



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 508125
SCH No. TBD

SUBJECT: Foxhill TM CDP SDP: Coastal Development Permit (CDP), Site Development Permit (SDP) and Tentative Map (TM) for the construction of a 9,995 square-foot single dwelling unit including 2,517 square-foot attached garage and 4,575 square-foot outdoor/covered patios and decks on a newly subdivided lot. The 8.77-acre site is located at 7007 Country Club Dr. within the RS-1-4 zone and the Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable Area 1) of the La Jolla Community Plan area and Council District 1. **Legal Description:** The land referred to herein below is situated in the City of San Diego, In the County of San Diego, State of California, and is described as follows: Parcel 1: APN: 352-300-04-00: All that real property situated in the City of San Diego, In the County of San Diego, State of California, Being a portion of Pueblo Lot 1263 of the Pueblo Lands of San Diego according to the map thereof made by James Pascoe in 1870, A copy of which was filed in Office of the County Recorder of said San Diego County, November 14, 1921, and is known as miscellaneous, Map no. 36

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

See attached Initial Study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

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

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above Determination.

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

**A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART I
Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)**

1. Prior to the issuance of a Notice To Proceed (NTP) for a subdivision, or any construction permits, such as Demolition, Grading or Building, or beginning any construction related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Director's Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve all Construction Documents (CD), (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the MMRP requirements are incorporated into the design.

2. In addition, the ED shall verify that the MMRP Conditions/Notes that apply ONLY to the construction phases of this project are included VERBATIM, under the heading, **"ENVIRONMENTAL/MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS."**

3. These notes must be shown within the first three (3) sheets of the construction documents in the format specified for engineering construction document templates as shown on the City website:

<http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/standtemp.shtml>

4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.

5. **SURETY AND COST RECOVERY** – The Development Services Director or City Manager may require appropriate surety instruments or bonds from private Permit Holders to ensure the long term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

**B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II
Post Plan Check (After permit issuance/Prior to start of construction)**

1. PRE CONSTRUCTION MEETING IS REQUIRED TEN (10) WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY WORK ON THIS PROJECT. The PERMIT HOLDER/OWNER is responsible to arrange and perform this meeting by contacting the CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER (RE) of the Field Engineering Division and City staff from MITIGATION MONITORING COORDINATION (MMC). Attendees must also include the Permit holder's Representative(s), Job Site Superintendent and the following consultants:

Qualified Biologist

Note:

Failure of all responsible Permit Holder's representatives and consultants to attend shall require an additional meeting with all parties present.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

a) The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the **RE** at the **Field Engineering Division – 858-627-3200**

b) For Clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, it is also required to call **RE and MMC at 858-627-3360**

2. MMRP COMPLIANCE: This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) #508125 and /or Environmental Document #508125, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc

Note:

Permit Holder's Representatives must alert RE and MMC if there are any discrepancies in the plans or notes, or any changes due to field conditions. All conflicts must be approved by RE and MMC BEFORE the work is performed.

3. OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS: Evidence of compliance with all other agency requirements or permits shall be submitted to the RE and MMC for review and acceptance prior to the beginning of work or within one week of the Permit Holder obtaining documentation of those permits or requirements. Evidence shall include copies of permits, letters of resolution or other documentation issued by the responsible agency.

None Required

4. MONITORING EXHIBITS

All consultants are required to submit, to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on a 11x17 reduction of the appropriate construction plan, such as site plan, grading, landscape, etc., marked to clearly show the specific areas including the **LIMIT OF WORK**, scope of that discipline's work, and notes indicating when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.

NOTE:

Surety and Cost Recovery – When deemed necessary by the Development Services Director or City Manager, additional surety instruments or bonds from the private Permit Holder may be required to ensure the long term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

5. OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:

The Permit Holder/Owner's representative shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL/INSPECTION CHECKLIST		
Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to or at Preconstruction Meeting
Biological Resources	Monitoring Report(s)	Monitoring Report Approval
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCE PROTECTION DURING CONSTRUCTION

I. Prior to Construction

- A. **Biologist Verification** - The owner/permittee shall provide a letter to the City's Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) section stating that a Project Biologist (Qualified Biologist) as defined in the City of San Diego's Biological Guidelines (2018), has been retained to implement the project's biological monitoring program. The letter shall include the names and contact information of all persons involved in the biological monitoring of the project.

- B. **Preconstruction Meeting** - The Qualified Biologist shall attend the preconstruction meeting, discuss the project's biological monitoring program, and arrange to perform any follow up mitigation measures and reporting including site-specific monitoring, restoration or revegetation, and additional fauna/flora surveys/salvage.

- C. **Biological Documents** - The Qualified Biologist shall submit all required documentation to MMC verifying that any special mitigation reports including but not limited to, maps, plans, surveys, survey timelines, or buffers are completed or scheduled per City Biology Guidelines, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Environmentally Sensitive Lands Ordinance (ESL), project permit conditions; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); endangered species acts (ESAs); and/or other local, state or federal requirements.

