

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

CITY OF NATIONAL CITY
Planning Division
1243 National City Boulevard
National City, CA 91950

1. **PROJECT TITLE/PROJECT #:** 2021-22 LS – Tentative Parcel Map for subdividing one lot into four at 1616 ‘M’ Avenue with exceptions for less than required lot width and lot size.

2. **LEAD AGENCY:** City of National City
Planning Department
1243 National City Boulevard
National City, CA 91950

Contact: Martin Reeder, AICP –Principal Planner
Phone: (619) 336-4313

3. **PROJECT LOCATION:** Southwest corner of East 16th Street and “M” Avenue, National City, CA 91950

4. **PROJECT PROPONENT:** Fernando Diaz De La Vega

5. **ZONING DESIGNATION:** Small Lot Residential (RS-2)

6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Tentative Parcel Map for the subdivision of an existing parcel into four. The property has four existing buildings, two primary residence sand two accessory dwelling units. Two lots will each have one of the residences and one of the accessory dwelling units. The remaining to two lots will be developed in the future. The two lots to be developed later are each 4,600 square feet in size and have 46 feet of street frontage, where 5,000 square feet and 50 feet respectively are typically required. The City’s Subdivision Ordinance allows for exceptions to these development standards. However, the normal categorical exemption – Section 15315 (Minor Land Divisions) does not apply due to the requested exceptions.

7. **SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:** The project site is surrounded by low-medium density residential uses of approximately 10 unit per acre. There is an undeveloped 1.7-acre property located across East 16th Street to the north, which was recently approved for a 39-unit multi-unit residential complex. The area slopes down approximately 15 feet from the west property line to the east.

8. **OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL MAY BE REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED):** N/A

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” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION:

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)
On the basis of this Initial Evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a “potentially significant impact” or is “potentially significant unless mitigated.” An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effect that remains to be addressed.

Signature 	Date 12/9/2021
Printed Name: Martin Reeder, AICP	Title: Principal Planner

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 the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address 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 w/ Mitigation Incorporated” applied where the incorporation of a mitigation measure has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to “Less than Significant Impact”. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D).
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). References 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 whichever 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 significance.

ISSUES with Supporting Documentation & Sources

I – AESTHETICS - Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime Views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The project site is an existing developed lot surrounded by other existing urban development. There are no scenic vistas or resources in the area that would be affected by the project. The development of the property would meet the density of the RS-2 zone (8.7 units per acre).

II – AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a				

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| Williamson Act contract? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

The City of National City does not contain farmland or agricultural resources, forest land, nor any land zoned for agricultural use. As such, approval of this project will have no impact on such lands or resources.

III – AIR QUALITY

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

Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| • e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

The City does not have any applicable air quality plan or standards that would apply in this case. Air quality is under the purview of the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District. The County of San Diego and National City are in attainment for all California Clean Air Act (CCAA) pollutants with the exception of ozone. Approval of this project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the San Diego County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) to manage air quality in our region. The prescribed density of the project area allows up to 4.8 residential units (not including accessory dwellings units). Approval of the

project would allow 4 residential units, of which two exist. While not proposing to be constructed, the two additional units could be reasonably estimated to generate approximately 12 additional vehicle trips per day. This amount does not trigger any threshold for a focused traffic study or traffic impact analysis. As such, overall, approval of this project will have no impact on air quality.

IV – BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? (Sources: 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 6, 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 5)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The property is a mostly developed and disturbed residential lot. There is no habitat of any kind on the lot. The two newly-created lots are currently a landscaped area consisting of dirt, and small non-native shrubs

There are no adopted habitat conservation plans within the City of National City.

V – CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? (Sources: 3, 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5? (Sources: 3, 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Sources: 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Sources: 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

No historical or archaeological resources as defined in Section 15064.5 are known to exist on the proposed project site. However, there is one previously recorded cultural resource within a half-mile radius of the project area and two previously recorded historical structures within a half-mile radius of the project area. Even with the number of cultural resources recorded within a half-mile radius of the project area, there is a very low likelihood of encountering unrecorded cultural resources within the project area at such time as any construction takes place. In addition, the site is previously disturbed, including the two properties to be developed in the future. Construction work would be limited to slab-on-grade construction and grading would be limited to the creation of flat areas on which to pour the slab. Therefore, there would be no impact to cultural resources caused by the proposed project or potential future development.

VI – GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------------|-----------|
| 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. (Sources: 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| iv) Landslides? (Sources: 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 2, 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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? (Sources: 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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? (Sources: 9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

- 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? (Sources: 9)

California Geological Survey information indicates the site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone, and there are no known active or potentially active faults that intercept the project site; therefore, the potential for ground rupture at this site is considered low. The nearest active fault to the site is the La Nacion Fault, located approximately a mile to the northeast. Accordingly, the site is not considered to possess a significantly greater seismic risk than that of the surrounding area in general. The site is not within an area susceptible to landslides and not within a fault zone, slide prone area or an area susceptible to liquefaction; therefore there is no impact or increased exposure to landslides due to the proposed project.

