



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 644885

SCH No. N/A

**SUBJECT: Coastal Rail Trail SDP:** The City of San Diego (City) proposes to construct the an approximately 1.8 mile long segment of the Coastal Rail Trail bicycle facilities located on Gilman Drive between the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus and the Rose Canyon Bikeway within both the La Jolla and University Community Planning Areas (USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle: La Jolla). It is approximately 1.8-miles long, and represents Segment 9 of the CRT Project Study Report. Natural open space is present on steep, eroded slopes (15% to 45%), and in a drainage that parallels Gilman Drive from Via Alicante to the I-5 freeway (at the base of the slope along the east side of the roadway). The site is located within and adjacent to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan.

The proposed project includes a one-way protected cycle track on each side of Gilman Drive and a continuous sidewalk on the west side of Gilman Drive over a project distance of approximately 8,800 linear feet. The cycle track will be separated from vehicular traffic by a raised median, striping, flexible posts, on-street parking, or other physical barrier. To accommodate the cycle tracks, the project would include roadway widenings on the west side of Gilman Drive from Villa La Jolla Drive southerly to an existing private driveway (an approximate distance of 3,000 linear feet). Roadway widenings would occur on the east side of Gilman Drive from Via Alicante to the Interstate 5 (I-5) southbound off-ramp (an approximate distance of 4,500 linear feet) along with construction of a 2-foot recovery slope adjacent to the cycle track along portions of the natural area from Via Alicante to I-5. In addition to roadway widening, the project includes roadway re-striping, street lighting, landscaping, retaining walls, drainage improvements, bus stop improvements and traffic signal modifications. The existing traffic signals at I-5, Via Alicante and Villa La Jolla Drive would be modified to work in conjunction with the proposed improvements.

Retaining walls would be required on the west side of Gilman Drive from just north of Villa La Jolla Drive to Via Alicante (an approximate distance of 1,054 LF) and from a point south of Via Alicante to a private driveway at La Jolla Hideaway private apartments (an approximate distance of 1,120 LF). The walls would range from heights between three and seven feet.

A new sidewalk would be constructed along the west side of Gilman Drive to connect existing sidewalk segments and create a continuous sidewalk along the entire west side. The sidewalks would be directly next to the proposed retaining walls. The sidewalks on the east side of Gilman Drive north of Via Alicante to La Jolla Village Drive would remain in place, and a new sidewalk would not be constructed on the east side of Gilman Drive south of Via Alicante.

Parallel parking would be protected along both sides of Gilman Drive most of the length between the La Jolla Village Drive ramps and Villa La Jolla Drive, and on the east side, south to Via Alicante. Additional parallel parking would be provided along the west side near the existing apartments and private driveways along the southern portion of the project. The parking spaces would be part of the buffer between the cycle track and vehicular traffic. In these areas, the raised buffer would not be constructed, rather, the cycle track and parking would be separated by a striped buffer.

Street lighting would be provided along Gilman Drive along the length of the project. The lighting would be installed per City of San Diego street lighting standards, with light standards on both sides of the street at 300-foot intervals. The lighting would be fully shielded to not shine in adjacent houses or open space areas, and would conform to dark sky glare reduction standards as well.

Existing storm drains within open space are undersized and have failed causing erosion. The storm drains are subject to improvements and will include the construction of: curb and gutters, curb inlets, cleanouts, storm drains, and brow ditches in order to comply with the City's Region MS4 Permit, and the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards BMP Design Manual dated 2018 at the preparation of this report.

A raised curb buffer would be placed on either side of the bus stop passenger waiting area. The bus stops on the west (southbound) side of Gilman Drive would remain at the sidewalk, and busses would pull into the cycle track area to pick up passengers.

Green paint and striping would highlight the cycle track at intersections and bus stops. Raised buffers also would be constructed on either side of driveway intersections where the cycle track is separated from driving lanes by painted stripes. The traffic signals at Villa La Jolla would be shifted to accommodate the project, and a new traffic signal would be added at La Jolla Village Drive.

Acquisition of additional roadway right-of-way (ROW) is required from several parcels east of Gilman Drive, south of Via Alicante, and temporary construction easements are required for several parcels for slope grading and retaining wall construction.

APPLICANT: City of San Diego Engineering and Capital Projects Department.

## **I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

See attached Initial Study.

## **II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

The project area is located along the boundary of the La Jolla and University community planning areas in the City of San Diego. It is located along an approximately 1.8-mile segment of the Coastal Rail Trail bicycle facilities on Gilman Drive between the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus and the Rose Canyon Bikeway near Interstate 5 (USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle: La Jolla). The approximately 1.8 miles long segment represents Segment 9 of the CRT Project Study Report.

## **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, Cultural Resources (Archaeology), and Tribal Cultural Resources**. Subsequent revisions in the project

proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V 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.

**B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS - PART II**

**Post Plan Check (After permit issuance/Prior to start of construction)**

**1. PRECONSTRUCTION (Precon) MEETING IS REQUIRED 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***

***Qualified Archaeologist***

***Qualified Native American Monitor***

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) #658793 and /or Environmental Document # 658793, 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.)

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 either copies of permits issued, letters of resolution issued by the Responsible Agency documenting compliance, or other evidence documenting compliance and deemed acceptable by the ADD Environmental Designee.

**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.

**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:

Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Precon Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to or at Preconstruction Meeting

Biological Resources	Biologist Limit of Work Verification	Limit of Work Inspection
Biological Resources	Biology Reports	Biology/Habitat Restoration Inspection
Archaeological Resources	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation
Tribal Cultural Resources	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology/Historic Site Observation
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

**C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS**

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

The following are measures to mitigate for direct impacts to sensitive upland habitat and City wetlands.

**BIO-1:** All direct permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive upland habitats and City wetlands will be mitigated consistent with City Guidelines.

- Direct impacts (permanent and temporary) to a total of 2.022 acres of Tier II sensitive upland habitats [*Artemisia californica* – *Salvia mellifera* Association, (Disturbed *Artemisia californica* – *Salvia mellifera* Association), *Salvia mellifera* – *Eriogonum fasciculatum*, (Disturbed *Salvia mellifera* – *Eriogonum fasciculatum* Association), and *Toxicodendron diversilobum* Shrubland Alliance] will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio for a total of 2.022 acres and mitigated offsite with the purchase of credits from the City of San Diego’s Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF) per San Diego Municipal Code § 143.0141(a)(1)(C). HAF monies are used to purchase lands within the MHPA and are collected by the City’s Facilities Financing Division. The City currently charges \$35,000 per acre purchased plus a 10% administration fee; however, note that the fee is revised periodically and may be different at time of payment than the amount noted herein.

- Direct impacts (permanent and temporary) to sensitive riparian habitats including 0.028-acre of *Quercus agrifolia* – *Salix lasiolepis* Association (southern riparian woodland) and 0.270-acre of *Salix lasiolepis* Association (southern riparian scrub) will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio for riparian woodland and a 2:1 ratio for riparian scrub for a total of 0.624-acre. Mitigation will occur offsite through allocation of credits at the City’s Stadium Mitigation Site. Permanent loss of riparian habitat under the jurisdiction of CDFW will be offset through allocation of rehabilitation credits. Temporary loss of riparian habitat under the jurisdiction of CDFW will be offset through the allocation of enhancement credits.

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY)**

Proposed open trenching in undisturbed soil outside of the developed right of way will require archaeological and Native American Monitoring.

### **CUL-1:**

#### **I. Prior to Permit Issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award**

##### **A. Entitlements Plan Check**

1. Prior to permit issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring have been noted on the applicable construction documents through the plan check process.

##### **B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD**

1. Prior to Bid Award, the applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). If applicable, individuals involved in the archaeological monitoring program must have completed the 40-hour HAZWOPER training with certification documentation.

2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project meet the qualifications established in the HRG.

3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain written approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

#### **II. Prior to Start of Construction**

##### **A. Verification of Records Search**

1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site-specific records search (quarter-mile radius) has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from South Coastal Information Center, or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.

2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.

3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the ¼ mile radius.

##### **B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings**

1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.

a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.

2. Acknowledgement of Responsibility for Curation (CIP or Other Public Projects)

The applicant shall submit a letter to MMC acknowledging their responsibility for the cost of curation associated with all phases of the archaeological monitoring program.

3. Identify Areas to be Monitored

Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.

The AME shall be based on the results of a site-specific records search as well as information regarding the age of existing pipelines, laterals and associated appurtenances and/or any known soil conditions (native or formation).

MMC shall notify the PI that the AME has been approved.

4. When Monitoring Will Occur

a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.

b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate conditions such as age of existing pipe to be replaced, depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

5. Approval of AME and Construction Schedule

After approval of the AME by MMC, the PI shall submit to MMC written authorization of the AME and Construction Schedule from the CM.

**III. During Construction**

A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching

1. The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.

2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.

3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSV). The CSV's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (Notification of Monitoring Completion), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

B. Discovery Notification Process

1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.