- D. **BCME** -The Qualified Biologist shall present a Biological Construction Mitigation/Monitoring Exhibit (BCME) which includes the biological documents in C above. In addition, include: restoration/revegetation plans, plant salvage/relocation requirements (e.g., coastal cactus wren plant salvage, burrowing owl exclusions, etc.), avian or other wildlife surveys/survey schedules (including general avian nesting and USFWS protocol), timing of surveys, wetland buffers, avian construction avoidance areas/noise buffers/ barriers, other impact avoidance areas, and any subsequent requirements determined by the Qualified Biologist and the City ADD/MMC. The BCME shall include a site plan, written and graphic depiction of the project's biological mitigation/monitoring program, and a schedule. The BCME shall be approved by MMC and referenced in the construction documents.

- E. **Avian Protection Requirements** - To avoid any direct impacts to raptors and/or any native/migratory birds, removal of habitat that supports active nests in the proposed area of disturbance should occur outside of the breeding season for these species (February 1 to September 15). If removal of habitat in the proposed area of disturbance must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds on the proposed area of disturbance. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation). The applicant shall submit the results of the pre-construction survey to City DSD for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting birds are detected, a letter report or mitigation plan in conformance with the City's Biology Guidelines and applicable State and Federal Law (i.e. appropriate follow up surveys, monitoring schedules, construction and noise barriers/buffers, etc.) shall be prepared and include proposed measures to be implemented to ensure that take of birds or eggs or disturbance of breeding activities is avoided. The report or mitigation plan shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and implemented to the satisfaction of the City. The City's MMC Section and Biologist shall verify and approve that all measures identified in the report or mitigation plan are in place prior to and/or during construction.

- F. **Resource Delineation** - Prior to construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall supervise the placement of orange construction fencing or equivalent along the limits of disturbance adjacent to sensitive biological habitats and verify compliance with any other project conditions as shown on the BCME. This phase shall include flagging plant specimens and delimiting buffers to protect sensitive biological resources (e.g., habitats/flora & fauna species, including nesting birds) during construction. Appropriate steps/care should be taken to minimize attraction of nest predators to the site.

- G. **Education** -Prior to commencement of construction activities, the Qualified Biologist shall meet with the owner/permittee or designee and the construction crew and conduct an on-site educational session regarding the need to avoid impacts outside of the approved construction area and to protect sensitive flora and fauna (e.g., explain the avian and wetland buffers, flag system for removal of invasive species or retention of sensitive plants, and clarify acceptable access routes/methods and staging areas, etc.).

II. During Construction

- A. **Monitoring**- All construction (including access/staging areas) shall be restricted to areas previously identified, proposed for development/staging, or previously disturbed as shown on "Exhibit A" and/or the BCME. The Qualified Biologist shall monitor construction activities as needed to ensure that construction activities do not encroach into biologically sensitive areas, or cause other similar damage, and that the work plan has been amended to accommodate any sensitive species located during the pre-construction surveys. In addition, the Qualified Biologist shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSV). The CSV shall be e-mailed to MMC on the 1st day of monitoring, the 1st

week of each month, the last day of monitoring, and immediately in the case of any undocumented condition or discovery.

- B. **Subsequent Resource Identification** - The Qualified Biologist shall note/act to prevent any new disturbances to habitat, flora, and/or fauna onsite (e.g., flag plant specimens for avoidance during access, etc). If active nests or other previously unknown sensitive resources are detected, all project activities that directly impact the resource shall be delayed until species specific local, state or federal regulations have been determined and applied by the Qualified Biologist.

III. Post Construction Measures

- A. In the event that impacts exceed previously allowed amounts, additional impacts shall be mitigated in accordance with City Biology Guidelines, ESL and MSCP, State CEQA, and other applicable local, state and federal law. The Qualified Biologist shall submit a final BCME/report to the satisfaction of the City ADD/MMC within 30 days of construction completion.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

State of California

State Clearinghouse

City of San Diego

Councilmember Joe LaCava, District 1

City Attorney

Corrine Neuffer

Planning Department

Plan Facilities Financing

Water Review

PUD Water and Sewer

Wastewater Review

Development Services Department

EAS

Project Manager

LDR-Engineering

LDR-Geology

LDR-Landscaping

LDR-Planning

Other

US Fish & Wildlife Service

California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Sierra Club
Jim Peugh
California Native Plan Society
Endangered Habitats League
La Jolla Village News
La Jolla Town Council
La Jolla Historical Society
La Jolla Community Planning Association
La Jolla Light
Patricia K. Miller
Richard Drury
Komalpreet Toor
Stacey Osborne
Michael Pallamary

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

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

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


_____ for
Jeff Szymanski
Senior Planner
Development Services Department

5/19/2021
Date of Draft Report

Date of Final Report

Analyst: Holowach

Attachments: Location Map
Site Plan

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Foxhill TM CDP / 508125
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, 1222 First Avenue, MS-501, San Diego, California 92101
3. Contact person and phone number: Courtney Holowach / (619) 446-5187
4. Project location: 7007 Country Club Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Ryan Kiesel, Manchester Fox Hill LLC, 2550 5th Ave., San Diego, CA 92103
6. General/Community Plan designation: La Jolla Community Plan
7. Zoning: RS-1-4
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.):

The proposed project is comprised of the tentative map to subdivide an existing 8.78 acre parcel into two parcels: 6.87 acre Parcel 1 and 1.91 acre Parcel 2. No work being proposed on existing Foxhill Residence on Parcel 1.

