



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

# MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 670393  
SCH No. TBD

**SUBJECT:** **Via Del Mar CDP SDP:** The project requests a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and Site Development Permit (SDP) to construct a new 6,200-square-foot single-family residence with an attached three car garage and a detached 1,000-square-foot companion unit located at 3821 Via Del Mar. The 1.00-acre site is designated Spaced-Rural Residential pursuant to the Carmel Valley Community Plan and is subject to the AR-1-2 zoning requirements. The project is also subject to the Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay zone, Environmentally Sensitive Lands (Biological Resources and Steep Hillides), Transit Priority Area, Very High Fire Severity Zone, and Council District 1. (LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Parcel 2 of Map No 10227, City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, July 16, 1980).  
APPLICANT: Lalit Dhir

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

See attached Initial Study.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following areas(s): **Biological Resources**. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section 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:

<https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/forms-publications/design-guidelines-templates>

4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the “Environmental/Mitigation Requirements” notes are provided.
5. **SURETY AND COST RECOVERY** – The Development Services Director or City Manager may require appropriate surety instruments or bonds from private Permit Holders to ensure the long-term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

**B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II**

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

1. **PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING IS REQUIRED TEN (10) WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY WORK ON THIS PROJECT.** The PERMIT HOLDER/OWNER is responsible to arrange and perform this meeting by contacting the CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER (RE) of the Field Engineering Division and City staff from MITIGATION MONITORING COORDINATION (MMC). Attendees must also include the Permit holder’s Representative(s), Job Site Superintendent and the following consultants: ***Not Applicable***

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

CONTACT INFORMATION:

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

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

- 2. MMRP COMPLIANCE:** This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) #670393 and /or Environmental Document #670393, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's Environmental Designee (MMC) and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc.

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

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

***None Required***

**4. MONITORING EXHIBITS**

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

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

**5. OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:**

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

<b>Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist</b>		
<b>Issue Area</b>	<b>Document Submittal</b>	<b>Associated Inspection/Approvals/Notes</b>
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
Biological Resources	Monitoring Exhibit	Monitoring Report Approval
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

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

**MM-BIO-1**

Prior to Notice to Proceed (NTP) for any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Plans/Permits and Building Plans/Permits, the project would mitigate for impacts to 0.88-acres of Tier I southern maritime chaparral at a 1:1 ratio in accordance with the City’s Biological Guidelines, off-site through purchase of a conservation easement per Section 143.0152 of the City Land Development Code. The applicant is working with J. Whelan Associates, Inc. to provide a covenant of easement over 1.04 acres within the MHPA on Assessor’s Parcel Number 366-021-09-00, located on Lot 73 of the Rancho Mission San Diego Land Grant.

**MM-BIO-2**

Replacement of 19 impacted wart-stemmed ceanothus plants at a minimum 1:1 ratio as described in the project’s revegetation plan, conditioned for approval. The revegetation plan describes installation of a minimum 24 wart-stemmed ceanothus container plants in the northern and western portions of the project site, outside the final development footprint. The installed plants would be irrigated and maintained a minimum of 25 months. The plan shows the general planting configuration although final locations would be field-fit and documented in an as-built submittal following installation.

**MM-BIO-3**

Vegetation removal should occur outside of the Cooper’s hawk breeding season (February 1 to August 31). If vegetation removal must occur during the breeding season, the Qualified Biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey to determine the presence or absence of nesting Cooper’s hawks within 300 feet of the proposed area of disturbance. The pre-construction survey shall be conducted within 10 calendar days prior to the start of construction activities (including removal of vegetation). The applicant shall submit the results of the pre-construction survey to City Development Services Department for review and approval prior to initiating any construction activities. If nesting Cooper’s hawks are detected, a letter report in conformance with the City’s Biology Guidelines and applicable state and federal law (i.e., appropriate follow-up surveys, monitoring schedules,

construction, and noise barriers/buffers, etc.) shall be prepared and include proposed measures to be implemented to ensure that take of birds or eggs or disturbance of breeding activities is avoided. The report shall be submitted to the City for review and approval and implemented to the satisfaction of the City. The City's MMC and Qualified Biologist shall verify and approve that all measures identified in the report are in place prior to and/or during construction.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