C. Determination of Significance

1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.
  - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.
  - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) and obtain written approval of the program from MMC, CM and RE. ADRP and any mitigation must be approved by MMC, RE and/or CM before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.
    - (1). Note: For pipeline trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, the PI shall implement the Discovery Process for Pipeline Trenching projects identified below under "D."
    - c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.
      - (1). Note: For Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if the deposit is limited in size, both in length and depth; the information value is limited and is not associated with any other resource; and there are no unique features/artifacts associated with the deposit, the discovery should be considered not significant.
      - (2). Note, for Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if significance cannot be determined, the Final Monitoring Report and Site Record (DPR Form 523A/B) shall identify the discovery as Potentially Significant.

D. Discovery Process for Significant Resources - Pipeline Trenching and other Linear Projects in the Public Right-of-Way

The following procedure constitutes adequate mitigation of a significant discovery encountered during pipeline trenching activities or for other linear project types within the Public Right-of-Way including but not limited to excavation for jacking pits, receiving pits, laterals, and manholes to reduce impacts to below a level of significance:

1. Procedures for documentation, curation and reporting
  - a. One hundred percent of the artifacts within the trench alignment and width shall be documented in-situ, to include photographic records, plan view of the trench and profiles of side walls, recovered, photographed after cleaning and analyzed and curated. The remainder of the deposit within the limits of excavation (trench walls) shall be left intact.



- b. The PI shall prepare a Draft Monitoring Report and submit to MMC via the RE as indicated in Section VI-A.
- c. The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) the resource(s) encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines. The DPR forms shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center for either a Primary Record or SDI Number and included in the Final Monitoring Report.
- d. The Final Monitoring Report shall include a recommendation for monitoring of any future work in the vicinity of the resource.

**IV. Discovery of Human Remains**

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:

A. Notification

- 1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.
- 2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.

B. Isolate discovery site

- 1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenience of the remains.
- 2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenience.
- 3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.

C. If Human Remains ARE determined to be Native American

- 1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, ONLY the Medical Examiner can make this call.
- 2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.
- 3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.
- 4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
- 5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:
  - a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission granted access to the site, OR;
  - b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to

the landowner, the landowner shall reinter the human remains and items associated with Native American human remains with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further and future subsurface disturbance, THEN

c. To protect these sites, the landowner shall do one or more of the following:

- (1) Record the site with the NAHC;
- (2) Record an open space or conservation easement; or
- (3) Record a document with the County. The document shall be titled "Notice of

Reinterment of Native American Remains" and shall include a legal description of the property, the name of the property owner, and the owner's acknowledged signature, in addition to any other information required by PRC 5097.98. The document shall be indexed as a notice under the name of the owner.

d. Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendants is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and items associated and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.

D. If Human Remains are NOT Native American

1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.

2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98).

3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.

#### **V. Night and/or Weekend Work**

A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract

1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.

2. The following procedures shall be followed.

a. No Discoveries

In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSV and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.

b. Discoveries

All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV - Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.

c. Potentially Significant Discoveries

If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV-Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.

- d. The PI shall immediately contact the RE and MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.
- B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
  - 1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
  - 2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

**VI. Post Construction**

- A. Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
  - 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines (Appendix C/D) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC via the RE for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring. It should be noted that if the PI is unable to submit the Draft Monitoring Report within the allotted 90-day timeframe as a result of delays with analysis, special study results or other complex issues, a schedule shall be submitted to MMC establishing agreed due dates and the provision for submittal of monthly status reports until this measure can be met.
    - a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program or Pipeline Trenching Discovery Process shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
    - b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation
      - The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.
  - 2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI via the RE for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
  - 3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC via the RE for approval.
  - 4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
  - 5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Artifacts
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
  - 2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
- C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification
  - 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
  - 2. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be

provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection C.

3. The PI shall submit the Accession Agreement and catalogue record(s) to the RE or BI, as appropriate for donor signature with a copy submitted to MMC.

4. The RE or BI, as appropriate shall obtain signature on the Accession Agreement and shall return to PI with copy submitted to MMC.

5. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.

D. Final Monitoring Report(s)

1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC of the approved report.

2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

### **TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-1 will reduce impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources to a less than significant level.

#### VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

#### Federal Government

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

#### State of California

State Clearinghouse

California Department of Fish and Wildlife

Caltrans District 11

#### City of San Diego

Public Notice Journal (144)

Councilmember LaCava, District 1

City Attorney's Office

Development Services Department

Sara Osborn, EAS

Catherine Rom, Project Management

Sam Johnson, MMC

Kreg Mills, Geology

Philip Lizzi, Planning

Hoss Florezabihi, Engineering

Ismail Elhamad, Transportation

Engineering and Capital Projects Department

Alejandra Gonzalez Nava, Associate Engineer

Karl Lintvedt, Associate Planner  
Jerry Jakubauskas, Senior Planner  
Rebecca Alvidrez, Biologist III  
Maya Mazon, Biologist III

Planning Department

Katie Winterspoon, Community Planner, University  
Marlon Pangilinan, Community Planner, La Jolla  
Dan Monroe, MSCP

University Community

UCSD Physical & Community Planning (277)  
University City Community Planning (480)  
The Guardian, UCSD (481)  
University City Community Association (486)

La Jolla Community

La Jolla Community Planning (275)  
La Jolla Village News (271)  
La Jolla Town Council - Land Use Committee (273)  
La Jolla Shores Association (272)  
La Jolla Historical Society (274)  
La Jolla Light (280)  
Patricia K. Miller (283)

Other Interested Parties

Sierra Club (165)  
San Diego Audubon Society (167)  
Mr. Jim Peugh (167A)  
California Native Plant Society (170)  
Endangered Habitats League (182A)  
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 9 (44)  
Wetland Advisory Board (171)  
Historical Resources Board (87)  
Carmen Lucas (206)  
South Coastal Information Center (210)  
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)  
Save Our Heritage Organisation (214)  
Ron Christman (215)  
Clint Linton (215B)  
Frank Brown – Inter-Tribal Cultural Resources Council (216)  
Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)  
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218)  
Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)  
Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)  
Native American Distribution (225 A-S)  
Native American Heritage Commission (222)  
Richard Drury

Komalpreet Toor  
Stacey Osborne  
John Stump  
LJCPA Traffic & Transportation  
UCSD Planning  
BikeSD  
SD Bike Coalition  
Larry Andrews  
Dave Strom

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.

*Sara Osborn*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sara Osborn  
Senior Planner  
Development Services Department

6/3/2021  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Draft Report

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Final Report

Analyst: Sara Osborn

- Attachments:
1. Initial Study Checklist
  2. Location Map

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Coastal Rail Trail SDP / 644885
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: Sara Osborn / (619) 446-5381
4. Project location: An approximately 1.8-mile-long segment of Gilman Drive between La Jolla Village Drive and Interstate 5 within both the La Jolla and University Community Planning Areas in Council District 1. (USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle: La Jolla)
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Alejandra Gonzalez Nava, Associate Engineer, City of San Diego Engineering and Capital Projects, 525 B Street, San Diego, CA 92101
6. General/Community Plan designation: Right of Way, Residential, Open Space
7. Zoning: Right of Way along RM-1-1; RM-3-7; CO-1-2; LJSPD-SF
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 City of San Diego (City) proposes to construct the an approximately 1.8 mile long segment of the Coastal Rail Trail bicycle facilities located on Gilman Drive between the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus and the Rose Canyon Bikeway within both the La Jolla and University Community Planning Areas (USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle: La Jolla). It is approximately 1.8 miles long, and represents Segment 9 of the CRT Project Study Report. Natural open space is present on steep, eroded slopes (15% to 45%), and in a drainage that parallels Gilman Drive from Via Alicante to the I-5 freeway (at the base of the slope along the east side of the roadway). The site is located within and adjacent to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan.

The proposed project includes a one-way protected cycle track on each side of Gilman Drive and a continuous sidewalk on the west side of Gilman Drive over a project distance of approximately 8,800 linear feet. The cycle track will be separated from vehicular traffic by a raised median, striping, flexible posts, on-street parking, or other physical barrier. To accommodate the cycle tracks, the project would include roadway widenings on the west side of Gilman Drive from Villa La Jolla Drive southerly to an existing private driveway (an approximate distance of 3,000 linear feet). Roadway widenings would occur on the east side of Gilman Drive from Via Alicante to the Interstate 5 (I-5) southbound off-ramp (an approximate distance of 4,500 linear feet) along with construction of a 2-foot recovery slope adjacent to the cycle track along portions of the natural area from Via Alicante to I-5. In addition to roadway widening, the project includes roadway re-striping, street lighting, landscaping, retaining walls, drainage improvements, bus stop improvements and traffic signal modifications. The existing

traffic signals at I-5, Via Alicante and Villa La Jolla Drive would be modified to work in conjunction with the proposed improvements.

Retaining walls would be required on the west side of Gilman Drive from just north of Villa La Jolla Drive to Via Alicante (an approximate distance of 1,054 LF) and from a point south of Via Alicante to a private driveway at La Jolla Hideaway private apartments (an approximate distance of 1,120 LF). The walls would range from heights between three and seven feet.

A new sidewalk would be constructed along the west side of Gilman Drive to connect existing sidewalk segments and create a continuous sidewalk along the entire west side. The sidewalks would be directly next to the proposed retaining walls. The sidewalks on the east side of Gilman Drive north of Via Alicante to La Jolla Village Drive would remain in place, and a new sidewalk would not be constructed on the east side of Gilman Drive south of Via Alicante.

