



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PRJ-0696585
SCH No. Pending

SUBJECT: Mercado Apartments: A request for a COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to amend Coastal Development Permit No. 92-0490, and a SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT to demolish two existing, two-story apartment buildings (12 dwelling units), trash enclosure and a portion of the parking lot, and construct a 4-story, 92-unit, 100,169-square-foot 100% affordable housing development. The project includes 5,886 square-feet of outdoor courtyard and plaza space. The project amends the existing development permit to reduce the minimum required number of vehicular parking spaces within the project site from 194 to 94 parking spaces. The project is requesting an incentive to reduce dedication and street improvement requirements. Three waivers are being requested; reduced window height, direct access from the street and removal of the requirement for building setbacks. The site is located at 2001 Newton Street and consists of 0.98 acres within the 4.34-acre Site Assessor's Parcel Number 538-672-0400. The site is designated as Residential/Commercial/Industrial and is zoned Barrio Logan Planned District (BLPD)-Redevelopment Sub-District. In addition, the site is within the Coastal Overlay Zone N-APP-2, Airport Influence Area (San Diego International Airport Review Area 2 and Naval Air Station North Island Review Area 2), Federal Aviation Administration Part 77 Notification Area, Parking Standards Transit Priority Area, Promise Zone, Transit Area Overlay Zone, and Transit Priority Area. [Legal Description: Parcel 1 of Parcel Map No. 17172, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, County Recorder of San Diego County June 29, 1993, as File No. 1993-0414075 Of Official Records]. APPLICANT: MAAC Development

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 (IS) which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect with regard to **Land Use** and **Noise**. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated

Negative Declaration (MND). 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

Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)

1. Prior to the issuance of a Notice to Proceed (NTP) for a construction permits, such as Demolition, Grading or Building, or beginning any construction-related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve all Construction Documents (CD) (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (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: 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 DSD 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.

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

6. 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), and Job Site Superintendent:

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, applicant is also required to call RE and MMC at 858-627-3360.
7. MMRP COMPLIANCE. This Project, PRJ-0696585, 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.

8. 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.
9. 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 DSD 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.

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

DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL/INSPECTION CHECKLIST

Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/ Approvals/Notes
General	Consultant qualification letters	Prior to preconstruction meeting
General	Consultant construction monitoring exhibits	Prior to preconstruction meeting
Noise	Construction Noise Management Plan	Inspection to verify noise measures during demolition and construction
Noise	Verification Letter - Vibration Monitoring and Control Plan	Inspection to verify vibration measures during demolition and construction

B. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS REQUIREMENTS

NOI-1 Construction Noise Management Plan: Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, the Owner/Permittee shall submit to the City a Construction Noise Management Plan prepared by a Qualified Acoustician that identifies the measures to be included on the construction plans to ensure compliance with the 75 dBA L_{EQ} (12-hour) limits specified by the City Noise Ordinance, when measured at occupied residences where noise is being received. These measures may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Construction equipment shall be properly outfitted and maintained with manufacturer-recommended noise-reduction devices.
- Diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.
- Mobile or fixed “package” equipment (e.g., arc-welders and air compressors) shall be equipped with shrouds and noise control features that are readily available for that type of equipment.
- Electrically powered equipment shall be used instead of pneumatic or internal-combustion powered equipment, where feasible.
- Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines (e.g., in excess of 5 minutes) shall be prohibited.
- The use of noise-producing signals, including horns, whistles, alarms, public address systems, and bells, shall be for safety warning purposes only.
- A reduction of the hours per day when heavy construction equipment would be in operation.
- A solid barrier shall be erected along the northeast and northwest boundaries of the project site prior to the start of demolition. The barrier shall be constructed with a

material achieving a transmission loss of 10 dBA, or an STC 10 rating to adequately reduce noise levels. The barrier shall be at a height of at least 12 feet to block the line-of-sight between construction equipment and first-floor receptors, or up to the height of the nearest window. These barriers would mitigate noise levels to within acceptable levels. To effectively reduce noise levels, the sound barrier should be constructed prior to the start of demolition and remain in place until the conclusion of construction grading activities.