FEDERAL

US Fish and Wildlife Service (23)

STATE

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (32)

State Clearinghouse (46)

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Mayor's Office

Councilmember Joe LaCava, Council District 1

Development Services:

Development Project Manager

Engineering Review

Environmental Review

Geology

Landscaping

Planning Review

Planning Department:

Plan-MSCP

MMC (77A)

City Attorney's Office (93C)

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

Sierra Club

San Diego Audubon Society

Mr. Jim Peugh

California Native Plant Society

Endangered Habitats League

Carmel Valley Community Planning Board

Richard Drury

Stacey Osborne

John Stump

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

10/12/2021

---

Date of Draft Report

---

Date of Final Report

Analyst: Rachael Ferrell

Attachments: Initial Study Checklist  
Figure 1 – Location Map  
Figure 2 – Site Plan

## INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Via Del Mar CDP SDP / 670393
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: Rachael Ferrell / (619) 446-5129
4. Project location: 3821 Via Del Mar, San Diego, CA 92130
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Lalit Dhir, 11649 Thistle Hill Place, San Diego, CA 92130, (858) 401-0065
6. General/Community Plan designation: Residential / Spaced Rural Residential
7. Zoning: AR-1-2
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 project requests a Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and Site Development Permit (SDP) to construct a new 6,200-square-foot single-family residence with an attached three car garage and a detached 1,000-square-foot companion unit located at 3821 Via Del Mar. The 1.00-acre site is designated Spaced Rural Residential pursuant to the Carmel Valley Community Plan and is subject to the AR-1-2 zoning requirements. The project is also subject to the Coastal (Non-Appealable) Overlay zone, Environmentally Sensitive Lands (Biological Resources and Steep Hillides), Transit Priority Area, Very High Fire Severity Zone, and Council District 1.

The project's landscaping has been reviewed by staff and would comply with all applicable City of San Diego Landscape ordinances and standards. Drainage would be directed into appropriate storm drain systems designated to carry surface runoff, which has been reviewed and accepted by City Engineering staff. Ingress and egress would be via a private driveway with access from Via Del Mar street to the east of the project site.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is bounded by El Camino Real to the west and residential homes to the east. State Route 56 is less than one mile to the north. The site contains some developed, but mostly undeveloped features and native vegetation. The site is located in a developed area currently served by existing public services and utilities.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

None required.

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

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.

In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code 21080.3.1, the City of San Diego provided formal notifications to the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, San Pasqual, and the Jamul Indian Village, traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. Consultation took place via email on January 26, 2021 and concluded the same day.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

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

The project is not located within, or adjacent to a designated scenic vista or view corridor that is identified in the Carmel Valley Community Plan. The project proposes to construct a single-family residence and would be conditioned to comply with all setback, height, and step back requirements pursuant to the community plan and regulations in the Land Development Code. The project is located in a Space-Rural Residential land use area with similar residential structures. The project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. No Impact would result.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response I (a) above. The project is situated within a residential neighborhood with similar development. The site is not adjacent to a historic building and is not adjacent to a significant landmark. The project is not located within or adjacent to a state scenic highway and would be required to meet all design requirements pursuant to the Carmel Valley Community Plan. No impact would result.

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

The project site is generally surrounded by residential uses and open space. The project would be conditioned to implement appropriate brush management and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and permitted by the General Plan, community plan land use and zoning designations. No impact would result.

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

The project would comply with the outdoor lighting standards contained in SDMC Section 142.0740 (Outdoor Lighting Regulations) that requires all outdoor lighting be installed, shielded, and adjusted so that the light is directed in a manner that minimizes negative impacts from light pollution, including trespass, glare, and to control light from falling onto surrounding properties. Therefore, lighting installed with the project would not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, resulting in a less than significant lighting impact.

The project would comply with SDMC Section 142.0730 (Glare Regulations) that requires exterior materials utilized for proposed structures be limited to specific reflectivity ratings. The project would have a less than significant impact.

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

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

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

The project is consistent with the Carmel Valley Community Plan's land use designation and is located within a developed residential neighborhood. As such, the project site does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any lands identified as Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as show on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resource Agency. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of such lands to non-agricultural use. No significant impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 the underlying zone. The project would not conflict with any properties zoned for agricultural use or be affected by a Williamson Act Contract. 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

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 any farmland or forest land. No changes to any such lands would result from project implementation. No impact would result.