Parallel parking would be protected along both sides of Gilman Drive most of the length between the La Jolla Village Drive ramps and Villa La Jolla Drive, and on the east side, south to Via Alicante. Additional parallel parking would be provided along the west side near the existing apartments and private driveways along the southern portion of the project. The parking spaces would be part of the buffer between the cycle track and vehicular traffic. In these areas, the raised buffer would not be constructed, rather, the cycle track and parking would be separated by a striped buffer.

Street lighting would be provided along Gilman Drive along the length of the project. The lighting would be installed per City of San Diego street lighting standards, with light standards on both sides of the street at 300-foot intervals. The lighting would be fully shielded to not shine in adjacent houses or open space areas, and would conform to dark sky glare reduction standards as well.

Existing storm drains within open space are undersized and have failed causing erosion. The storm drains are subject to improvements and will include the construction of: curb and gutters, curb inlets, cleanouts, storm drains, and brow ditches in order to comply with the City's Region MS4 Permit, and the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards BMP Design Manual dated 2018 at the preparation of this report.

A raised curb buffer would be placed on either side of the bus stop passenger waiting area. The bus stops on the west (southbound) side of Gilman Drive would remain at the sidewalk, and busses would pull into the cycle track area to pick up passengers.

Green paint and striping would highlight the cycle track at intersections and bus stops. Raised buffers also would be constructed on either side of driveway intersections where the cycle track is separated from driving lanes by painted stripes. The traffic signals at Villa La Jolla would be shifted to accommodate the project, and a new traffic signal would be added at La Jolla Village Drive.

Acquisition of additional roadway right-of-way (ROW) is required from several parcels east of Gilman Drive, south of Via Alicante, and temporary construction easements are required for several parcels for slope grading and retaining wall construction.



9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The site is located along Gilman Drive in an urban area of multifamily housing south of the University of California, San Diego (UCSD) campus. Natural open space is present on steep, eroded slopes (15% to 45%), and in a drainage that parallels Gilman Drive from Via Alicante to the I-5 freeway (at the base of the slope along the east side of the roadway). The site is located within and adjacent to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan. Much of the landscape has been altered by urban development.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

The City is the project Lead Agency under CEQA. In its role as Lead Agency, the City is responsible for ensuring the adequacy of this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. Caltrans, on behalf of the Federal Highway Administration, is the Lead Agency under the National Environmental Policy Act and requires preparation of a Natural Environment Study (NES). Additionally, a LSA permit was administered through the California Dept of Fish & Wildlife.

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?

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.

The Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, Jamul Indian Village and the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians all requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. The City of San Diego sent notification to these three Native American Tribes on January 21, 2021. The Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel requested more information which was provided, and consultation closed on March 22, 2021. No response was received from the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians or Jamul Indian Village within the 60-day period to request consultation and additional information. Jamul Indian Village responded concurring with the mitigation on April 12, 2021. Please see Section XVIII(b) of the Initial Study for more information regarding the consultation.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/>            | Mineral Resources               | <input checked="" 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?

Pursuant to the City’s Thresholds, projects that block public views from designated open space areas, roads, or scenic vistas to significant visual landmarks may result in significant impacts. A scenic vista is generally defined as a public viewpoint that provides expansive or notable views of a highly valued landscape and are typically identified in planning documents, such as a community plan, but can also include locally known areas or locations where high-quality public views are available. Gilman Drive bounds University and La Jolla and is a primary road to access both communities.

Along the University community, Gilman Drive is located adjacent to private open space along the east side of the street between Via Alicante and I-5. The slopes on the east side of Gilman Drive are preserved as open space by easement and provide a scenic entrance to this part of the community from I-5. Most of the bike path project would utilize the existing right of way, however, encroachment into the eastern open space will require some grading or vegetation removal. Since revegetation of this area is proposed the project would not substantially change the existing visual character of this private open space area.

The north west portion of the project along Gilman Drive is located within the La Jolla community and will include construction of retaining walls varying in height. The project proposes approximately 2200 linear feet of retaining walls with an average of 10 feet tall along Gilman Drive which will be visible to the public. The walls will allow for the right of way to be widened and will exceed the significance threshold of retaining walls greater than six feet in height and 50 feet in length at some locations. The walls will be sand colored faux-rock soil-nail walls to blend in with the natural soil colors of the hillside and undulate with the slope.

The project is not located within, nor would it obstruct, a designated scenic vista, view corridor, or gateway identified within the University Community Plan or the La Jolla Community Plan. The open space area within the project boundaries are not designated as a significant public resource. Despite the private open space not being identified as a scenic vista, public views of the open space would not be affected by the project. Therefore, project implementation would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and 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?

As noted above in I(a) pursuant to the City’s Thresholds, projects that block public views from designated open space areas, roads, or scenic vistas to significant visual landmarks may result in significant impacts. State Scenic Highways are considered scenic vistas due to the visual attributes and resources that comprise their designation.

There are no designated State Scenic Highways with views to Gilman Drive and the improvements include right of way improvements for active transportation uses. Therefore, the project would not

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

substantially damage or block views of scenic resources, including those along a State Scenic Highway. No impacts would occur.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 and 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, historic 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.

Implementation of the project involves right of way improvements for active transportation uses and includes retaining walls and drainage improvements. Some vegetation removal would be required along the alignment but the removal would not substantially alter the visual character of Gilman Drive or the open space. The north west portion of the project will include construction of retaining walls varying in height with an average of 10 feet tall, with some points extending to 17 feet. The project proposes approximately 2200 linear feet of retaining walls along Gilman Drive that will be visible to the public and are on the northern portion of the project, further from the open space area, adjacent to multifamily residences. Three-strand tension cable railings approximately three feet high would be installed at the top of each wall. The cables would be strung between metal posts spaced between four and ten feet apart. All the metal components of the railing would be stained with a rust-brown patina finish. The walls will exceed the significance threshold of retaining walls greater than six feet in height and 50 feet in length at some locations. The location where the soil nail walls are to be constructed consist primarily of exposed light-tan soil where the slope was previously cut in order to construct the existing roadway, and sparse to thick growth of non-native, light-colored grasses and chaparral at the top of the cut slopes. Native shrubs are located higher up the slope above the exiting slope cuts. The soil nail walls would have a textured faux rock finish and modeled earth-tone coloring to blend with the surrounding environment.

The treatment of the crib walls would be earth tone color to blend with the surrounding hillside with a faux rock finish and reduce impacts through design and materials. The project is in an area where there is adjacent development and the project would be visually compatible with the existing character. A Visual Impact Assessment was prepared for the project by KTUA Planning and Landscape Architecture and includes visual simulations of the project and retaining walls. The visual simulations show that the retaining walls are designed with wall texturing and earth-tone coloring to

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

blend with the natural environment and that the native plantings would soften the appearance of the retaining walls and mimic existing conditions, thereby reducing the potential for a visual impact.

The project is also within a 2035 Transit Priority Area. Pursuant to CEQA Statue Section 21099 (d)(1) aesthetic impacts related to projects located on infill sites within a Transit Priority Area (TPA) shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, it was determined that the project would result in a less than significant impact to the visual character, and the walls would not substantially degrade the existing visual quality of the site and its surroundings.

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

According to the City's Thresholds, a project may have a significant light and glare impact if a 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.

The street lighting along Gilman Drive currently is mostly concentrated near existing residential areas, and most of the roadway is dark. Street lighting would be provided along Gilman Drive along the length of the project. The lighting would be installed per City of San Diego street lighting standards, with light standards on both sides of the street at 300-foot intervals. The lighting would be fully shielded to avoid shining into adjacent houses or open space areas and would also conform to dark sky glare reduction standards. The project, therefore, is not proposing lighting that would create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts related to light and glare 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

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

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.

According to the CDC's California Important Farmland Finder (CDC 2016), the project does not contain any Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. Agricultural land is not present on the site or in the general vicinity. As a result, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No impacts would occur.

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

Refer to response II (a), above. There are no Williamson Act Contract lands on or within the vicinity of the project. The project is consistent with the existing land use and circulation of the community plans. The project would not conflict with any properties zoned for agricultural use or be affected by a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, no impacts would result.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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. No designated forest land or timberland occur onsite as the project is consistent with the community plan, and the underlying zone. No impacts would result.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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. Additionally, the project would not contribute to the conversion of any forested land to non-forest use, as surrounding properties are developed, and land uses are generally built out. No impacts would result.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 response II (a) and II (c), above. The project and surrounding areas do not contain Farmlands or forest land. No changes to any such lands would result from project implementation. Therefore, no impact would result.

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"/>

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.

The RAQS relies on SANDAG growth projections based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by the cities and by 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 be in conflict with the RAQS and may contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on air quality.

The project would improve an existing roadway in accordance with current City standards in order to provide a one-way protected cycle track on each side of Gilman Drive and a continuous sidewalk on the west side of Gilman Drive. No additional traffic lanes would be constructed, and the project would not generate additional vehicular trips to this road once constructed.

