) Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies in the San Diego Region (2019) specify that for a project consistent with a General Plan or Community Plan with 0 to 1,000 average daily trips (ADT), a VMT analysis is not needed and VMT impacts are presumed not significant. Additionally, SANTEC/ITE Guidelines offer guidance on local transportation analysis and that if a project is consistent with a General Plan or Community Plan and has less than 1,000 ADT or 100 peak hour trips, a traffic impact analysis is not warranted. Project-associated construction trips would not meet these benchmarks and thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

- c. The Project is the installation of storm drain improvements in an existing roadway right-of-way and a portion of an existing parking lot. Once the improvements are installed the Project area would be repaved and returned to its current condition. There would be no alteration to the existing circulation system; thus, no impact would occur in relation to this issue.
- d. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within the rights-of-way of Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street, and Kroc Center parking lot. During the anticipated one-year construction period, Boulevard Drive, 69<sup>th</sup> Street and/or the parking lot's northeastern access may experience partial or full closures and heavy construction-related vehicles could interfere with emergency response to the site or emergency evacuation procedures in the event of an emergency (e.g., vehicles traveling behind slow-moving trucks). However, such delays would be brief and infrequent. Moreover, as discussed in item 9.f, prior to the issuance of an encroachment permit, a traffic control plan would be required to be prepared and approved by the City Engineer. This Plan would include the appropriate measures to assure that emergency access and response procedures would not be hindered by the Project. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

## 18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
a. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code §5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a.i-ii As discussed in Section 5, Cultural Resources, HELIX conducted a cultural resources analysis for the Project that included a review of historic aerial photographs and maps, a records search, a SLF search, and a site reconnaissance. The findings of the study are summarized herein and the study in its entirety is included as Appendix B, Cultural Resources Study Letter Report. of this IS/MND. In addition, In accordance with the requirements of AB 52, the City has initiated correspondence and sent out notification letters regarding the Project were sent to Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the Project area in April 2020. Consultation is ongoing.				

A letter requesting a review of the SLF was sent to the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on February 26, 2020. The NAHC responded on March 10, 2020 stating that their review of the SLF produced negative results; no known tribal cultural resources or areas of Native American heritage significance are located within the Project area. However, as stated by the NAHC, "...the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not indicate the absence of cultural resources in any project area." A list of tribal contacts from whom additional information can be solicited was provided with the NAHC's response.

Due to the highly disturbed nature of the Project site and the absence of recorded archaeological sites within the project area, the possibility for subsurface resources is unlikely. However, there is still a possibility for buried, unknown cultural resources to occur, including tribal cultural resources. Impacts to any subsurface resources from implementation of the Project would result in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation measure CR-1 as provided in Section 5, Cultural Resources of this IS/MND, reduces impacts to less than significant in relation to this issue.

## 19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>a. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements, the environmental effects of which are evaluated in items 1-21 of this IS/MND. There is the potential for the Project to result in significant environmental impacts related to cultural and/or tribal cultural resources prior to mitigation. However, with the implementation of mitigation measure CR-1, impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact after mitigation in relation to this issue.</p> <p>b. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within the rights-of-way of existing roadways and parking lot that would be repaved post construction. Water may be used during construction for construction activities, and to implement BMPs such as watering to control dust and sedimentation and washing construction equipment and tires to reduce pollutants. This temporary water demand could be accommodated by existing water supplies and would not impact the availability of water purveyors to meet their existing or future needs. Once operational, the storm drain improvements would have no water demands. The Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.</p> <p>c. The Project involves the installation of storm drain improvements in the rights-of-way of existing roadways and parking lot. There would be no generation of wastewater and no impact to wastewater treatment infrastructure. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.</p> <p>d. The Project would generate solid waste during construction activities. Title 14 of the La Mesa Building Code (Chapter 14.27, Construction and Demolition Debris Diversion Deposit</p>				

Program) requires that a Project applicant recycle or reuse 75 percent of designated recyclables (including asphalt, concrete, and dirt reuse) from a project. Once operational, the Project would not generate any waste. Thus, with the Project's required adherence to the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Program the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

- e. The Project would comply as required with the City's solid waste reduction programs, which are designed to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. These statutes and regulations include the California Integrated Solid Waste Management Act and the City's solid waste disposal policies and practices. The Integrated Solid Waste Management Act requires that jurisdictions maintain a 50 percent or better diversion rate for solid waste, including construction and demolition waste. The Project would divert no less than 75 percent of demolition debris and would not generate any operational waste. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant issued in relation to this issue.