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

The project site is located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Both the State of California and the Federal government have established health-based Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for the following six criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO); ozone (O<sub>3</sub>); nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>); sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>); particulate matter up to 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>); and lead (Pb). O<sub>3</sub> (smog) is formed by a photochemical reaction between NO<sub>x</sub> and reactive organic compounds (ROCs). Thus, impacts from O<sub>3</sub> are assessed by evaluating impacts from NO<sub>x</sub> and ROCs. A new increase in pollutant emissions determines the impact on regional air quality as a result of a proposed project. The results also allow the local government to determine whether a proposed project would deter the region from achieving the goal of reducing pollutants in accordance with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) in order to comply with Federal and State AAQS.

The 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 SDAB. The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991 and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2009). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (O<sub>3</sub>). The RAQS relies on information from the 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

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

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 construct a single-family dwelling in an area with similar land uses, The project is consistent with the General Plan, community plan, and the underlying zoning. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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. Construction operations would include standard measures as required by City of San Diego grading permit to limit potential air quality impacts. Any impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant and would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. 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. Operation of single-family residences would produce minimal stationary sources emissions. The project is compatible with the surrounding development and is permitted by the community plan and zone designation. Based on the residential land use, project emissions over the long-term 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)? | <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
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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. 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.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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. 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. Residential units, in the long-term operation, are not typically associated with the creation of such odors nor are they anticipated to generate odors affecting a substantial number or people. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

A field survey and Biological Letter Report was prepared by RECON, July 1, 2021 (BLR) to assess sensitive biological resources and vegetation communities that occur on-site and how the project would impact those resources. As included in the Project Description and the BLR, the project site is adjacent to the City’s Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) to the west and north, and contains two vegetation communities, including the sensitive plant species wart-stemmed ceanothus. The two vegetation communities are classified under the City’s Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) as disturbed (Tier IV) and southern maritime chaparral (Tier I). The BLR identifies that the project would impact 1.04-acres (0.88-acres of maritime chaparral and 0.16-acre of disturbed land). Under the City’s Biological Resources Guidelines in the Land Development Code, impacts to MSCP Tier I habitats over 0.10-acre are considered significant, and impacts to Tier IV habitats are not considered significant. Impacts to 0.88-acres of maritime chaparral would be mitigated through the purchase of a Covenant of Easement on 1.04 acres within the MHPA on Assessor’s Parcel Number 366-021-09-00, located on Lot 73 of the Rancho Mission San Diego Land Grant. The area to be conserved is situated approximately one mile north of Interstate 15 and 1.1 miles west of the

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

Sycamore Landfill. This easement would ensure conservation of 1.04 acre of Tier I native grasslands, which would fully mitigate impacts to the southern maritime chaparral.

The BLR identified that the project would impact 19 wart-stemmed ceanothus, which are a MSCP covered species. According to the City's Biological Guidelines, the wart-stemmed ceanothus should be mitigated at a 1:1 ratio. The project proposes a revegetation plan to replace the impacted wart-stemmed ceanothus on-site. The revegetation plan describes installation of a minimum 24 wart-stemmed ceanothus container plants in the northern and western portions of the project site, outside the final development footprint.

Cooper's Hawk was identified in the BLR to have a moderate to high potential to nest on-site. As such, mitigation measures have been included to avoid any vegetation removal during their breeding season.

A Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program (MMRP), as detailed within Section V of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), would be implemented. With implementation of the monitoring program, potential impacts on biological resources would be reduced to below a level of significance.

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

Refer to Response IV (a), above. Implementation of the project would impact 0.88 acres of Tier I sensitive habitat, which would be considered significant and would require mitigation. Thus, sensitive upland impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

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

Wetlands or waters do not occur on-site. Wetlands or waters as regulated by the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) or the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) do not occur on-site and therefore will not be impacted by the project. No impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

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

The project site is surrounded by existing residential development and is not located adjacent to any established wildlife corridor and would not impede the movement of any wildlife or the use of any wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, no impact would occur, and no mitigation measures are required.