- The existing second-story units in Mercado Apartment complex buildings with a direct line-of-sight facing the project area shall be vacated throughout the demolition and grading phases of construction. If agreed to by existing residents, the temporary vacancies shall be demonstrated via written signed documentation from the Owner/Permittee and applicable residents to the City's Mitigation Monitoring Coordinator. The second-story units that would be exposed to elevated construction noise levels are listed as follows:
 - 2061 Newton Avenue, Unit 224
 - 2079 Newton Avenue, Unit 228
 - 2079 Newton Avenue, Unit 229
 - 2079 Newton Avenue, Unit 230
 - 2097 Newton Avenue, Unit 234
 - 2097 Newton Avenue, Unit 235
 - 2097 Newton Avenue, Unit 236
 - 2058 Main Street, Unit 257
 - 2058 Main Street, Unit 260
 - 2086 Main Street, Unit 264
 - 2086 Main Street, Unit 265
 - 2086 Main Street, Unit 266

NOI-2 Vibration Monitoring and Control Plan. Vibration from construction equipment shall not exceed the 0.04 PPV in/sec level for nearby residential receptors. Prior to grading permit issuance, the City shall verify the following requirements are identified on the grading plans and the Owner/Permittee has provided written signed documentation that demonstrates the following construction limitations shall be implemented:

- When grading occurs within 52 feet of an occupied residence, the Grading Contractor shall use a small bulldozer, or temporarily relocate the resident(s).
- When soil compaction occurs within 75 feet of an occupied residence, the Grading Contractor shall use a hand-operated tamper or walk-behind compactor, or temporarily relocate the resident(s) during vibration-generating activity.
- Hand-operated tampers shall not be used within 11 feet of an occupied residence, or temporarily relocate the resident(s) during vibration-generating activity.

If temporary relocations of residents are requested, residents shall return to their residences upon completion of vibration-inducing construction activities as described above.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION

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

State of California

State Clearinghouse

Councilmember Moreno, District 8
Development Services Department

Environmental

Planning

Engineering

Transportation Development

Water and Sewer

Planning Department

Long Range Planning

Environmental Services Department

San Diego Fire Rescue Department

San Diego Police Department

Library Department - Government Documents (81)

Central Library (81A)

Logan Heights Library (81N)

City Attorney (93C)

David Li, Development Coordination-DSD (78A)

Other Organizations, Groups, and Interested Individuals

Barrio Logan Community Planning Group (240)

San Diego Unified School District (132)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health and Quality

County Site Assessment and Mitigation

San Diego County Apartment Association (152)

Clint Linton, Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel

Lisa Cumper, Jamul Indian Village

Angelina Gutierrez, San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians

Richard Drury, Lozeau Drury LLP

Molly Greene, Lozeau Drury LLP

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.



Dawna Marshall, Senior Planner
Development Services Department

February 4, 2025

Date of Draft Report

Date of Final Report

Attachments: Initial Study Checklist
Figure 1 – Regional Location
Figure 2 – Aerial Photograph
Figure 3 – Site Plan

This page intentionally left blank

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Mercado Apartments Project / PRJ-0696585
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: Dawna Marshall / (619) 687-5904
4. Project location: 2001 Newton Avenue, San Diego, California 92113
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Oscar Del Toro, 1355 Third Avenue, San Diego CA 91911
6. Community Plan designation: Residential /Commercial/Industrial
7. Zoning: Barrio Logan Planned District (BLPD)-Redevelopment Sub-District
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 site is a 0.98-acre portion of a 4.34-acre parcel (project parcel; Assessor's Parcel Number 538-672-0400) currently occupied by multi-family residential use and associated parking lots at 2001 Newton Avenue in the City of San Diego (City). Refer to Figure 1, *Regional Location*, and Figure 2, *Aerial Photograph*. The project proposes to construct one new four-story structure encompassing six sub structures, totaling 100,169 square feet (SF). The project would include 92 units of affordable housing residential apartments. In addition, the project would demolish two existing two-story buildings on the property totaling approximately 12,000 SF, a parking lot with 116 parking spaces, and trash enclosure. The project would also include 5,886 SF of outdoor courtyard and plaza space. Additional vehicular parking is not included as part of the project. Refer to Figure 3, *Site Plan*.

Direct site access for pedestrians would be provided by the new main entry off Evans Street, and two new entries off Main Street. A loading driveway would also be provided off Main Street. Vehicular access would be provided by an existing driveway off Newton Street, which provides access to the existing apartment complex surrounding the project site. The existing driveway on Evans Street would be removed as part of the project and replaced with full height curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The project is requesting an incentive to reduce the requirement for dedication and street improvements on Main Street and Evans Street. In addition, the project is seeking waivers (1) from San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 152.0319(e)(1)(A) to allow for a 7-foot window height instead of 10 feet, (2) from SDMC Section 152.0319(e)(1)(B) to allow direct access from the street and (3) from SDMC Section 152.0319(f)(1) to remove the requirement for setbacks.

The project is proposed to be constructed in one phase, with construction assumed to be completed in 2026. Construction would require balanced cut and fill of 750 cubic yards over a 42,790 square-foot area, with no export.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The 0.98-acre project site consists of one APN 538-672-0400, located at 2001 Newton Avenue in the Barrio Logan Neighborhood of the City. The site has been previously developed as a multi-family residence called the Mercado Apartments. The site is contained on the Cortese list compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5. The project site is located within the Barrio Logan Community Plan Area, south of Downtown San Diego and west of I-5. Surrounding land uses include multi-family residences, the Coronado bridge, and Chicano Park to the north; multi-family residences to the east; and industrial and commercial uses to the south, east, and west.