The proposed development on Parcel 2 consists of Coastal Development Permit and Site Development Permit for new 9,995 square-foot residence including 2,517 square-foot attached garage. The new residence would also have 4,575 square-foot outdoor/covered patios and decks. New sitework includes bioretention basins, foundational retaining walls, and landscaping. A new pool and spa on the first floor outdoor patio would be installed.

The landscaping plan for the new parcel includes new native trees and plantings. All working including landscaping will not impact any adjacent sensitive habitat.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The 8.77-acre site is located at 7007 Country Club Dr. within the RS-1-4 zone and the Coastal Overlay Zone (Non-Appealable Area 1) of the La Jolla Community Plan area within council district 1. The project site is in a residential neighborhood.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):
None required

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Yes, two Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. The City of San Diego sent notification to these two Native American Tribes on September 6, 2019. The Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel responded within the 30-day period requesting consultation and additional information. Consultation took place and was concluded on September 9, 2019 with the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel. No response was received within the 30 day notification period from the Jamul Indian Village. Please see Section XVII of the Initial Study for more information regarding the consultation.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

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

Development of the project would introduce new permanent visual features to the community. Per the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (Thresholds) projects that would block public views from designated open space areas, roads, or parks or significant visual landmarks or scenic vistas may result in a significant impact. City staff reviewed the proposed project for consistency with all applicable zoning regulations and land use plans including the La Jolla Community Plan (LJCP). The LJCP addresses the need to retain and enhance public views of the ocean from identified public vantage points. These vantage points include visual access across private properties at yards and setbacks. The project proposes construct a new residence on a newly subdivided lot, in a residential neighborhood with similar development. No scenic vista is designated on or near the property in the La Jolla Community Plan. The project would be required to meet all required setback and height requirements. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is situated within a developed residential neighborhood. The project is not located within or adjacent to a state scenic highway and would be required to meet all setback and height requirements; therefore, the project would not substantially damage such scenic resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

According to the City's Thresholds projects that severely contrast with the surrounding neighborhood character may result in a significant impact. To meet this threshold one or more of the following conditions must apply: the project would have to exceed the allowable height or bulk regulations and the height or bulk of the existing patterns of development in the vicinity of the project by a substantial margin; have an architectural style or use building materials in stark contrast to adjacent development where the adjacent development follows a single or common architectural theme (e.g., Gaslamp Quarter, Old Town); result in the physical loss, isolation or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark (e.g., a stand of trees, coastal bluff, historical landmark) which is identified in the General Plan, applicable community plan or local coastal program; be located in a highly visible area (e.g., on a canyon edge, hilltop or adjacent to an interstate highway) and would strongly contrast with the surrounding development or natural topography through excessive height, bulk signage or architectural projections; and/or the project would have a cumulative effect by opening up a new area for development or changing the overall character of the area. None the above conditions apply to the project.

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

Existing development in the neighborhood does not have a unifying architectural theme. In addition, existing development in the area has similar square footage to the proposed project ranging from 6,703 square feet to 13,626 square feet. The proposed project is located on a 1.91-acre site and located approximately 450 feet from Country Club Drive and other residences. Because of the distance impacts to surrounding development would be minimized. The closest adjacent structure is the existing 17,000 square-foot Foxhill Residence. The new development would be constructed to comply with all height and bulk regulations and is consistent with Visual Resource recommendations as outlined in the LJCP. The structure height is consistent with building envelope regulations which preserve public views through the height, setback, landscaping, and fence transparency parameters of the Land Development Code that limit the building profile and maximize view opportunities. The project would not result in the physical loss, isolation, or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark which is identified in the General Plan, applicable community plan, or local coastal program.

The project site is currently developed with an existing dwelling unit and would construct an additional dwelling unit. The existing dwelling unit is in a similar size to the new additional dwelling unit. The new dwelling would also be constructed to be compatible with the existing development on the property. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and permitted by the community plan and zoning designation. The project site is also set back from the street and would not be visible from surrounding properties. The project would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Per the City's Thresholds, projects that would emit or reflect a significant amount of light and glare may have a significant impact. To meet this significance threshold, one or more of the following must apply:

- a. The project would be moderate to large in scale, more than 50 percent of any single elevation of a building's exterior is built with a material with a light reflectivity greater than 30 percent (see LDC Section 142.07330(a)), and the project is adjacent to a major public roadway or public area.
- b. The project would shed substantial light onto adjacent, light-sensitive property or land use, or would emit a substantial amount of ambient light into the nighttime sky. Uses considered sensitive to nighttime light include, but are not limited to, residential, some commercial and industrial uses, and natural areas.

Neither of the above conditions apply to the proposed project.

The most prominent light sources from the proposed project would be interior lighting for the new dwelling unit, and exterior and landscaping lighting. All new lighting would be compatible with existing lighting in the project vicinity. The project would be subject to the City's Outdoor Lighting Regulations per SDMC Section 142.0740, which are intended to minimize negative impacts from light pollution, including light trespass, glare, and urban sky glow, in order to preserve enjoyment of the

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

night sky and minimize conflict caused by unnecessary illumination. Light fixtures would be required to be directed away from adjacent properties and shielded, as necessary. Outdoor lighting would be located and arranged in a manner consistent with City requirements, to promote public safety, and minimize unnecessary light and glare effects to the surrounding community.