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

The project would not conflict with any local policies and/or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impact would result.

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

The project would conform with the adopted City MSCP Subarea Plan (1997). The City's MSCP Subarea Plan addresses the impacts to preserve areas from adjacent development in Section 1.4.3, Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (LUAGs).

City MHPA land exists adjacent to the project site. The project is conditioned to comply with the City's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines to protect any habitat within the MHPA that might be indirectly impacted by the project. Land Use Adjacency Guidelines address indirect impacts caused by drainage, toxics, lighting, noise, barriers, invasive species, brush management, grading, and bird strikes. Any impacts would be less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 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 City of San Diego criteria for determination of historic significance, pursuant to CEQA, is evaluated based upon age (over 45 years), location, context, association with an important event,

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

uniqueness, or structural integrity of the building. Projects requiring the demolition and/or modification of structures that are 45 years or older have the potential to result in potential impacts to a historical resource.

The project site does not contain a residence over 45 years old, and therefore did not require an evaluation. The site is not historically designated nor contain historic buildings. No impacts would result.

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

Many areas of San Diego County, including mesas and the coast, are known for intense and diverse prehistoric occupation and important archaeological and historical resources. The region has been inhabited by various cultural groups spanning 10,000 years or more. The project area is located within an area identified as sensitive on the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps.

A Cultural Resources Survey Report, prepared by RECON, was submitted for the project which concluded that the lack of resources found during the survey, the lack of previously recorded resources on-site, and the disturbed nature of the site would result in a low probability of any impacts to historical resources rising to a level of significance. Due to the results of the survey and lack of any prerecorded resources, impacts would be less than significant.

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

According to the "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California, Del Mar, 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Maps" (Kennedy and Peterson, 1975), the project site is mostly underlain with the highly sensitive rating Torrey sandstone formation, which has a high probability of containing important paleontological resources. The City's Significance Determination Thresholds state paleontological monitoring during grading activities may be required if it is determined that the project's earth movement quantity exceeds the Paleontological threshold (if greater than 1,000 cubic yards and ten feet deep for formations with a high sensitivity rating and if greater than 2,000 cubic yards and ten feet deep for formations with a moderate sensitivity rating). The project proposes to excavate approximately 1,760-Cubic Yards to a depth of 10-feet, which exceeds the City's grading thresholds for sensitive paleontological resources. According to the Land Development Code's 12<sup>th</sup> update, paleontological monitoring would be made a condition of approval if the thresholds are exceeded. With the implementation of the monitoring conditioned for the project, impacts would remain less than significant.

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

Refer to response V (b) above. Impacts would remain less than significant.

VI. ENERGY – Would the project:

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

All projects would be required to meet mandatory energy standards of the current California energy code. The unpermitted grading would have required operation of heavy equipment but would have been temporary and short-term in duration. Additionally, long-term energy usage from the buildings would be reduced through design measures that incorporate energy conservation features in heating, ventilation and air conditioning systems, lighting and window treatments, and insulation and weather stripping. The project would also incorporate cool-roofing materials and solar panels. 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 Carmel Valley Community Plan's land use designation. The project is required to comply with the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) by implementing energy reducing design measures, therefore 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"/>

According to the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report, prepared by Christian Wheeler Engineering (December 21, 2020), the closest known fault is Rose Canyon Fault, located approximately 3 miles west 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 considered low. Additionally, 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 at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts based on 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
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report, the site could be affected by seismic activity as a result of earthquakes on major active faults located throughout the Southern California area. The project would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, in order to ensure that potential impacts from regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant.

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

Liquefaction generally occurs when loose, unconsolidated, water-laden soils are subject to shaking, causing the soils to lose cohesion. According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report, the potential for soil liquefaction at the subject site is low due to the lack of liquefaction prone areas. 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 at the building permit stage, 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"/> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

According to the Geotechnical Investigation Report, no evidence of landslides or slope instabilities were observed on-site. The report concluded that due to the relatively level terrain of the site, the possibility of deep-seated slope stability problems at the site is low. Implementation of proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that the potential for impacts would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

As discussed in Section VII (a) and VII (b), the project site is not likely to be subject to landslides, and the potential for liquefaction and subsidence is low. The soils and geologic units underlying the site are considered to have a “low” expansion potential. 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 Report, the project site is considered to have a low expansive soil potential. 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 at the building permit stage, 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 require the construction of any new facilities as it relates to wastewater, as services are available to serve the project. No impacts would occur.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

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 Del Mar Mesa 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.