It should be recognized that Southern California is an area that is subject to some degree of seismic risk and that it is generally not considered economically feasible nor technologically practical to build structures that are totally resistant to earthquake-related hazards. Construction in accordance with the minimum requirements of the Uniform Building Code should minimize damage due to seismic events. Due to the number and nature of the active and non-active fault lines within the southern California region, it cannot be known when earthquakes will occur; therefore, there is a less than significant impact.

No construction or grading is proposed as part of this project, which is solely a subdivision of an existing developed lot. Any future design and construction would require conformance with City’s stormwater ordinance and grading regulations. Therefore, there is no impact or increased substantial erosion due to the proposed project.

The existing site has traditional sewer laterals, which connect with the existing sewer system that serves the City. Any future design and construction would connect to the same system. There would be no use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems; therefore, no impact.

VII – GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Sources: 1, 9, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Sources: 1,9, 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

GHG emissions contribute, on a cumulative basis, to the significant adverse environmental impacts of global climate change. No single project could generate enough GHG emissions to noticeably change the global average temperature. The combination of GHG emissions from past, present, and future projects contributes substantially to the phenomenon of global climate change and its associated environmental impacts and as such is addressed only as a cumulative impact. No construction is proposed at this time, therefore there is no impact. However, any future construction of up to two new homes would occur over the short construction duration, and would consist primarily of emissions from equipment exhaust. There would also be long-term regional emissions associated with project-related new vehicular trips and indirect source emissions, such as energy usage. The existing density in the area allows up to 4.8 residential units. Approval of the project would allow five units; therefore there would still be not impact to air quality.

California has adopted several policies and regulations for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. On

December 11, 2008, CARB adopted the AB 32 Scoping Plan to achieve the goals of AB 32 that establishes an overall framework for the measures that will be adopted to reduce California’s GHG emissions. The proposed project is subject to compliance with AB 32, which is designed to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.

In addition, in 2012 the City of National City adopted its Climate Action Plan and associated targets to reduce GHG emissions by 15 percent below 2005/2006 levels by 2020, with additional reductions by 2030. Some of the primary provisions of the Climate Action Plan are to promote greater density and infill development, water conservation, energy efficiency, and waste reduction strategies. The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG emissions, as contained in the Climate Action Plan. Based on the above, therefore no impact.

VIII – HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The existing project area is developed with two residences and two accessory dwelling units. No transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials is expected, due to no additional construction at this time. At such time as the two vacant lots will be developed, the two additional residences would be consistent with the prescribed use and density of the RS-2 zone. Therefore, there will not be any reasonably foreseeable upset or accident condition involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.

The project is not expected to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in general, and is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The site is already developed and would only be developed in conformance with the existing zoning of the property, which has already been analyzed under the CEQA action adopted for creation of the zone. The site is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. As a result the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Therefore, there would be no impact.

There is no adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan in the City, although there are local considerations that are included as appendices to the Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization approved Annex Q of the Operational Area Emergency Plan. The project does not conflict with any of the considerations or plans in the Area Emergency Plan, thus no conflict.

The site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5; There are no airports or airstrips in the vicinity; the project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan; and the project is not adjacent to any wildlands or land subject to wildland fires; therefore there would not be any significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildfires. Therefore, there is no impact.

IX – HYDROLOGY / WATER QUALITY

Would the project:	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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)? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1, 3, 6, 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

The project is developed and no construction is proposed at this time. At such time as the two new vacant lots will be developed, they will be subject to water quality and discharge requirements through the City’s Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan (JRMP). In addition, the project will not result in a density greater than that already anticipated under the RS-2 zoning. Future design of the potential two new single-family dwellings will require compliance with all storm water handling, storage, drainage, and hydromodification regulations. The property is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area or an area influenced by any levee or dam failure, seiche, tsunami, or mudflow; therefore, no impact.

X – LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| 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? (Sources: 1, 2, 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Sources: 1, 2) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

The site is surrounded by existing low density residential development. The existing density already allows for up to five units, where only four would be constructed under potential future conditions. Development of the site would not physically impact the existing community; therefore, there would be no impact to established communities.

There are no applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans in the City, therefore no impact.

XI – MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

- | | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| 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? (Sources: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

specific plan or other land use plan? (Sources: 1)

The project site is located completely within an urbanized area and surrounded by development. The site contains no known mineral resources on the proposed project site or delineated on a local plan for the site; therefore, there is no impact to mineral resources.

XII – NOISE

Would the project result in:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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 project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The proposed project area is in an urbanized area and is a residential use in an area of mostly residential development. As no construction is proposed at this time, the use is not expected to generate any additional ambient noise in this area. Furthermore, the development is subject to the limitations contained in the City’s Noise Ordinance; therefore, no impacts are expected.

Any associated construction in the future on the project site would create temporary noise impacts. Modern construction equipment, properly used and maintained, should not exceed the noise limits contained in the City’s Noise Ordinance. All noise generated by the project would be required to comply with the City’s Noise Ordinance and be limited to specific hours of operation. No significant impact from the project would occur.