In addition, the contractor would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) specifications as required in the City's "Whitebook" during construction. Typical dust suppression BMPs would consist of watering for dust abatement, which would further reduce dust emissions by 75%. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to criteria pollutants.

The project would be consistent with the circulation elements of the community plans; therefore, planned development of an active transportation facility along Gilman Drive is considered to be anticipated in the SIP and RAQS. Because the project does not conflict with adopted land uses, the project is considered anticipated in local air quality plans, 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 result.

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



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

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions

Construction-related activities are temporary, short-term sources of air emissions. Sources of construction-related air emissions include fugitive dust from grading activities; construction equipment exhaust; construction-related trips by workers, delivery trucks, and material-hauling trucks; and construction-related power consumption.

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 offsite.

Fugitive dust emissions are generally associated with land-clearing and grading operations. The contractor would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) specifications as required in the City’s “Whitebook” during construction. Typical dust suppression BMPs would consist of watering for dust abatement, which would further reduce dust emissions by 75%. Thus, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact with respect to criteria pollutants. No mitigation measures are required.

Long-Term (Operational) Emissions

Long-term air emission impacts are those associated with stationary sources and mobile sources related to any change caused by a project. By providing a transportation alternative that connects the regional Coastal Rail Trail to the University and uses along and near Gilman Drive, there is the potential for the project to reduce vehicle miles traveled and contribute to improved air quality. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and is permitted by the community plan and zone designation. Operation of the cycle track and sidewalk are not anticipated to contribute to emissions over the long-term and are not anticipated to violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

- 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)?

As described in III (b) above, construction operations could temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants. However, construction emissions would be temporary and short-term in duration; implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is a nonattainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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 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 would be less than significant.

Long-term (Operational)

Typical long-term operational characteristics of the project are not associated with the creation of such odors nor anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number of people. Active transportation improvements, in the long-term operation, are not associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number or people. Therefore, project operations would result in less than significant impacts.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

As detailed in the Biological Technical Report (City of San Diego, 2020), of the 78 special status flora with a potential to occur within the BSA, 32 species are considered covered under the MSCP and/or narrow endemics. One MSCP-covered species was observed within the BSA (Torrey Pine), but occurred outside of the Project impact area. One special status flora, Palmer’s sagewort (*Artemisia palmeri*), would be directly impacted by implementation of the Project. Of the 38 special status fauna species with a potential to occur within the BSA, 11 species are considered covered under the MSCP. One MSCP-covered species, Coastal California Gnatcatcher, would be directly impacted by permanent loss of occupied habitat by implementation of the Project.

Palmer’s sagewort

Palmer’s sagewort is not an MSCP-Covered species. Approximately 50 individuals have been mapped within the BSA within the western floodplain of the drainage that runs parallel and adjacent to Gilman Drive. Project implementation will directly impact 18 individuals found within the grading

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

limits. Removal of 18 individuals will not impact the overall population within the BSA and will not significantly impact this species overall. Mitigation is not required.

California Gnatcatcher

Coastal California Gnatcatcher a federal-listed threatened and MSCP-Covered species; thus, take of this species is allowed for projects that comply with the City’s MSCP implementing regulations. The following is the MSCP condition of coverage for this species (Subarea Plan Appendix A):

*Area specific management directives must include measures to reduce edge effects and minimize disturbance during the nesting period, fire protection measures to reduce the potential for habitat degradation due to unplanned fire, and management measures to maintain or improve habitat quality including vegetation structure. No clearing of occupied habitat within the cities’ MHPAs and within the County’s Biological Resource Core Areas may occur between March 1 and August 15.*

Direct impacts to occupied CAGN habitat within the MHPA are anticipated but will not significantly impact the species population in the region. To avoid impacts to the species, habitat would not be cleared during the nesting season, or protocol surveys would be conducted to determine the presence/absent within occupied habitat. No occupied habitat would be removed during the nesting season. Areas where vegetation have been removed will be revegetated per the City Landscape Standards to coastal sage scrub habitat following construction, and are anticipated to improve habitat quality so long-term impacts to the species is not anticipated. The location of impacts will avoid edge effects and the expanse of adjacent habitat will ensure that the individuals have access to ample territory for foraging and nesting while the temporarily impacted areas undergo revegetation. Project implementation has the potential to have indirect effects on CAGN resulting from construction noise during the breeding season. Compliance with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines and implementation of avoidance and minimization measures identified in the BTR will ensure that impacts are avoided. Therefore, significant impacts to the species and to the overall population are not anticipated, and mitigation is not required.

- 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?
 

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

The proposed Project would result in impacts to Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL), which include wetland habitat (consisting of native wetland and riparian habitat, including Southern Riparian Woodland and Southern Riparian Scrub at the project site), and Tier II habitat (consisting of native upland vegetation, including Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub and Coastal Sage-Chaparral Transition at the project site).

Permanent impacts to wetland habitat include removal of riparian scrub and riparian woodland vegetation located within an unnamed drainage to the east of Gilman Drive. The drainage contains USACE, RWQCB, and CDFW jurisdictional waters (bed and bank, wetlands, ordinary high-water mark) that are near the project site, but not within its impact area. Although the hydrologic function (stream flow) of the jurisdictional water feature would not be impacted by the project, the feature is

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

associated with an area of riparian habitat that is considered wetlands under the City's Land Development Code Biology Guidelines. Project implementation would partially remove and therefore directly impact this City & CDFW jurisdictional wetland/riparian habitat.

Permanent impacts to Tier II upland habitat include the replacement of vegetation located along the edge of the existing Gilman Drive roadway with new impervious road surface, which would result in a direct loss of habitat. The Project would also include grading beyond the limits of the new road surface, but because habitat impacted by grading has the potential for recovery through revegetation, these impacts to habitat are considered temporary, not permanent. However, for the purposes of determining the compensatory mitigation required for impacts, the Land Use Development Code (Biology Guidelines) does not distinguish between direct permanent and direct temporary impacts to vegetation, and so mitigation is required for direct impacts regardless of whether the loss of vegetation is permanent or temporary.

The impacts to ESL would be considered a substantially adverse effect. In order to avoid a significant impact to biological resources, mitigation is required (MM-Bio-1: Compensatory Mitigation). MM-Bio-1 states that all direct permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive upland habitats and City wetlands will be mitigated consistent with City Guidelines.

Direct impacts to wetland habitat total 0.298 acres (consisting of 0.102 acre inside the MHPA, and 0.196 acre outside the MHPA) and will be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio for the Southern Riparian Woodland and a 2:1 ratio for the Southern Riparian Scrub, for a total of 0.624 acre of mitigation. Mitigation will occur offsite through allocation of credits at the City's Stadium Mitigation Site. Permanent loss of riparian habitat under the jurisdiction of CDFW will be offset through allocation of rehabilitation credits. Temporary loss of riparian habitat under the jurisdiction of CDFW will be offset through the allocation of enhancement credits. Impacts to the riparian habitat associated with the CDFW jurisdictional water feature will also require a Streambed Alteration Agreement.

Direct impacts to Tier II habitat total 2.022 acres, consisting of 0.257 acre inside the MHPA, and 1.765 acre outside the MHPA. These impacts will be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio for a total of 2.022 acres of mitigation. Mitigation for impacts to upland habitat will be implemented through monetary compensation into the City of San Diego's Habitat Acquisition Fund (HAF). Mitigation into the HAF for this Project is necessary and would be appropriate as pockets of ESL within the BSA are isolated and surrounded by Urban/Developed areas, mainly residential housing. There is no connectivity to existing Open Space or other natural areas that would provide wildlife corridors or habitat connectivity. These areas provide minimal habitat quality for special status or MSCP-Covered species. In addition, on-site mitigation within the MHPA would not be feasible for this Project, because of the existing privately-owned conservation easement associated with this land.

Temporary construction impacts will be revegetated through a 25-month revegetation plan, wherein non-native dominated areas will be revegetated with native upland species, resulting in an overall increase in native habitat at the project site. In addition, implementation of avoidance measures during construction will ensure further impacts to ESL are avoided.

Mitigation Measure MM-Bio-1 (BTR 6.1.1 Compensatory Mitigation) detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration would be implemented to reduce impacts related to Biological Resources to below a level of significance.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please see IV(a).

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The Project area is not identified as a regional wildlife corridor by the MSCP. Natural habitat areas adjacent to Gilman Drive are surrounded by extremely dense residential development. There is limited connectivity with the open space areas of Rose Canyon and Mt. Soledad located to the south. To the west, the nearby I-5 corridor (roadway, ROW fencing, and non-native landscaping) creates an effective barrier to a majority of terrestrial wildlife movement. However, avian species with adequate dispersal capabilities are unlikely to be constrained by the barrier between Gilman Drive and Rose Canyon. The stream parallel to Gilman Drive flows via a culvert underneath the I-5 corridor and into Rose Canyon Creek. Small mammals may use this culvert for movement; however, culvert length may be a deterrent to these small prey species. Connectivity from the project site to Mt. Soledad is equally as constrained where residential housing and La Jolla Parkway divides the available habitat at Mt. Soledad, and in the southwest portion of the project site.