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

NA

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?

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill 52, the City sent notification letters to the Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. The Notifications were distributed to the Jamul Indian Village, Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel, and San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians for consultation on February 28, 2024. No tribe requested consultation. Please see Section XVIII of the Initial Study for more detail.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

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. “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;
 - b. Where applicable, the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) are identified and used to evaluate project impacts; and
 - c. 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

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

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Pursuant to the City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a), projects that block public views from designated open space areas, roads, or scenic vistas to significant visual landmarks may result in significant impacts. The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds also note that grading activities resulting in landform alterations of more than 2,000 cubic yards per acre, or less in highly scenic or environmentally sensitive areas, may also result in substantial adverse impacts to scenic vistas under certain conditions.

A scenic vista is generally defined as a public viewpoint that provides expansive or notable views of a highly valued landscape and are typically identified in planning documents, such as the applicable community plan, but can also include locally known areas or locations where high-quality public views are available. The project was deemed complete on October 25, 2022, and is therefore subject to the 1978 Barrio Logan/ Harbor 101 Community Plan. The 1978 Barrio Logan Community Plan (City 1978) contains information regarding the visual resources and public views that are integral to the character of the community.

Although Barrio Logan is marked by several visual barriers and a lack of major vista points, there are several visual landmarks located in the Barrio Logan community. The 1978 Barrio Logan Community Plan identifies various visual breaks in the industrial views that dominate the area, such as Chollas Creek and the Coronado Bridge, which serves as a major landmark in the San Diego Bay. San Diego Bay is the dominating visual feature in the area, although it is generally obscured at ground level due to the industrial development in the tidelands area. The proposed buildings would integrate visually and topographically with surrounding development. The development would not significantly block views of Chollas Creek, as it is not visible from the project area. Considering the elevation of the Coronado Bridge relative to the proposed buildings, the proposed buildings would not significantly block views of the Coronado Bridge. Views of the San Diego Bay and the downtown skyline would remain available with implementation of the project.

During construction, equipment would be located within the project site; however, this equipment would be in this area temporarily and would not result in a permanent alteration of scenic vistas or critical view corridors. Views of the San Diego Bay and the downtown skyline would remain available with implementation of the project. Accordingly, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Pursuant to the City’s 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a), projects that block public views from designated open space areas, roads, or scenic vistas to significant visual landmarks may result in significant impacts. State scenic highways are considered scenic vistas due to the visual attributes and resources that comprise their designation.

The closest designated state scenic highway to the project is State Route (SR) 75 where it crosses San Diego Bay via the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge. This state scenic highway is located approximately 1,000 feet west of the project site. Because the tops of project buildings would be at a lower elevation than the bridge roadway, the site would not block public views from the designated state scenic highway. In addition, as described in I(a), the project would occur within a previously developed area, and the proposed buildings would integrate visually and topographically with surrounding development. There are no structures or historic buildings, rock outcroppings, or mature tree stands within the project site. The redevelopment of a portion of a multi-family residential development and associated parking lot into the proposed multi-family residential would not be visually prominent in the view from the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge. Therefore, the project would not substantially damage or block views of scenic resources, including those along a state scenic highway. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

According to the City’s Thresholds, projects that severely contrast with the surrounding neighborhood character may result in a significant impact. To meet this significance threshold the project must exceed allowable height or bulk regulations, use a contrasting architectural theme, result in the loss or degradation of a designated community landmark, be located in a highly visible area, and/or open a new area for development.

The proposed project would involve the construction of 92 multi-family residential units and courtyard and plaza space. Per Land Development Code Section 143.0920, projects proposing affordable, infill, and sustainable development may request deviations from applicable development regulations. As the project proposes infill development of 100 percent affordable housing, the project is seeking the use of a waiver for window height, direct access from the street and the requirement for step backs.