The project would comply with Municipal Code Section 142.0730 (Glare Regulations) that requires exterior materials utilized for proposed structures be limited to specific reflectivity ratings. No large surface areas of reflective building materials or finishes are proposed that could create glare effects on surrounding properties. Additional light or glare from the proposed project would be consistent with the other development in the area and therefore would not substantially affect day or nighttime views. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and irrigation status; the best quality land is called Prime Farmland. Unique farmland is land, other than prime farmland, that has combined conditions to produce sustained high quality and high yields of specialty crops. Farmland of Statewide Importance may include tracts of land that have been designated for agriculture by State law. In some areas that are not identified as having national or statewide importance, land is considered to be Farmland of Local Importance. The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) maintained by the California Department of Conservation (CDC) is the responsible state agency for overseeing the farmland classification. In addition, the City's Thresholds state that in relation to converting designated farmland, a determination of substantial amount cannot be based on any one numerical criterion (i.e., one acre), but rather on the economic viability of the area proposed to be converted. Another factor to be considered is the location of the area proposed for conversion.

The project site is not classified as farmland by the California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance occurs on site of within the area immediately surrounding the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts related to the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>

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 response II (a) above. The proposed project site is not zoned for agricultural use. There are no Williamson Act Contract lands on or within the vicinity of the project. The project would not affect properties zoned for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act Contract. No impact would occur.

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

The project would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. The project site is zoned for residential use; no designated forest land or timberland occurs within the boundaries of the project. No impact would occur.

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

Refer to response II (c) above. The project would not convert forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Refer to responses II (a) and II (c) above. No existing farmland or forest land are located in the proximity of the project site. No changes to any such lands would result from project implementation. No impact would occur.

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

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

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

According to the City's Thresholds, a project may have a significant air quality impact if it could conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991 and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2016). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (O3). The RAQS relies on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SANDAG, including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in San Diego County and the cities in the county, to project future emissions and then determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by San Diego County and the cities in the county as part of the development of their general plans.

As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by local plans would be consistent with the RAQS. However, if a project proposes development that is greater than that anticipated in the local plan and SANDAG's growth projections, the project might conflict with the RAQS and may contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on air quality.

The project would develop one dwelling unit in an already established neighborhood. The project is consistent with the General Plan, community plan, and the underlying zoning for residential development. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. As such no impacts would occur.

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

The City's Thresholds state that a significant impact may occur if a project violates any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Short-term Emissions (Construction)

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

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

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with land clearing and grading operations. Due to the nature and location of the project, construction activities are expected to create minimal fugitive dust, because of the disturbance associated with grading. Construction operations are subject to the requirements established in Regulation 4, Rules 52, 54, and 55 of the SDAPCD rules and regulations. The project would include standard measures as required by the City grading permit to minimize fugitive dust and air pollutant emissions during the temporary construction period. Therefore, impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant and would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts related to short-term emissions would be less than significant.

Long-term Emissions (Operational)

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

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

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

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

The City's Thresholds state that a project may have a potentially significant air quality impact if it could result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including release of emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors).

As described above in response III (b), construction operations may temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants; however, construction emissions would be temporary and short-term in duration. Implementation of BMPs would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to less than significant. Operational air pollutant emissions resulting from such sources as HVAC systems, motorized equipment, and project traffic would not be generated in quantities that would result in exceedances of regulatory thresholds for criteria pollutants. Projects that propose development consistent with the growth anticipated by applicable general plans were considered in, and therefore are consistent with, the RAQS. The proposed project is consistent with the applicable land use plans (General Plan and La Jolla Community Plan), and therefore, buildout of the project site has been accounted for in region-wide air quality plans. The project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The City's Thresholds state that for a project proposing placement of sensitive receptors near an existing odor source, a significant odor impact will be identified if the project site is closer to the odor source than any existing sensitive receptor where there has been more than one confirmed or three confirmed complaints per year (averaged over a three-week period) about the odor source. Moreover, for projects proposing placement of sensitive receptors near a source of odors where there are currently no nearby existing receptors, the determination of significance should be based on the distance and frequency at which odor complaints from the public have occurred in the vicinity of a similar odor source at another location. None of the above applies to the proposed project.

Short-term (Construction)

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified

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

as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The City's Thresholds state that significance of impacts to biological resources are assessed by City staff through the CEQA review process and through review of the project's consistency with the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) regulations, the Biology Guidelines (2018) and with the City's MSCP Subarea Plan (1997). Before a determination of the significance of an impact can be made, the presence and nature of the biological resources must be established. The City has established a two-step process that: (1) provides guidance to determine the extent of biological resources and values present on the site; and (2) based on the findings of Step 1, if significant biological resources are present, then a survey to determine the nature and extent of the biological resources on the site is warranted.

The project proposes the development of a new residence on a vacant subdivided lot. A biological survey was prepared for the proposed project (Biological Resources Report, Leopold Biological Services, September 2020). Per the approved report, the parcel supports 0.23-acre southern maritime chaparral (Tier 1), 0.29-acre disturbed land (Tier IV) and 1.82-acre developed land Tier IV. The development area is disturbed and developed land. Per the City's Thresholds, direct impacts to disturbed and developed lands do not require mitigation. In addition, the 0.23-acre of southern maritime chaparral (Tier 1) is located entirely out of the development area. Sensitive flora species were located and mapped during the survey. Two Torrey pines are present approximately 65 feet of the proposed project's driveway. These Torrey pines are outside the development area, however, therefore no impacts are anticipated.