The proposed project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport or private airstrip; therefore, there is no impact to those people working on the project site.

XIII – POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (Sources: 1, 2, 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | X |

The property is currently zoned for a density of five residential. Only the single-family zoning, which permits one home per lot, is preventing construction of said units. Subdividing the property will allow for two additional units, which would be an overall density of 7.2 units acre, below the maximum density of 8.7 units per acre. therefore no housing or people will be displaced. Therefore, there will be no impact.

XIV – PUBLIC SERVICES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Police protection? (Sources: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Schools? (Sources: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Parks? (Sources: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
Other public facilities? (Sources: 1, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

The proposed project would not result in any impacts to public services, as no construction is proposed. The project site is currently and will continue to be served by the National City Fire and Police Department. The closest Fire Station is approximately a half mile away on East 16th Street, and the Police Station at 12th Street and National City Boulevard is one mile away. Typical response time for this area would not be adversely impacted, as plans do not involve changes to public streets adjacent to the site. Any potential development of two new residences will generate impact fees specifically slated for public services that will supplement any additional requirements brought about by said residential development; therefore, there is no impact. Park and school fees will also be paid as part of potential development to offset any increase in need generated by the project, thus no impact.

XV – RECREATION

Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation	Less Than Significant	No Impact
-------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------

	Impact	Incorporation	Impact	
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? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

There are three parks within a mile and a half of the project, which are currently underutilized and able to accommodate potential use by the potential addition of two new families that could be expected from the potential two new residences. Therefore, there would be no impact.

XVI – TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (Sources: 1, 2, 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

There are no plans, ordinances, or policies that measure circulation system current effectiveness or performance, thus no impact. There is also no congestion management program that the project would conflict with.

This segment of East 16th Street (“L” Avenue to Palm Avenue) currently has an ADT (Average Daily Trip) rate 7,800 and a capacity of 10,000 ADT. The segment operates at a current Level of Service (LOS) of D and is expected to operate at an LOS of F in 2035. According to trip generation rates published by the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), the two potential homes could be expected to generate another 12 vehicle trips per day, which would not exceed the current or proposed (2035) maximum capacity. Furthermore, the existing allowable density is already calculated in said capacity data.

No change in road design is proposed which would cause a safety risk or hinder emergency access. The project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities, as there are no such activities existing or planned in this area, thus no impact.

XVII – UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (Sources: 1, 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1, 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1, 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Sources: 1, 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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? (Sources: 1, 11)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? (Sources: 1, 13)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Sources: 1, 12)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Any potential project would be designed and constructed using Best Management Practices (BMPs) to appropriately handle wastewater and not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board; therefore, there is no impact.

The existing property is located within an urbanized area and served by existing water facilities. There is an existing 16-inch PVC water main in the East 16th Street right-of-way that services the property. Sweetwater Authority, the local water provider, has indicated that additional infrastructure, as needed by the potential two new homes, can be provided. Also, all necessary improvements would be included with potential development of the two new residences, and project approval and construction would be undertaken in

accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations; therefore, there would be no impact.

The existing site is served by EDCO, the local waste collection and recycle company. EDCO has a contract with the City to handle City residents’ waste disposal and recycling needs. According to EDCO staff, the company utilizes several landfill sites for the disposal of waste collected in National City, with the most common being Otay Mesa, Sycamore, and Miramar Landfills, with an additional 12, 26 and 9 years of capacity remaining respectively; therefore, there is a less than significant impact. There are two other landfill sites in San Diego County – the Ramona landfill, which is full, and Borrego Springs landfill, which has an additional 30 years capacity remaining. In addition, the proposed project would comply with all federal, state, and local statues and regulations related to solid waste.

XVIII – MANDATORY FINDINGS of SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
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)? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

Discussion: No significant impacts to the environment as a result of this project have been identified. Approval of the project is not expected to have any significant impacts, either long-term or short-term, nor will it cause substantial adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

REFERENCE SOURCES:

Reference # Document Title

1 National City General Plan

Available for Review at:

National City
 Planning Department
 1243 National City Boulevard
 National City, CA 91950
<http://www.nationalcityca.gov/>

2	City of National City Municipal Code	National City Planning Department
3	Case File 2021-22 LS	National City Planning Department
4	SANDAG trip generation by land use	www.sandag.org
5	US Fish and Wildlife Service	https://www.fws.gov/
6	US Fish and Wildlife Wetland Mapper System	https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html
7	South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) cultural resources records search	National City Planning Department
8	California Department of Conservation	http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/
9	City of National City Final Climate Action Plan	National City Planning Department
10	Environmental Protection Agency	https://www.epa.gov/energy/greenhouse-gas-equivalencies-calculator
11	Comments received from Building, Engineering, and Fire Departments, and Sweetwater Authority	National City Planning Department
12	California Integrated Waste Management Board	http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/
13	Environmental Protection Agency	https://www.epa.gov/energy/greenhouse-gas-equivalencies-calculator