The proposed project does not add any additional barriers or structures that would interfere with wildlife movement or impede the use of nursery sites. Although the project does propose to construct a fence at the top of the two-foot recovery slope adjacent to the cycle track on the east side of Gilman Drive and parallel to the natural habitats within the drainage, installation of the fence is a public safety measure intended to prevent encroachment into the natural areas by the public. Therefore, impacts resulting from the project's interference with the movement of native resident or migratory fish and wildlife species within their corridors, or the use of native wildlife nursery sites, would be less than significant.

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

The majority of the project site is located within urban areas, including the existing Gilman Drive ROW, as well as adjacent natural areas located within and outside of the MSCP Subarea Plan MHPA. Natural areas within the project site have potential to support nests for common avian species. Protection of avian species is required under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and/or the California Fish and Game Code (§3503) under which it is unlawful to "take, possess, or needlessly destroy" avian nests or eggs. Any minor vegetation removal or trimming of vegetation that has the potential to

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

support active nests during the nesting season (January 15 to September 15) would require standard nest protection measures, as outlined in Pre-Construction Avoidance and Minimization Measure AMM-1 of the Biological Technical Report (BTR) (City of San Diego, 2020). The nesting season timeframe includes nesting for raptor species which starts as on January 15. Project activities within the MHPA are restricted to outside of the nesting season, as outlined in AMM-1 and AMM-4 in the BTR.

The MSCP Subarea Plan (City 1997), City Land Development Code (LDC) Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations, and Biology Guidelines (City 2018), require that impacts to wetlands shall be avoided, and that a sufficient wetland buffer shall be maintained to protect the functions and values of wetland resources. Wetland deviations outside the Coastal Overlay Zone may be granted if it meets certain criteria including Essential Public Projects (EPP), (2) Economic Viability, or (3) Biologically Superior Option. Deviations from wetland requirements in Environmentally Sensitive Lands were considered under the EPP Option. The proposed project qualifies as an Essential Public Project, as it would service the community at large and not just a single development project or property, and is essential in both location and need. The Gilman Drive segment is essential to the larger CRT project and the goal of meeting future projected multi-use trail needs in the region. The proposed project aims to develop a new cycle track within the designated existing ROW (Gilman Drive). The proposed project and two alternatives were considered and analyzed in the BTR. It should be noted that there are no feasible alternatives that could relocate the Gilman Drive segment outside of the current alignment. All options propose minimum standard roadway lane widths to reduce the roadway/cycle track footprint and reduce impacts into the sensitive habitat. The alternatives analyzed consider the design constraints and various options to reduce grading and impacts required for the cycle track construction. The Preferred Option was chosen as the proposed project. This will result in no long-term net loss of habitat in association with temporary impacts. In addition, significant impacts will be mitigated at the Stadium Mitigation Site, which is a larger contiguous wetland with higher restoration value which is further discussed in in IV(b) above. The proposed project is consistent with the City's MSCP Subarea Plan.

Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the requirements of any local, regional, or state conservation plans including the City's MSCP Subarea Plan and impacts would be less than significant.

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

Please see IV(e).

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

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the

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

historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises. Before approving discretionary projects, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

The proposed project consists of the development of the Gilman Drive segment of the Coastal Rail Trail. The proposed project includes a one-way protected cycle track on each side of Gilman Drive and a continuous sidewalk on the west side of Gilman Drive over a project distance of approximately 8,800 linear feet. The Area of Potential Effects (APE) was established as approximately 25.8 acres, within which, direct impacts of project construction, including staging and other ancillary areas, may have an effect on cultural resources. All potential impacts were considered to be direct, as no historical built environment buildings or structures are in proximity to the APE. The APE is linear improvements at the northern end and the new bridge and staging/ancillary areas are the blade portion to the south. The vertical extent of the APE is anticipated to extend to 3 feet along the east side of Gilman Drive. On the west side of the road, grading cuts are anticipated to be up to 10 feet in depth.

The Historic Property Survey Report and Archaeological Survey Report conducted by AECOM for this project performed a search for archaeological and historical records of the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) of the California Historical Resources Inventory System (CHRIS) on February 19, 2018. The record search covered a one-mile radius around the APE boundaries. The record search determined that there are no previously recorded cultural resources within the APE. However, seventy-two cultural resources were previously identified and documented within a one-mile radius of the APE. Previously, 239 cultural resources investigations have been completed within a one-mile radius of the APE. Of these, 14 studies included a portion of the APE.

Additional information was provided within the APE regarding the El Camino Real Mission Bell Markers that exist along Gilman Drive. The letter report, *El Camino Real Mission Bell Markers/Guide Posts along the Coastal Rail Trail - Gilman Drive Segment*, prepared by RECON, identified two Mission Bell Markers along Gilman Drive. The report recommends the bell markers be preserved. Although the markers are located within the project area, they will not be relocated or moved. The Site Plan has identified preserving the bell markers in place.

The project site is located within a high sensitivity area and would alter more than 2,000 cubic yards of earth per graded acre by either excavation or fill. According to the Archaeological Survey Report, the archival research and field survey performed for the project found no archaeological resources within the project area, nor have any cultural resources or Native American traditional properties been identified within the area. Although the report concluded that no direct or indirect impacts to known cultural resources will occur, archaeological monitoring along with a Native American monitor will be required because of the amount of earth work proposed along a large linear area within a sensitive area.

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

Archaeological monitoring would be required during grading for the project. Monitoring would be performed by qualified archaeologists and a Native American monitor to ensure that no significant impacts to cultural resources occur during construction. Due to the scope of work in this location, impacts to any unknown resources buried beneath the surface could rise to a level of significance, according to the City of San Diego’s Cultural Resources Guidelines. As such, an archaeological and Native American monitor must be present during all grading activities in order to reduce any potential impacts to a level below significance. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration would be implemented to reduce impacts related to Historical Resources (archaeology) to below a level of significance.

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

Please see V(a).

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

Earthwork tabulations for total excavation (cut) is anticipated to be 2200 cubic yards with grading cuts anticipated to be up to 10 feet in depth. The Geotechnical Report describes the site as containing fill, Young Alluvial flood-plain deposits and the Tertiary Ardath Shale (Kennedy and Tan 2007). Per the City of San Diego’s Significance Determination Thresholds Ardath Shale formation has high paleontological sensitivity in this area of the city.

San Diego Municipal Code Section 142.0501 (Paleontological Resources Requirements for Grading Activities) requires paleontological monitoring for grading that involves 1,000 cubic yards or greater and 10 feet or greater in depth, in a High Resource Potential Geologic Deposit/Formation/Rock Unit, grading on a fossil recovery site. The project exceeds this threshold and monitoring will be required through conditions of approval. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant.

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

Refer to response V (a) above. No human remains have been recorded within the study area. Therefore, no human remains are anticipated to be discovered. However, Section V of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program contains provisions for the discovery of human remains. 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. Based upon the required mitigation measure impacts would be less than significant.



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

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

The project would be required to meet mandatory energy standards of the current California energy code. Construction would require operation of heavy equipment but would be temporary and short-term in duration. Additionally, long-term energy usage is not anticipated. The project is primarily an active transportation facility with improved bike lanes and sidewalks connecting to the regional coastal rail trail to encourage alternative mobility options to vehicular travel. Development of the project would not result in a significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Impacts would remain less than significant.

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

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the University and La Jolla Community Plans for an improved bicycle network and the project would not obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impacts would result.

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"/> |

SCST, Inc. prepared a Geotechnical Investigation for the Coastal Rail Trail at Gilman Drive project (October 17, 2018) and the project is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Zone. The closest known active fault is the Rose Canyon fault zone located about 1 mile (1.5 km) west-southwest of the site. The site is not located in an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. No active faults are known to underlie or project toward the site. Therefore, the probability of fault rupture is low. The project would be required to comply with the seismic requirements of the California Building Code. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

- |                                    |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <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 site is located within a seismically active Southern California region, and is potentially subject to moderate to strong seismic ground shaking along major earthquake faults. Seismic shaking at the site could be generated by any number of known active and potentially active faults in the region. The closest known active fault is the Rose Canyon fault zone located about 1 mile (1.5 km) west-southwest of the site. According to Geotechnical Investigation, the *City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study* map (2008) identifies the Geologic Hazard Categories within the project area to include Category 12 (potentially active faults), 25 (Ardath Shale with neutral or favorable geologic structure), 26 (Ardath Shale with unfavorable geologic structure), and 32 (low potential for liquefaction).

The main geotechnical considerations affecting the proposed construction are the presence of potentially compressible soils, expansive soils, cut/fill transitions, potentially active faults, and difficult excavations in the Ardath Shale Formation. The geotechnical Investigation recommends the geotechnical engineer review project plans and specifications prior to bidding and construction, and observations and tests be performed during construction. The project would be required to comply with seismic requirements of the California Building Code, utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified by the City Engineer, in order to ensure that potential impacts based on regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

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

According to the Geotechnical Investigation (October 17, 2018) liquefaction occurs when loose, saturated, generally fine sands and silts are subjected to strong ground shaking. The soils lose shear strength and become liquid, potentially resulting in large total and differential ground surface settlements as well as possible lateral spreading during an earthquake. Due to the lack of shallow groundwater, and given the relatively dense nature of the materials beneath the site, the potential for liquefaction and dynamic settlement to occur is considered negligible.