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 project’s direct and cumulative GHG emissions would have a less than significant impact.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No 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. The project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations. Further based upon review and evaluation of the completed CAP Consistency Checklist for the project, the project is consistent with the applicable strategies and actions of the CAP. Therefore, the project 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"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would conduct grading activities and although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during such activities, they are not anticipated to create a significant public hazard. Once constructed, due to the nature of the project, the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous 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"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Refer to response IX (a) above. No health risks related to the storage, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would result from the implementation of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Refer to response IX (a) above. Future risk of releases of hazardous substances would not occur as a result of project operations because it is anticipated that future on-site operations would not require the routine use or transport of acutely hazardous materials. The project would be required to comply with all federal, state and local requirements associated with hazardous materials. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- 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?
- Potentially Significant Impact    
 Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated    
 Less Than Significant Impact    
 No Impact

A hazardous waste site record search was completed using Geo Tracker, an online website which discloses any type of hazardous clean-up site pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5: <http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/> The records search identified that no hazardous waste sites exist onsite or in the surrounding area. No Impacts would result.

- 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?
- Potentially Significant Impact    
 Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated    
 Less Than Significant Impact    
 No Impact

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. 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?
- Potentially Significant Impact    
 Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated    
 Less Than Significant Impact    
 No Impact

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?
- Potentially Significant Impact    
 Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated    
 Less Than Significant Impact    
 No Impact

The project would not impair the implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan. No roadway improvements are proposed that would interfere with circulation or access, and all construction would take place on-site. No impacts would result.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?
- Potentially Significant Impact    
 Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporated    
 Less Than Significant Impact    
 No Impact

The project 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. The project would implement brush management and be constructed to

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

comply with the City's Fire Code. Further discussion can be found in 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would be conditioned to comply with the City's Storm Water Regulations, and appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP's) 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.

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

The project does not require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. The project would be conditioned to include pervious design features and appropriate drainage. Therefore, the project would not introduce a significant amount of new impervious surfaces that could interfere with groundwater recharge. The project as designed was reviewed by qualified City staff and would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project is located in a residential neighborhood where all infrastructures exist. The project would connect to the existing public water system. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Proper landscaping would prevent substantial erosion onsite. No stream or river is located on or adjacent to the site, all runoff would be routed to the existing storm drain system and would therefore not substantially alter existing drainage patterns. The project would be required to implement BMPs to ensure that substantial erosion or siltation on or off-site during construction activities would not occur. Impacts would be 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

Refer to response X (c) above. No flooding would occur. 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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 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 both during and after construction, using appropriate BMP's that would ensure that water quality is not degraded. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or any other known flood area. The project has been reviewed by the proper engineering staff and would be conditioned to follow building construction guidelines to avoid flooding. Any impacts would remain below a level of significance.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input 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. Impacts would remain below a level of significance.

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 site is located within a developed residential neighborhood and surrounded by similar residential development. 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

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

community. The project is consistent with the Carmel Valley Community Plan and the General Plan. The project would meet all regulations outlined in the SDMC. No impacts would result.

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

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the Carmel Valley Community Plan's land use designation. There are no conflicts with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulations. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

Please refer to section IV (e) above. The project is located within a developed residential neighborhood and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The project is not located within the City of San Diego's Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). However, the project is adjacent to the MHPA and therefore is subject to conformance with the City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (Section 1.4.3) as conditions of approval. Impacts would be less than significant.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <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. No impacts would result.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <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.

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

XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- a) Generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

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 receptors (e.g. residential uses) 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. Additionally, the proposed project would be in conformance with the City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (Section 1.4.3) as a condition of approval. Construction would be avoided during coopers hawk breeding season as mitigation discussed in Section IV above. Impacts would remain below a level of significance.

Long-term (Operation)

For the long-term, typical noise levels associated with residential uses are anticipated, 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?