One sensitive wildlife species were observed in the BSA during the reconnaissance-level survey, a Cooper's hawk, an MSCP covered species and CDFW Watch List species. The Cooper's hawk was observed actively ambushing passerines on the proposed project site. There are mature, dense trees suitable for nesting Cooper's hawk within the development area. Tree removal within the proposed development area is scheduled during the non-breeding period (September 16 through January 31). Therefore, no direct impacts to nesting Cooper's hawk would occur due to project implementation.

Suitable Cooper's hawk nesting sites lie adjacent to the development area. Noise from construction activities have the potential to result in indirect impacts to Cooper's hawk during the breeding season (February 1 through September 15). Therefore, mitigation measures are provided to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

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

Please see response IV(a) above. The project would have a potentially substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. However, mitigation measures are provided to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

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

Please see response IV(a) above. The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. Although there is a jurisdictional ephemeral drainage in the adjacent Covenant of Easement (COE), there are no wetlands or jurisdictional drainages on the proposed project site. The ephemeral drainage is approximately 650 feet up-slop of the BSA, draining southwest to a storm drain inlet at the COE south boundary. The US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) determined the ephemeral drainage is non-Wetland Waters of the US (WoUS) based on the lack of hydrophytic vegetation and hydric soils. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. The ephemeral drainage does not meet the City's definition of City-jurisdictional "wetlands" as defined in the City's ESL regulations and Biological Guidelines. No impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Please see response IV(a) above. The project would not 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. No impacts would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

The project is consistent with the City's Biology Guidelines (2018) and ESL Regulations; no conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Please see response IV(a) above. The project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impacts would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

Archaeological Resources

The project site is in an area known to contain sensitive archaeological resources and is located on the City's Historical Sensitivity map. Therefore, a record search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database was reviewed by qualified archaeological City staff to determine presence or absence of potential resources within the project site. The CHRIS search did not identify any archaeological resources within or adjacent to the site. In addition, an archaeological resources survey was performed in March 2017 (Cultural Resources Inventory for the Foxhill Guest Quarters Project, Spindrift Archaeological LLC, March 2017).

The survey found no cultural resources. The potential for subsurface historic and prehistoric-period cultural resources is generally considered low within the Project Area of Potential Effect (APE) due to it being situated on Ardath Shale on a ridge.

The study concluded that due the low sensitivity of the project APE for prehistoric and historic-period resources as well as the negative survey results no further work or monitoring would be required. Qualified City staff reviewed and approved the survey results. No impacts would occur.

Built Environment

The City reviews projects requiring the demolition of structures 45 years or older for historic significance in compliance with CEQA. Historic property (built environment) surveys are required for properties which are 45 years of age or older and which have integrity of setting, location, design, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. In accordance with CEQA and San Diego Municipal Code Section 143.0212 the proposed project site underwent historic review by Plan Historic staff in April 2021.

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

Based on this review Plan Historic staff determined that the property does not meet local designation criteria as an individually significant resource under any adopted HRB Criteria. This determination is good for five years from this date unless new information is provided that speaks to the building's eligibility for designation. Therefore, no historical research report was required at this time and the project as proposed has no potential to impact any unique or non-unique historical resources. No impacts to the built environment would occur.

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

Refer to response V (a) above.

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

The proposed project site is underlain by the Ardath Shale Formation. The Ardath Shale Formation is assigned a high potential for fossil resources. The City's Significance Determination Threshold for a high sensitivity rating is grading greater than 1,000 cubic yards exported and cut of 10 feet or more in depth. Monitoring may be required for shallow grading (i.e. <10 feet) when a site has previously been graded and/or unweathered geologic deposits/formations/ rock units are present at the surface.

According to sheet A1.0 the proposed project will grade 1,362 cubic yards at a depth of 7 feet Since the proposed grading quantities do not exceed the City's Significance Determination Threshold EAS finds that the proposed project will not be subject to monitoring requirements. No further comment is required.

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

No known human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries exist on site. If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken. Impacts would be less than significant.

VI. ENERGY – 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

The proposed project would be required to meet energy standards of the current California Energy Code (Title 24). In addition, the proposed project would be conditioned to meet building design measures per City code that incorporate energy conservation features (window treatments, efficient HVAC systems etc). The project would also be required to implement CAP strategies which are energy reducing (cool roof, etc.). The proposed project is construction of one dwelling unit which would not have any out of the ordinary energy consumption. Less than significant impact.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan and Community Plan land use designations. Please refer to VI(b) for further information on energy efficiency strategies.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

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

The project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. In addition, the project submitted a Geotechnical Report (Report of Limited Geotechnical Investigation, Proposed Storm Water Infiltration BMPs, Proposed Foxhill Guesthouse, Country Club Drive, La Jolla, California, prepared by Geotechnical Exploration, Inc., dated April 20, 2017) that has been reviewed by City Geology staff. Per staff review, the geotechnical consultant has adequately addressed the soil and geologic conditions potentially affecting the proposed project. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with seismic requirement of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts based on regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

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

Refer to response V (a). The site could be affected by seismic activity as a result of earthquakes on major active faults located throughout the Southern California area. The project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant and mitigation is not required.