The project would be required to comply with the California Building Code that would reduce impacts to people or structures to an acceptable level of risk. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified by the City Engineer, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

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

Evidence of landslides or slope instabilities was not observed according to the Geotechnical Investigation (October 17, 2018). However, the site is located in an area designated as containing unfavorable geologic structure within the Ardath Shale (Zone 26). The potential for landslides or slope instabilities to occur at the site is considered to be moderate. The geotechnical Investigation recommends the geotechnical engineer review project plans and specifications prior to bidding and construction, and observations and tests be performed during construction. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified by the City Engineer, would ensure that the potential for impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Demolition and construction activities would temporarily expose soils to increased erosion potential. The project would be required to comply with the City's Storm Water Standards which requires the implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs). Grading activities within the site would be required to comply with the City of San Diego Grading Ordinance as well as the Storm Water Standards, which would ensure soil erosion and topsoil loss is minimized to less than significant levels. Furthermore, permanent storm water BMPs would also be required postconstruction consistent with the City's regulations, along with landscape regulations. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified by the City Engineer would ensure that the potential for impacts would be reduced. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soils erosion or loss of topsoil. 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

As discussed in Section VII (a) and VII (b), the project site is not likely to be subject to liquefaction and subsidence, and the potential for landslides is moderate. The project consists of constructing a cycle track and sidewalks which require retaining walls and associated right of way improvements. The project design would be required to comply with the requirements of the California Building Code, ensuring hazards associated with expansive soils would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. As such, impacts are expected to be less than significant.

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

According to the Geotechnical Investigation, based on the soil types encountered during field investigation, the on-site soils are expected to have a low to medium potential for expansion. The project would be required to comply with seismic requirements of the California Building Code that would reduce impacts to people or structures due to local seismic events to an acceptable level of risk. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified by the City Engineer, would ensure that the potential for impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project site is located within an area that is already developed with existing infrastructure (i.e., water and sewer lines) and does not propose a septic system. In addition, the project does not

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

require the construction of any new facilities as it relates to wastewater, as services are available to serve the project. No impact 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) outlines the actions that the City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of State greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions. A CAP Consistency Checklist is part of the CAP and contains measures that are required to be implemented on a project-by-project basis to ensure that the specified emission targets identified in the CAP are achieved. The project is consistent with the General Plan and the La Jolla Community Plan's land use and zoning designations. Further, based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist, the project is consistent with the applicable strategies and actions of the CAP.

The project does not result in new occupancy of buildings from which GHG emissions reductions could be achieved, therefore, Step 2 of the Checklist is not required to be completed per footnote 5. Based on the project's consistency with the City's CAP Checklist, the project's contribution of GHG's to cumulative statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the projects direct and cumulative GHG emissions would have a less than significant impact.

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

The project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses. Refer to VIII. a). Because the project does not conflict with or obstruct the Climate Action Plan, no impact would occur. Therefore, the project is consistent with the assumptions for relevant CAP strategies toward achieving the identified GHG reduction targets. Impacts are considered 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Construction of the project may require the use of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.), which would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal. 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. Once constructed, due to the nature of the project, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous

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

materials on or through the subject site is not anticipated. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Coastal Rail Trail - Gilman Drive Segment Project (AECOM, June 2018) prepared for the project observed no visual evidence of hazardous materials storage aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), underground storage tanks (e.g., vent pipes, fill ports), water wells, monitoring wells, dry wells, clarifiers, septic tanks, or leach fields. The site is located in an urban area consisting primarily of apartments and single-family homes, as well as some commercial properties. Gasoline service stations and dry cleaners were not observed in the immediate vicinity (i.e., 500 feet) of the site. Off-site sources of concern were not identified in the immediate vicinity. Additionally, groundwater was not encountered at depths up to approximately 60 feet below ground surface during a geotechnical investigation conducted along Gilman Drive. Furthermore, based on the available information, no off-site groundwater contaminant plumes were identified during this investigation, and therefore groundwater is not expected to represent an environmental concern to the project.

Based on the age of the original construction of Gilman Drive, the Phase I report concluded a limited subsurface investigation (Phase II Site Investigation) within the proposed project area will be conducted prior to construction plans and documents. This will determine the presence or absence of ADL in shallow soil at the site or lead-based paint from the yellow stripping. As part of the subsurface investigation, a health and safety plan will be completed prior to commencing field activities. Additionally, in the event that construction activities encounter underground contamination, the contractor would be required to implement section 7-22 of the City's "Whitebook" for "Encountering Or Releasing Hazardous Substances" of the City of San Diego Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction which is included in all construction documents and would ensure the proper handling and disposal of any contaminated soils in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations. Compliance with these requirements would minimize the risk to the public and the environment; therefore, impacts would remain 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The University of California at San Diego campus is within one-quarter mile from the project site, located north of the project area. As identified in response IX (a) above, construction of the project may require the use of hazardous materials (fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.), which would require proper storage, handling, use, and disposal; however, the project would not routinely transport, use, or dispose of hazardous materials, nor would the project emit hazardous materials that would affect

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

the nearby school. Therefore, impacts associated with hazardous emissions would be less than significant.

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

A search of potential hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 was completed for the project site. Several databases and resources were consulted including the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, the California State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database, and other sources of potential hazardous materials sites available on the California EPA website. The records search identified that no hazardous waste sites exist onsite. The University of California at San Diego campus which is north of the site is an identified closed LUST Cleanup Site (T0607399190) as of January 22, 2010. As mentioned above in IX. b), the City of San Diego Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction which is included in all construction documents would ensure the proper handling and disposal of any contaminated soils in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations. Compliance with these requirements would minimize the risk to the public and the environment. Therefore, implementation of the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 proposed project is located within the MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan – Review Area 2. The project is a roadway improvement to provide greater bicycling and pedestrian safety through the installation of a cycle track and sidewalks and associated improvements. The project would not constitute a hazard or obstruction to air navigation and would not create a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area. No impacts would result.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip, nor would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. 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 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 improve the roadway by expanding the width of the existing roadway and provide for a cycle track, new sidewalks and associated improvements. Therefore, the project would have no direct impacts with the implementation of or physical interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Implementation of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) would be required to address any indirect traffic-related issues associated with the project as a result of construction. Vehicle movement would be managed in either direction by construction crew personnel, and would be modified as necessary to allow expedited access for emergency vehicles and/or emergency evacuation from the area. In the unlikely event of a natural disaster, all construction vehicles and materials would be moved in order to allow for vehicular access thru or away from the project site. Given the implementation of the TCP, the project would not significantly impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

The project is to construct a cycle track and associated roadway improvements and is located within a developed urbanized area. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires because the project is not adjacent to any wildlands. Further discussion can be found in the Wildfire Section XX below. Any impacts would be less than significant.

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

A City of San Diego Stormwater Requirements Applicability Checklist was completed along with a Water Quality Assessment Report (April, 2018). The project was reviewed for applicable water quality standards and water discharge requirements. The existing storm drains within the open space east of Gilman Drive are undersized and are causing erosion. As part of the cycle track and roadway improvements, associated storm drain improvements will include the construction of curb and gutters, curb inlets, cleanouts, storm drains, and brow ditches in order to comply with the City's Region MS4 Permit, and the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards BMP Design.

This project is considered to be exempt from being a priority development project and therefore permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) are not required. These exemptions are in accordance with the Category 1 PDP Exemption listed in section 1.4.3 of the City of San Diego's Stormwater Standards BMP Design Manual. Source control and site design stormwater requirements are still applicable. The source control BMPs are proposed in order to control erosion, sediment, sediment tracking, wind erosion, nonstormwater pollutants and pollutants from construction site wastes and materials. The project is anticipated to be Risk Level 2 and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the project will be prepared separately during the construction permit phase of the project.

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

The project stays within the confines of the existing roadway when possible and intends to implement source and site control BMPs. The proposed project will not have a significant impact on downstream properties and the drainage system is engineered to adequately manage site stormwater. The project would comply with the City's Storm Water Regulations during construction, and appropriate BMPs would be utilized. Implementation of project specific BMP's would preclude violations of any existing water quality standards or discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <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 propose the use of groundwater nor would it impact groundwater during grading activities. Furthermore, the project would not introduce a substantially large amount of new impervious surfaces over ground that could interfere with groundwater recharge. Newly proposed impervious surface consists of the proposed sidewalk along the west side of Gilman Drive and a segment of the Cycle track. The proposed Gilman Drive Segment will include a non-erodible permeable surface as part of the proposed sidewalk. The project maintains the existing drainage patterns with the proposed storm drain improvements and storm drain conveyance system and keeps the roadway design within the existing curb to curb when feasible. Therefore, the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. 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 existing storm drains within the open space east of Gilman Drive are undersized and are causing erosion. As part of the cycle track and roadway improvements, associated storm drain improvements will include the construction of curb and gutters, curb inlets, cleanouts, storm drains, and brow ditches in order to comply with the City's Region MS4 Permit, and the City of San Diego's Storm Water Standards BMP Design.