Potential effects from construction noise would be reduced through compliance with the City restrictions. Pile driving activities that would potentially result in ground borne vibration or ground borne noise are not anticipated with construction of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

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 allowed land use. Post construction noise levels and traffic would be generally unchanged as compared to noise with the existing residential use. 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?

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

The project would not expose people to a substantial increase in temporary or periodic ambient noise levels. Construction noise would result during construction activities but would be temporary in nature. Construction-related noise impacts from the project would generally be higher than existing ambient noise levels in the project area but would no longer occur once construction is completed. In addition, the project would be required to comply with the San Diego Municipal Code, Article 9.5 "Noise Abatement and Control." 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan. The project site is also not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. 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 project is consistent with the underlying zone and is consistent with the land use designation. The project site is currently served by existing infrastructure. As such, the project would not substantially increase housing or population growth in the area. 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to response XIV (a) above. No impacts would result.

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

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

Refer to response XIV (a) above. 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

The project is consistent with the land use designation pursuant to the Carmel Valley Community Plan. The project is for unpermitted grading and does not propose any new structures. 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. Impacts would be less than significant.

ii) Police protection

Refer to response XV (a)(i) above. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services or create a new significant demand and would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing governmental facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Schools

Refer to response XV (a)(i) above. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where public school services are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on public schools over that which currently exists and is not anticipated to result in a significant increase in demand for public educational services. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Parks

Refer to response XV (a)(i) above. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City-operated parks are available. The project would not significantly increase the demand on existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities over that which presently exists. Impacts would be less than significant.

v) Other public facilities

Refer to response XV (a)(i) above. The project site is located in an urbanized and developed area where City services are already available. The project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services and not require the construction or expansion of an existing governmental facility. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

The project is consistent with the underlying zoning and land use designation pursuant to the General Plan and the Carmel Valley Community Plan. The project proposes to construct a single-family dwelling in a location with similar development. The project would not adversely affect the availability of and/or need for new or expanded recreational resources. The project would not require the construction or expansion of an existing park facility. The project would not significantly increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in the use of available parks or facilities such that substantial deterioration occurs, or that would require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities to satisfy demand. As such, impacts would remain less than significant.

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

Refer to XVI (a) above. The project does not propose recreation facilities nor require the construction or expansion of any such facilities. As such, impacts would remain less than significant.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

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

The project proposes to construct a single-family dwelling which is consistent with the land use designation pursuant to the Carmel Valley Community Plan. The project would not result in design measures that would conflict with existing policies, plan, or programs supporting alternative transportation. No impacts would result.

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

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

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 involves the construction of a new single-family residence in a neighborhood which serves similar residential development. A "Small Project" is defined as a project generating less than 300 daily unadjusted driveway trips using the City of San Diego trip generation rates/procedures.

Based upon the screening criteria identified above, the project qualifies as a “Small Project” and is screened out from further VMT analysis. Therefore, as recommended in the City of San Diego TSM, 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 does not propose any new road development or infrastructure. The project complies with the zoning regulations and the land use designation pursuant to the Carmel Valley Community Plan. No impacts would result.

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

Adequate emergency access would be provided during both short-term construction (with construction operating protocols) and long-term operations of the project. Emergency access to the site would be provided from the driveway entrances on Via Del Mar. The project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. No impacts would result.

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	<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
historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				

The project site is not listed nor is it 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). In addition, please see section V (b) above. Impacts would not result.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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)).

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, The City of San Diego sent notification to the Native American Tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area on January 26, 2021. All tribes responded within the 30-day time period requesting consultation. Consultation took place via email and concluded the same day. It was determined that there are no sites, features, places or cultural landscapes that would be substantially adversely impacted by the proposed project. Due to the scope of work, the negative Cultural Resources Survey report, and the lack of recorded resources in the near vicinity, the potential to impact any unknown resources would not rise to a level of significance. Impacts would remain below a level of significance.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

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

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

Refer to response XIX (a) above. Adequate services are available to serve the project site. Additionally, the project would not significantly increase the demand for water or wastewater treatment services and thus, would not trigger the need for new treatment facilities. 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 not exceed the capacity of the existing storm water drainage systems and therefore, would not require construction of new or expansion of existing storm water drainage facilities of which could cause significant environmental effects. The project was reviewed by qualified City staff who determined that the existing facilities are adequately sized to accommodate the proposed development. No impacts would result.