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

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

Refer to response V (a). Liquefaction occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water-laden soils are subject to shaking, causing the soils to lose cohesion. Implementation of the project would not result in an increase in the potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

Refer to response V (a). The project site is not mapped within a landslide zone and no landslides have been identified within the site or in the immediate vicinity. No impact would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Refer to response V (a). The project includes a landscape plan that has been reviewed and approved by City staff that precludes erosion of topsoil. In addition, standard construction BMPs necessary to comply with SDMC Grading Regulations (Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 1) would be in place to ensure that the project would not result in a substantial amount of topsoil erosion. Impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Refer to response V (a). Proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices would be verified at the construction permitting stage and would ensure that impacts in this category would not occur.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

The proposed project is located on Olivenhain cobbly loam soil. This soil is not defined as expansive. No impacts would occur. Furthermore, proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices would be verified at the construction permitting stage and would ensure that impacts in this category would not occur.

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?

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

The proposed project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative water disposal systems. No impacts would occur.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

On July 12, 2016, the City of San Diego adopted the Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist, which requires all projects subject to discretionary review to demonstrate consistency with the Climate Action Plan.

The CAP is a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15604 (h) (3), 15130 (d), and 15183 (b), a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative GHG emissions effect may be determined not to be cumulatively considerable if it complies with the requirements of the CAP.

Projects that are consistent with the CAP as determined through the use of this Checklist may rely on the CAP for the cumulative impacts of GHG emissions.

The submitted Climate Action Plan (CAP) Consistency Checklist was reviewed by EAS staff and found to be acceptable. The CAP Consistency Checklist includes a three-step process to determine project if the project would result in a GHG impact. Step 1 consists of an evaluation to determine the project's consistency with existing General Plan, Community Plan, and zoning designations for the site. Step 2 consists of an evaluation of the project's design features compliance with the CAP strategies. Step 3 is only applicable if a project is not consistent with the land use and/or zone, but is also in a transit priority area to allow for more intensive development than assumed in the CAP.

Under Step 1 of the CAP Consistency Checklist, the project is consistent with the existing General Plan and La Jolla Community Plan land use designations and zoning for the site. Therefore, the project is consistent with the growth projections and land use assumptions used in the CAP. Furthermore, completion of Step 2 of the CAP Consistency Checklist demonstrates that the project would be consistent with applicable strategies and actions for reducing GHG emissions. This includes project features consistent with the energy and water efficient buildings strategy, as well as bicycling, walking, transit, and land use strategy. These project features would be assured as a condition of project approval. Thus, the project is consistent with the CAP. Step 3 of the CAP Consistency Checklist would not be applicable, as the project is not proposing a land use amendment or a rezone.

Based on the project's consistency with the City's CAP Consistency Checklist, the project's contribution of GHGs to cumulative statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project's direct and cumulative GHG emissions would have a less than significant impact on the environment.

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

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

of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations. Further based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist for the project, the project is consistent with the applicable strategies and actions of the CAP. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the assumptions for relevant CAP strategies toward achieving the identified GHG reduction targets. Impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

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

The City's Thresholds states that significant impacts may occur if a project proposes the handling, storage and treatment of hazardous materials.

Construction activities for the project would involve the use of potentially hazardous materials including vehicle fuels, oils, transmission fluids, paint, adhesives, surface coatings and other finishing materials, cleaning solvents, and pesticides for landscaping purposes. However, the use of these hazardous materials would be temporary, and all potentially hazardous materials would be stored, used, and disposed of in accordance with manufacturers' specifications, applicable federal, state, and local health and safety regulations. As such, impacts associated with the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant during construction.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The City's Thresholds state that project sites on or near known contamination sources and/ or that meet one or more of the following criteria may result in a significant impact:

- A project is located within 1,000 feet of a known contamination site;
- A project is located within 2,000 feet of a known "border zone property" (also known as a "Superfund" site) or a hazardous waste property subject to corrective action pursuant to the Health and Safety Code;
- The project has a closed Department of Environmental Health (DEH) site file;
- A project is located in Centre City San Diego, Barrio Logan, or other areas known or suspected to contain contamination sites;

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

- A project is located on or near an active or former landfill;
- A project is located on properties historically developed with industrial or commercial uses which involved dewatering (the removal of groundwater during excavation), in conjunction with major excavation in an area with high groundwater;
- A project is located in a designated airport influence area and where the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has reached a determination of "hazard" through FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" , inconsistent with an Airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan (ACLUP), within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Plan (ALP), or two nautical miles of a public or public use airport; or
- A project is located on a site presently or previously used for agricultural purposes.

The project site does not meet any of the criteria outlined in the City's Thresholds stated above. The project site was not listed in any of the databases for hazardous materials including being listed in the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker system, which includes leaking underground fuel tank sites inclusive of spills, leaks, investigations, and cleanups Program or the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor Data Management System, which includes CORTESE sites. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The City's Thresholds states that significant impacts may occur if a project proposes the handling, storage and treatment of hazardous materials. The proposed project location is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No impact would result.