The Water Quality Assessment Report (April 2018) includes a Preliminary Basin and Outfall Study for the Coastal Rail Trail Gilman Drive Segment (Nasland Engineering, January 2018). The study exhibits evaluated existing and proposed drainage conditions and the impact of constructing the cycle track and associated roadway improvements. According to the Report, the existing site includes urban drainage on Gilman drive and adjacent Residential that outlets into the roadway. Runoff also flows from the steep pervious cliffs on the west side of the project. The general direction of stormwater



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

runoff flows towards the south, outlets into the natural and pervious drainage channel on the south eastern side of the project. The existing roadway is crowned, and drainage collects in the gutter system and begins to flow south. The runoff that is collected via curb inlets, storm drain risers, and/or cross gutters is conveyed by the storm drain system to outfall into the open space to the south eastern side of the project. The runoff is then collected by adjacent vegetation, native soils, and the existing natural channel.

The Report concludes that the proposed improvements would not change drainage patterns or negatively impact the site because storm water will continue to follow the existing drainage patterns and improvements to the storm water system will correct existing erosion. Additionally, compliance with local, state, and federal storm water regulation would reduce potential impacts from erosion or siltation to less than significant.

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

Refer to response X (a) and (c) above. Post-project runoff will remain similar to pre-project runoff and the design of the roadway improvements and storm drain system would prevent any such impacts from occurring. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Refer to response X (a) through (c) above. The proposed project includes improvements to the storm water system along Gilman Drive. The project will not have a significant impact on downstream properties and the drainage system is engineered to adequately manage site stormwater. The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards during and after construction. Appropriate BMPs would be implemented to ensure that water quality is not degraded; therefore, ensuring that project runoff is directed to the appropriate drainage systems. Any runoff from the site is not anticipated to exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

Refer to response X (a) above. The project would be required to comply with all City storm water standards, using appropriate BMPs that would ensure that water quality is not degraded. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 roadway improvement project would not include construction of any housing, and is not located within, or adjacent to, a 100-year flood hazard area. Therefore, the project would have no such impact as a result of project implementation.

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

Refer to X (g) above. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or any other known flood area. Therefore, the project would have no such impact as a result of project implementation.

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 would improve the roadway by expanding the width of the existing roadway and provide for a cycle track, new sidewalks and associated improvements. The project is consistent with active transportation policies in the University Community Plan. No new roadways are proposed. The project would not substantially change the nature of the surrounding area and would not introduce any barriers or project features that could physically divide the community. No impacts would result.

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 for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposed project includes a one-way protected cycle track on each side of Gilman Drive and a continuous sidewalk on the west side of Gilman Drive over a project distance of approximately 8,800 linear feet. The cycle track will be separated from vehicular traffic by a raised median, striping, flexible posts, on-street parking, or other physical barrier. To accommodate the cycle tracks, the project would include roadway widenings on the west side of Gilman Drive from Villa La Jolla Drive southerly to an existing private driveway (an approximate distance of 3,000 linear feet). Roadway widenings would occur on the east side of Gilman Drive from Via Alicante to the Interstate 5 (I-5) southbound off-ramp (an approximate distance of 4,500 linear feet) along with construction of a 2-foot recovery slope adjacent to the cycle track along portions of the natural area from Via Alicante to I-5. Acquisition of additional roadway right-of-way (ROW) is required from several parcels east of Gilman Drive, south of Via Alicante, and temporary construction easements are required for several parcels for slope grading and retaining wall construction.

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

The project is consistent with active transportation policies in the General Plan and University Community Plan and no new roadways are proposed. Since there are no conflicts with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulations, impacts would remain below a level of significance.

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

The majority of the project site is located within urban areas, including the existing Gilman Drive ROW, as well as adjacent natural areas located within and outside of the MSCP Subarea Plan MHPA. The proposed project would not conflict with the requirements of any local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans, including the MSCP Subarea Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the City's MSCP Subarea Plan as discussed in Biological Resources IV(e) and impacts resulting from conflicts with local, regional, or state policies, ordinances, or plans protecting biological resources would be less than significant.

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

There are no known mineral resources located on the project site. The urbanized and developed nature of the project site and vicinity would preclude the extraction of any such resources. As such, project implementation would not impact the operations of any existing quarries, or result in the significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and residents of the state. No impacts would result.

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

See XII (a), above. The project site has not been delineated on a local general, specific or other land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no such resources would be affected with project implementation. Therefore, no impacts were identified.

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

Short-term (Construction)

Short-term noise impacts would be associated with onsite grading, and construction activities of the project. Construction-related short-term noise levels would be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area but would no longer occur once construction is completed. Sensitive

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

receptors (e.g. residential uses, open space) occur in the immediate area and may be temporarily affected by construction noise; however, 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. Potential noise impacts to sensitive habitat within the open space are addressed through MSCP Land Use Adjacent Guidelines. Impacts would remain below a level of significance.

Long-term (Operation)

For the long-term, the cycle track and associated improvements are not anticipated to produce excessive noise, and the project would not result in an increase in the existing ambient noise level. The project would not result in noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Diego General Plan or Noise Ordinance. Impacts would remain below a level of significance.

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

Potential effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with the City restrictions. Therefore, impacts related to groundborne vibration during construction would be less than significant. Once operational, the project would not be a source of ground borne vibration.

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

The project would not significantly increase long-term (ambient) noise levels. The project would not introduce a new land use or significantly increase the intensity of the roadway. Post construction noise levels and traffic would be generally unchanged as compared to noise of the existing roadway. Therefore, no substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels is anticipated. Impacts would be 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Please see XIII(a) and XIII(c) above. The project would be required to comply with the City’s Municipal Code (Section 59.5.0404, Construction Noise). Implementation of these standard measures would reduce potential impacts from an increase in ambient noise level during construction to a less than significant level.

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

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

The proposed project is located outside of the MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Noise Exposures Contours. No impacts would result.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts would result.

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

The proposed roadway improvements would not directly and/or indirectly induce substantial population growth. No new development other than the roadway improvements is proposed. No additional lanes of vehicular traffic would be constructed, and the roadway is not being extended so that population growth would occur. No impacts would result.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 project would not result in the displacement of any housing. Therefore, no such impacts would occur as a result of project implementation. No impacts would occur.

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

Refer to response XIV (b) above. Improvements to the existing roadway would not result in the displacement of any homes or people as no housing is being removed, replaced, and/or relocated as a result of project implementation. No impacts would result.

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"/> |

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

The project which would construct active transportation improvements to an existing roadway would not create the need to provide or alter existing governmental facilities. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing governmental facilities. No impacts would result.

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

Please see XV(i). The project would not alter any police protection response times, facilities or impact the operation of police personnel.

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

Please see XV(i). The project would not physically alter any schools.

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

Please see XV(i). The project would not physically alter any parks.

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

The project would not result in a substantial increased demand for electricity, gas, or other public facilities. The proposed roadway improvements would require new light standards, minor relocation of existing utilities within the public right-of-way, and reconstruction of required storm drain structures. Impacts occurring as a result of project implementation have been mitigated to below a level of significance. Please see Section V. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program of the Mitigated Negative Declaration for more details regarding the project-specific mitigation measures. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 proposed roadway improvements would not result in an increase in the use of any parks or other recreational facilities therefore resulting in, or accelerating, the physical deterioration of those facilities. No impacts would result.

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

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

Refer to XVI (a) above. The project does not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, no such impacts would occur as a result of project implementation.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>a) Would the project or plan/policy conflict with an adopted program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the transportation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project would not conflict with any adopted program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the transportation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The proposed project includes a one-way protected cycle track on each side of Gilman Drive and a continuous sidewalk on the west side of Gilman Drive over a project distance of approximately 8,800 linear feet. The cycle track will be separated from vehicular traffic by a raised median, striping, flexible posts, on-street parking, or other physical barrier. The project is consistent with active transportation policies in the General Plan and University Community Plan and would not adversely affect public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>b) Would the project or plan/policy result in VMT exceeding thresholds identified in the City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

On September 27, 2013, Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. signed SB-743 into law, starting a process that fundamentally changes the way transportation impact analysis is conducted under CEQA. Related revisions to the State’s CEQA Guidelines include elimination of auto delay, level of service (LOS), and similar measurements of vehicular roadway capacity and traffic congestion as the basis for determining significant impacts.

In December 2018, the California Resources Agency certified and adopted revised CEQA Guidelines, including new section 15064.3. Under the new section, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), which includes the amount and distance of automobile traffic attributable to a project, is identified as the “most appropriate measure of transportation impacts.” As of July 1, 2020, all CEQA lead agencies must analyze a project’s transportation impacts using VMT.

The City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual (TSM) dated September 29, 2020 is consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) guidelines and utilizes VMT as a metric for evaluating transportation-related impacts. Based on these guidelines, all projects shall go through a screening process to determine the level of transportation analysis that is required.

The project is proposing a protected cycle track on each side of Gilman Drive and a continuous sidewalk on the west side of Gilman Drive. This project is classified as a transportation project - bicycle facility and according to the TSM this project type would not result in increased vehicle travel

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

and would have a less than significant impact and can be screened out from performing VMT analysis.