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

The 2015 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). The Public Utilities Department local water supply is generated from recycled water, local surface supply, and groundwater, which accounts for approximately 20 percent of the total water requirements for the City. The City purchases water from the San Diego County Water Authority to make up the difference between total water demands and local supplies (City of San Diego 2015). Therefore, the project would not require new or expanded entitlements. No impacts would result.

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

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

The project would not adversely affect existing wastewater treatment services. Adequate services are available to serve the project site without requiring new or expanded entitlements. No impacts would result.

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

All construction waste from the project site would be transported to an appropriate facility, which would have sufficient permitted capacity to accept that generated by the project. Long-term operation of the residential use is anticipated to generate typical amounts of solid waste associated with residential uses. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code requirement for diversion of both construction waste during the short-term, construction phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project would comply with all Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The project would not result in the generation of large amounts of solid waste, nor generate or require the transport of hazardous waste materials, other than minimal amounts generated during the construction phase. All demolition activities would comply with any City of San Diego requirements for diversion of both construction waste during the demolition phase and solid waste during the long-term, operational phase. Impacts would be less than significant.

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 Carmel Valley Community Plan's land use and the Land Development Code's zoning designation. The project is located in an urbanized area of San Diego and construction of a single-family residence 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

The project is located in a Very High Fire Severity Zone, in an urbanized neighborhood of similar residential development. The project would construct a new single-family residence and would comply with the City's Brush Management regulations. The project is consistent with the zoning and land use designation pursuant to the Carmel Valley Community Plan. The project would not have the potential to expose occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. Therefore, impacts would remain below a level of significance.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project is located in a residential neighborhood with similar development. The site is currently serviced by existing infrastructure which would service the site after construction is completed. No new construction of roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities would be constructed that would exacerbate fire risk. 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. The project would comply with the City's appropriate Best Management Practices (BMP) for drainage and would not expose people or structures to significant risks as a result of run-off, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, 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 there are significant impacts related to Biological Resources. As such, mitigation measures included in this document would reduce these potential impacts to a less than significant level as outlined within the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 the environment, notably with respect to Biological Resources, which may have cumulatively considerable impacts. As such, mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impacts to less than significant. Other future projects within the surrounding neighborhood or community would be required to comply with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations to reduce the potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts.

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 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: Carmel Valley

#### II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

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

#### III. Air Quality

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

#### IV. Biology

- City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996
- City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997
- Community Plan - Resource Element
- California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001
- California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001
- City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines
- Site Specific Report: *Biological Resources Letter*, prepared by RECON (July 1, 2021)

#### 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: *Historical Resources Survey*, prepared by RECON (December 21, 2020)

#### VI. Energy

- City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP), (City of San Diego 2015)
- City of San Diego Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist – Via Del Mar Project

#### 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: *Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report*, prepared by Christian Wheeler Engineering (December 21, 2020)

**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 – Via Del Mar Project

**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
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- Site Specific Report:

**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:

**XI. Land Use and Planning**

- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan: Carmel Valley
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
- 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: Carmel Valley
- San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps
- Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps
- Montgomery Field CNEL Maps
- San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes


- San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG  
 Site Specific Report:
- 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:
- XV. Population / Housing**
- City of San Diego General Plan  
 Community Plan: Carmel Valley  
 Series 11/Series 12 Population Forecasts, SANDAG  
 Other:
- XVI. Public Services**
- City of San Diego General Plan  
 Community Plan: Carmel Valley
- XVII. Recreational Resources**
- City of San Diego General Plan  
 Community Plan: Carmel Valley  
 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: Carmel Valley  
 San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG  
 San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG  
 City of San Diego Draft Transportation Manual  
 Site Specific Report:
- XIX. Utilities**
- City of San Diego General Plan  
 Community Plan: Carmel Valley  
 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:

**XXII. Wildfire**


- City of San Diego General Plan
- Community Plan: Carmel Valley
- 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 Map

Via Del Mar CDP SDP - Project No. 670393  
3821 Via Del Mar

Figure 1



## Site Plan

Via Del Mar CDP SDP – Project No. 670393  
3821 Via Del Mar



Figure 2