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

See VIII(b) above for applicable City Threshold related to listed hazardous materials sites. A hazardous waste site records search was completed in February 2019 using Geotracker <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. The records search showed that no hazardous waste sites exist onsite or in the surrounding area. No impacts would result.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The City's Thresholds state that a project may result in a significant impact if it is located in a designated airport influence area and where the FAA has reached a determination of "hazard" through FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration" , inconsistent with an Airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan (ACLUP), within the boundaries of an Airport Land Use Plan (ALP), or two nautical miles of a public or public use airport.

The project is not located in a Safety Zone of the adopted 2014 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP); therefore, the use and density are consistent with the ALUCP. The project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. No impacts would occur.

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

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would result.

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

The proposed project is residential development in an established neighborhood. It would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impacts would result.

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

The project site it not located adjacent to wildlands or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. It would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. No impact would result.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

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

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

The project would comply with all storm water quality standards during and after construction, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) will be utilized and provided for on-site. Implementation of these BMP's would preclude any violations of existing standards and discharge regulations. This will be addressed through the project's Conditions of Approval; therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The project does not require the construction of wells. The construction of the project may generate an incremental use of water, but it would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or the area. Streams or rivers do not occur on or adjacent to the site. Although grading is proposed, the project would implement on-site BMPs, therefore ensuring that substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site would not occur. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

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

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

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

The project would not introduce any new conditions that would 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

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

The project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map. No impacts would result.

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

See Response (IX) (g). No impacts would result.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

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

The project is consistent with the General Plan and La Jolla Community Plan land use designation. The project site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development. The development of one dwelling unit would not affect adjacent properties and is consistent with surrounding land uses. Therefore, the project would not physically divide an established community. No impact would result due to implementation of the project.

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

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

for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

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

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

As previously discussed in Section IV, although the proposed project is not within the MHPA, the project would be consistent with all relevant goals and policies regarding the preservation and protection of biological resources, as outlined in the City's MSCP. The proposed project does not have the potential to conflict with any habitat conservation plans. In addition, implementation of the project would be consistent with all biological resources policies outlined in the General Plan, La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Land Use Plan. Implementation of the project would not conflict with any applicable plans, and no impact would occur.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

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

The project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan.

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

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

The City's Thresholds identify that a significant impact would occur if:

Traffic generated noise would result in noise levels that exceed a 45 weighted decibel (dbA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) interior of 65 dbA CNEL exterior for single- and multi-family land uses, 75 dbA exterior for office, churches, and professional uses, and 75 dbA exterior for commercial land uses.

- A project which would generate noise levels at the property line which exceed the City's Noise Ordinance Standards is also considered a potentially significant impact. Additionally, Temporary construction noise which exceeds 75 dB (A) L_{EQ} at a sensitive receptor would be considered significant.
- Temporary construction noise which exceeds 75 dB (A) L_{eq} at a sensitive receptor. Construction noise levels measured at or beyond the property lines of any property zoned residential shall not exceed an average sound level greater than 75-decibels (dB) during the 12-hour period from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. In addition, construction activity is prohibited between the hours of 7:00 p.m. of any day and 7:00 a.m. of the following day, or on legal holidays as specified in Section 21.04 of the San Diego Municipal Code, with exception of Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday, or on Sundays, that would create disturbing, excessive, or offensive noise unless a permit has been applied for and granted beforehand by the Noise Abatement and Control Administrator, in conformance with San Diego Municipal Code Section 59.5.0404.

If noise levels during the breeding season for the California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, southern willow flycatcher, least tern, cactus wren, tricolored blackbird or western snowy plover would exceed 60dB(A) or existing ambient noise level if above 60dB(A).

The project would not result in the generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Any short-term noise impacts related to construction activities would be required to comply with the construction hours specified in the City's Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise), which are intended to reduce potential adverse effects resulting from construction noise. Impacts remain less than significant and none of the above conditions apply.

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

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

See response XII (a) above. Potential short-term effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with City restrictions. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. Impacts remain less than significant.

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

See response XII (a) above. Potential short-term effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with City restrictions. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. Impacts remain less than significant.

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

See response XII (a) above. Potential short-term effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with City restrictions. No significant long-term impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required. Impacts remain less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project is not located within an airport land use plan. No public airport is within 2 miles of the project site. The project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels. No impacts would result from the project.

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

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. The proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels. No impacts would result from the project.

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

The proposed project is with the construction of one new dwelling unit. The construction of one new unit would not induce substantial population growth. Infrastructure already exists on the project site to account for both dwelling units (i.e. newly constructed and existing). Impacts remain less than significant.

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

The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The proposed project would result in the construction of a new dwelling unit on a currently vacant parcel. Therefore, the result of the project is a net addition to available housing.

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

The construction of a new dwelling unit on a newly subdivided parcel would not displace substantial numbers of people. New construction of replacement housing elsewhere would not occur.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where fire protection services are already provided. The proposed project would not require the construction of new fire protection facilities.

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

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area within the City of San Diego where police protection services are already provided. The proposed project would not require the construction of new police protection facilities.

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

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

The project would not affect existing levels of public services and would not require the construction or expansion of a school facility. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where public school services are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services.

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

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities over that which presently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for parks or other offsite recreational facilities

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

The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services and not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. Therefore, no new public facilities beyond existing conditions would be required.

XVI. RECREATION

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

The project would not 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.