Based upon the screening criteria identified above, the project is screened out from further VMT analysis. Therefore, as recommended in the City of San Diego TSM, September 29, 2020, the project would have a less than significant impact.

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

The project would improve pedestrian and cyclist safety and would conform to City of San Diego requirements for safety and site distance. Therefore, the project does not include any design features that would substantially increase hazards. No impacts would result.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Adequate emergency access would be provided during both short-term construction (with construction operating protocols) and long-term operations of the project. Gilman Drive provides adequate emergency access in its existing condition. As such, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Refer also to Cultural Resources V(a) and (b). The project site would not impact any designated historical resources. No additional mitigation measures are needed to address Historical Resources in addition to what has already been recommended for the project for cultural resources. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration would be implemented to reduce impacts related to Historical Resources (archaeology) to below a level of significance.

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 | <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
Public Resource Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.				

Tribal Cultural Resources include sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, and sacred places or objects that have cultural value or significance to a Native American Tribe. Tribal Cultural Resources include “non-unique archaeological resources” that, instead of being important for “scientific” value as a resource, can also be significant because of the sacred and/or cultural tribal value of the resource. Tribal representatives are considered experts appropriate for providing substantial evidence regarding the locations, types, and significance of tribal cultural resources within their traditionally and cultural affiliated geographic area (PRC § 21080.3.1(a)).

Tribal Cultural Resources could potentially be impacted through project implementation. Therefore, to determine significance of the resources and in accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, staff consulted with the Lipay Nation of Santa Isabel, Jamul Indian Village and San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. The City of San Diego sent notification to these three Native American Tribes on January 21, 2021. The Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel requested more information which was provided, and consultation closed on March 22, 2021. No response was received from the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians or Jamul Indian Village within the 60-day period to request consultation and additional information. Jamul Indian Village responded concurring with the mitigation on April 12, 2021.

It was determined that there are no sites, features, places or cultural landscapes that would be substantially adversely impacted by the proposed project. Although no Tribal Cultural Resources were identified within the project site, there is a potential for the construction of the project to impact buried and unknown Tribal Cultural Resources due to its location to known recorded resources in the near vicinity. Therefore, it was agreed upon that archaeological and Native American monitoring should be included in the MMRP. Mitigation in the form of archaeological and Native American monitoring would reduce all impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources to below a level of significance. See section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for further details.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

The project would not result in an increase in the intensity of the use and would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. No wastewater generation is associated with this project. No impacts would result.

- 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?

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

Refer to response XIX (a) above. The project would not result in an increase in the intensity of the use, would not be associated with the generation of wastewater, and would not be required to construct a new water or wastewater treatment facility. No impacts would result.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 require improvements to the existing storm water system and reconstruction of storm water drainage facilities, as described in Hydrology and Water Quality Section X (a). Potentially significant impacts to cultural and biological resources occurring as a result of project implementation would be reduced to below a level of significance with the implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section V. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Therefore, the construction of the new storm water system would not cause any significant environmental effects.

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

The City Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) serves as the water resources planning document for the City's residents, businesses, interest groups, and public officials. The UWMP assess the current and future water supply and needs for the City. Implementation of the project would not result in new or expanded water entitlements from the water service provider, as the project is consistent with existing demand projections contained in the UWMP (which are based on the allowed land uses for the project site).

No new or expanded entitlements are proposed. Temporary water supplies would be needed during construction (e.g. dust suppression) and post-construction (i.e. revegetation/restoration of impacted areas) and would either be supplied by a water truck or thru the existing water service (i.e. fire hydrant meter and hook-up.) Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

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

The proposed project would result in improvements to an existing roadway, which would not require any wastewater treatment services. Therefore, the project would have no impact on the current demand on existing wastewater commitments.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate | <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's solid waste disposal needs?

Construction debris and waste would be generated from the construction of the project. The project is required to comply with the City's Municipal Code requirement for diversion of construction waste during the short-term, construction phase. Operation of the project would not generate waste once construction has been completed, and, therefore, would not have permanent solid waste disposal needs thus affecting the permitted capacity of the landfill serving the project area. Impacts are considered to 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Please see XIX (f). Any solid waste generated during construction related activities would be recycled or disposed of in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 University and La Jolla Community Plans circulation elements. The project is located in an urbanized area of San Diego and improves active transportation uses along an existing roadway and 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 includes active transportation and associated improvements along Gilman Drive which is located in an urbanized area of San Diego within the Very High Fire Severity Zone. Implementation of fire safety procedures in the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction would reduce the potential for exacerbating fire risk due to construction activities to a less than significant level. The improvements of active transportation along an existing roadway and replacement and construction of storm drain infrastructure would not impact the risk of wildfire during operation. The project would not significantly exacerbate wildfire risks, and no mitigation is required.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) | <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
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

The project improves active transportation uses and associated infrastructure along an existing roadway. 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 result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Refer to response XX (b) above. Additionally, the project would comply with the City’s appropriate Best Management Practices 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, a less than significant impact would result.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

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

This analysis has determined that, although the proposed project could have significant impacts to sensitive Biological, Cultural, and Tribal Cultural 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. These mitigation requirements are also consistent with the MSCP City of San Diego Subarea Plan.

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable (“cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

As documented in this Initial Study, the project may have the potential to degrade the quality of

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

the environment, notably with respect to Biology, Cultural Resources (Archaeology) and Tribal Cultural 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.

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

The project improves active transportation uses and associated infrastructure along an existing roadway. 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: University and La Jolla
- Site Specific Study: Visual Impact Assessment, Coastal Rail Trail - Gilman Drive Segment, Rose Creek Bikeway to UCSD, prepared by KTUA Planning and Landscape Architecture, dated August, 21 2018.
- Visual Impact Assessment Addendum, Coastal Rail Trail - Gilman Drive Segment, Rose Creek Bikeway to UCSD, prepared by KTUA Planning and Landscape Architecture, dated October, 31 2019.

#### 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: Coastal Rail Trail - Gilman Drive Segment Biological Technical Report July 2020, E&CP

#### V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources)

- City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- Historical Resources Board List
- Community Historical Survey:
- Site Specific Report: Historic Property Survey Report and Archaeological Survey Report 2018, AECOM

Site Specific Report: El Camino Real Mission Bell Markers/Guide Posts along the Coastal Rail Trail - Gilman Drive Segment, prepared 2019 by RECON

**VI. Energy**

City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP), (City of San Diego 2015)

City of San Diego Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist

**VII. 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: Geotechnical Investigation, Coastal Rail Trail at Gilman Drive, Gilman Drive, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by SCST, Inc., dated October 17, 2018 (their project no. 160504P3)

Geotechnical Addendum, Coastal Rail Trail at Gilman Drive, Gilman Drive, La Jolla, California 92037, prepared by SCST, Inc., dated July 11, 2019

Geotechnical Addendum #2, Coastal Rail Trail at Gilman Drive, Gilman Drive and Villa La Jolla Drive, La Jolla, California, prepared by SCST, Inc., dated October 3, 2019

Geotechnical Addendum #3 and Response to Review Comments, Coastal Rail Trail at Gilman Drive, Gilman Drive and Villa La Jolla Drive, La Jolla, California, prepared by SCST, Inc., dated October 15, 2019

**VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP), (City of San Diego 2015)

City of San Diego Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist

**IX. 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, GeoTracker: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>

State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized

MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

Site Specific Report: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of the Coastal Rail Trail - Gilman Drive Segment Project San Diego, California prepared by AECOM, dated June, 2018.

**X. 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](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html)

Site Specific Report: See Water Quality XXI.

**XI. Land Use and Planning**

City of San Diego General Plan

- Community Plan: La Jolla and University
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan – MCAS Miramar
- City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- FAA Determination
- Other Plans:

**XII. Mineral Resources**

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

**XIII. Noise**

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan: La Jolla and University
- MCAS Miramar - CNEL Maps
- MCAS Miramar Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes
- San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) 2013 Technical Noise Supplement. November.
- Site Specific Report:

**XIV. 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: see Geology/Soils section above

**XV. Population / Housing**

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

**XVI. Public Services**

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan: La Jolla and University

**XVII. Recreational Resources**



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

**XVIII. Transportation / Circulation**

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan: La Jolla and University
- San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
- San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG
- City of San Diego Transportation Study Manual (September 29, 2020)
- Site Specific Report:

**XIX. Utilities**

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan: La Jolla and University
- Site Specific Report:

**XX. Water Conservation**

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

**XXI. Water Quality**

- Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, [http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d\\_lists.html](http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html)
- Site Specific Report: Water Quality Assessment Report (Caltrans, April 2018) which includes:
  - Attachment A – City of San Diego’s Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist
  - Attachment B – City of San Diego Stormwater Checklist - Storm Water BMP Requirements
  - Attachment C – Basins and Outfalls Study Exhibits for the Coastal Rail Trail Gilman Drive Segment

**XXII. Wildfire**

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan: La Jolla and University
- San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Very High Fire Severity Zone Map, City of San Diego
- City of San Diego Brush Management Regulations, Landscape Regulations (SDMC 142.0412)
- Site Specific Report:



## Location

Coastal Rail Trail SDP / Project No. 644885

City of San Diego – Development Services Department

**FIGURE**

**No.1**