## 20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Please refer to items 9.f and 17.c. The Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.				
b. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within the rights-of-way of existing roadways and a parking lot. Once the improvements are installed, the Project site would be repaved and returned to its existing condition.				

The Project site is level and void of slopes. The surrounding area is highly developed and does not support the common characteristics identified as a wildfire risk, such as difficult terrain, inadequate access, and unmaintained vegetation. As discussed in item 9.g, the

Project is not within a very high fire hazard severity zone as mapped by CalFire. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

- c. Please refer to item 20.b. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.
- d. Please refer to items 7.a-d and item 20.b. The Project would have no impact in relation to this issue.

## 21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less than Significant Impact	No Impact
Does the project:				
a. Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. The Project site does not contain or support any sensitive habitat or special status species. Additionally, as discussed in the Project Description the Project is designed to retain flows in the natural channel adjacent to the Project site. Therefore, adequate flows would be maintained to sustain the existing vegetation and wildlife supported on the two parcels to the south of the Project site.

The Project would not affect any known historic or archaeological resources. Yet, while the Project site is highly disturbed, there is still the potential for unknown subsurface cultural resources to be disturbed or uncovered during Project construction. With the implementation of mitigation measure CR-1, the Project would not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

- b. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within existing roadway rights-of-way and a parking lot. There may be short-term cumulative impacts in relation to any diversion of traffic or access to the greater Project site area. However, as with the Project, other cumulative Projects would be required to prepare traffic control plans that

would require approval of the City Engineer prior to the issuance of the appropriate permits. Thus, any such cumulative impacts would be mitigated to less than significant.

Likewise, cumulative impacts to cultural and/or tribal cultural resources could be significant if not mitigated. With the implementation of mitigation measure CR-1, the Project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

Impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, and noise would be limited to construction of the Project and would not occur during Project operation; therefore, impacts would be temporary in nature and would not result in significant cumulative impacts. Additionally, as discussed in this IS/MND, Project impacts related to air quality, GHG emissions, and noise would be less than significant. Furthermore, potential cumulative projects that could be constructed in the vicinity of the Project would be required to comply with existing applicable federal, state, and local regulations. As such, the Project would not result in impacts that are considered individually limited but cumulatively considerable.

Once complete, the Project site would be repaved, and the roadways and parking lot would be returned to their existing condition. Thus, there would be no contribution to cumulative impacts. Therefore, overall, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

- c. The Project entails the installation of storm drain improvements within existing roadway rights-of-way and a parking lot. Once complete, the Project site would be repaved, and the roadway and parking lot would be returned to their existing condition. The Project would result in beneficial impacts by alleviating the current ponding and flooding conditions that occur during storm events. As identified in Sections 1 through 20 of this document, with mitigation, there are no Project-related environmental effects of the Project that would cause substantial adverse effects on humans. Also, there would be no Project-related cumulative significant adverse effects as discussed in item 21.b. Thus, the Project would have a less than significant impact in relation to this issue.

## References

- California Department of Conservation. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed February 18, 2020. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/> .
- California Division of Mines and Geology. Online Mineral Resource Maps. Accessed February 19, 2020. [ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR\\_153/SR-153\\_Plate-21.pdf](ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/pubs/sr/SR_153/SR-153_Plate-21.pdf).
- Department of Natural Resources. Accessed February 18, 2020. <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/surveylist/soils/survey/state/?stateId=CA>.
- Department of Water Resources. 2016. Bulletin 118.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Accessed March 30, 2020. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=6601%20University%20Avenue%20San%20Diego%2C%20CA#searchresultsanchor>.
- HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX). 2020. Cultural Resources Study for the Boulevard Drive Storm Drain Improvement Project. March 20.
- Helix Water District. 2015. Urban Water Management Plan.
- La Mesa, City of. 2012. 2012 General Plan.
- La Mesa, City of. March 2020. Personal communication with Joe Kuhn.
- San Diego, County of. Online Wildfire Hazard Map. Accessed February 20, 2020. <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/fire/pdf/maps/grid20.pdf>.
- San Diego, County of. Online Wildfire Hazard Map. Accessed February 20, 2020. <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/fire/pdf/maps/grid20.pdf>.



## Appendix A

---

### Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Modeling Calculations

## Appendix B

---

### Cultural Resources Study Letter Report