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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project is not construction recreational facilities, nor does it require the expansion of recreation facilities.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

a) Would the project or plan/policy conflict with an adopted program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the transportation system, including transit,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

The construction of one new dwelling unit would not change road patterns or congestion. The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account of all modes transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. In addition, the project would not require the redesign of streets, traffic signals, stop signs, striping or any other changes to the existing roadways or existing public transportation routes or types are necessary. No impact would result due to implementation of the project.

- b) Would the project or plan/policy result in VMT exceeding thresholds identified in the City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual?

The proposed project is the development of one dwelling unit and would not result in VMT exceeding thresholds identified in the City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual.

- c) Would the project or plan/policy substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses.

- d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 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:

- a) 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

The project is the construction of one new dwelling unit. The existing dwelling unit is not 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).

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>b) 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 section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Assembly Bill 52 (AB 52) requires as part of CEQA, evaluation of tribal cultural resources, notification of tribes, and opportunity for tribes to request a consultation regarding impacts to tribal cultural resources when a project is determined to require a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report under CEQA. In compliance with AB-52, the City notified all tribes that have previously requested such notification for projects within the City of San Diego. The City of San Diego sent notification to these two Native American Tribes on September 6, 2019. The Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel responded within the 30-day period requesting consultation and additional information. Consultation took place and was concluded on September 9, 2019 with the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel. No response was received within the 30-day notification period from the Jamul Indian Village.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

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

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

This project would not result in an increase in the intensity of the use and would not be required to construct a new water or wastewater treatment facility. No impact would result due to implementation of the project.

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

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

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

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

The project does not meet the CEQA significance threshold that would require the preparation of a water supply assessment. The existing project site currently receives water service from the City, and adequate services are available to serve the proposed residential project without required new or expanded entitlements. No impact would result due to implementation of the project.

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

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

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

All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have adequate capacity to accept the limited amount of waste that would be generated by the project. Long-term operation of the proposed residential unity is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with residential use. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The project would not result in the generation of large amounts of solid waste, nor would it generate or require the transportation of hazardous waste materials. All demolition activities would comply with City of San Diego requirements for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operation phase. No impact would result due to implementation of the proposed project.

XX. WILDFIRE – 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The City of San Diego participates in the San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The project complies with the General Plan and is consistent with the La Jolla Community Plan's land use and the Land Development Code's zoning designation. The project is in an urbanized area of San Diego and construction of one dwelling would not disrupt any emergency evacuation routes as identified in the Hazard Mitigation Plan. Therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on an emergency response and evacuation plan during construction and operation.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 wildfire? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is in an urbanized neighborhood of similar residential development. The proposed project is in a high fire severity zone. However, the proposed project is surrounded by existing development with no wildlands near the site. Due to the location of the project, the project would not have the potential to expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. Therefore, impacts would remain below a level of significance.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is in a residential neighborhood with similar development. The site is currently serviced by existing infrastructure which would service the site after construction is completed. No new construction of roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities would be constructed that would exacerbate fire risk, therefore impacts would be less-than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Refer to response XX (b) above. Additionally, the project would comply with the City's appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP) for drainage and would not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of run-off, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, less than-significant impact would result.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

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

This analysis has determined that, although there is the potential of significant impacts related to Biological Resources. As such, mitigation measures included in this document would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level as outlined within the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

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

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

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

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

The project is consistent with the environmental setting and with the use as anticipated by the City. Based on the analysis presented above, implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce environmental impacts such that no substantial adverse effects on humans would occur

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plans: La Jolla Community Plan

II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

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

III. Air Quality

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

IV. Biology

- City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996
- City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997
- Community Plan - Resource Element
- California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001
- California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001
- City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines
- Site Specific Report: Biological Technical Report for the Foxhill Project, San Diego California, prepared by Leopold Biological Services., April 2021

V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources and Built Environment)

- City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- Historical Resources Board List
- Community Historical Survey:
- Site Specific Report:

VI. Geology/Soils

- City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study
- U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975
- Site Specific Report:

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Site Specific Report:

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing
- San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
- FAA Determination
- State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- Site Specific Report:

IX. Hydrology/Drainage

- Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map
- Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html
- Site Specific Report:

X. Land Use and Planning

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- FAA Determination:
- Other Plans:

XI. Mineral Resources

- California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification
- Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps
- City of San Diego General Plan: Conservation Element
- Site Specific Report:

XII. Noise

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan
- San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps
- Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps
- Montgomery Field CNEL Maps
- San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes
- San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- Site Specific Report:

XIII. Paleontological Resources

- City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines
- Deméré, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996
- Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," *California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin* 200, Sacramento, 1975
- Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977
- Site Specific Report:

XIV. Population / Housing

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan
- Series 11/Series 12 Population Forecasts, SANDAG
- Other:

XV. Public Services

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan

XVI. Recreational Resources

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan
- Department of Park and Recreation
- City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map
- Additional Resources:

XVII. Transportation / Circulation

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan:
- San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG
- Site Specific Report:

XVIII. Utilities

- Site Specific Report:


XIX. Water Conservation

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

XX. Water Quality

- Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html
- Site Specific Report:

Revised: April 2021



Location Map

Foxhill TM CDP SDP/Project No. 508125

City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE

No. 1