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

The 1978 Barrio Logan Community plan generally states that future development should take into consideration surrounding communities and the waterfront when determining development type, intensity, view corridors and landscaping. The project site is located within the existing housing development of Mercado Apartments. While deviations for window heights and step backs would be applied, the proposed project would generally implement similar height and design standards as the existing development. In addition, the project site currently consists of residential units, a parking lot, and a trash enclosure; no designated community landmarks would be removed or degraded by the development of the proposed project. The project also does not consist of infrastructure or other elements that would open a new area for future development, thereby resulting in a cumulative impact to visual character. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site or the surrounding area and impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The project site is currently developed with existing multi-family residences and parking lots/hardscape. The demolition of approximately 12,000 SF of existing buildings and associated parking lot and trash enclosure for the provision of a four-story structure encompassing six substructures and outdoor courtyard and plaza space would not create a new significant source of light compared to the existing condition. The project would comply with the outdoor lighting standards contained in SDMC Section 142.0740 (Outdoor Lighting Regulations) that require 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. Additionally, the project would not introduce a source of glare that could affect day or nighttime views. Exterior materials utilized for the proposed structure would be limited to specific reflectivity ratings as required per SDMC Section 142.0730 (Glare Regulations). Therefore, the project would not create substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, and impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

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

and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

- Would the project:

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

Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and irrigation status; the best quality land is called Prime Farmland. Unique farmland is land, other than prime farmland, which has combined conditions to produce sustained high quality and high yields of specialty crops. Farmland of Statewide Importance may include tracts of land that have been designated for agriculture by State law. In some areas that are not identified as having national or statewide importance, land is considered to be Farmland of Local Importance. The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) maintained by the California Department of Conservation (DOC) is the responsible state agency for overseeing the farmland classification. In addition, the City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that in relation to converting designated farmland, a determination of substantial amount cannot be based on any one numerical criterion (i.e., one acre), but rather on the economic viability of the area proposed to be converted. Another factor to be considered is the location of the area proposed for conversion.

According to the DOC's California Important Farmland Finder, the project site is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land, which is "land occupied by structures with a building density of at least 1 unit to 1.5 acres, or approximately 6 structures to a 10-acre parcel. This land is used for residential, industrial, commercial, construction, institutional, public administration, railroad and other transportation yards, cemeteries, airports, golf courses, sanitary landfills, sewage treatment, water control structures, and other developed purposes" (DOC 2022). Agricultural land is not present on the site or in the general vicinity. As a result, the project would not result in the conversion of land to non-agricultural use. No impact would occur.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

The Williamson Act, also known as the California Land Conservation Act of 1965, enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agricultural or related open space use; in return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. The Williamson Act is only applicable to parcels within an established agricultural preserve consisting of at least 20 acres of Prime Farmland, or at least

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

40 acres of land not designated as Prime Farmland. The Williamson Act is designed to prevent the premature and unnecessary conversion of open space lands and agricultural areas to urban uses.

As described above, the project site is not located on or near land zoned for agriculture or land that has a Williamson Act contract. The project site has been previously developed. No impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Public Resources Code Section 12220(g) defines “forest land” as land that can support 10 percent native cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. According to Public Resources Code Section 4526, “timberland” means land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. Based on these definitions, no forest land or timberland occurs within the project site. Moreover, there is no land zoned as forest land or timberland that exists within the project site or within its vicinity. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for or cause a rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No impact would occur.

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

As stated in III(c), there is no forest land present on the site or in the project vicinity. The site has not been historically and is not currently used or planned to be used for forest land. As such, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Refer to III(a) through III(d), above. No existing agricultural or forest land uses are located in the vicinity of the project site. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use. Therefore, the project would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland or forest land into non-agricultural or non-forest use. No impact would occur.

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:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 discussion below is based on the Air Quality Technical Report prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) for the proposed project (HELIX 2023a; Appendix A).

The project site is located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), which is governed by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). The SDAPCD develops and administers local regulations for stationary air pollutant sources within the SDAB and develops plans and programs to meet attainment requirements for both federal and state ambient air quality standards (National Ambient Air Quality Standards [NAAQS] and California Ambient Air Quality Standards [CAAQS], respectively). The current regional air quality plan for the NAAQS is SDAPCD's *2020 Plan for Attaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone in San Diego County* (Attainment Plan; SDAPCD 2020) and the current regional air quality plans for the CAAQS is SDAPCD's *2016 Revision to the Regional Air Quality Strategy for San Diego County* (RAQS; SDAPCD 2016). These plans accommodate emissions from a variety of sources, including natural sources, through implementation of control measures, where feasible, on stationary sources to attain the standards. Mobile sources are regulated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the emissions and reduction strategies related to mobile sources are considered in the Attainment Plan and RAQS.

The SDAPCD is required, pursuant to the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the SDAB is in nonattainment. Strategies to achieve these emissions reductions are developed in the Attainment Plan and RAQS, prepared by the SDAPCD for the region. Criteria pollutants of primary concern include ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), particulate matter (including both respirable particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter [PM₁₀] and fine particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter [PM_{2.5}]), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead. The SDAB is currently designated as a nonattainment area for the 8-hour NAAQS for ozone. The SDAB is designated as being in attainment for all other applicable criteria pollutants under the NAAQS. The SDAB is currently classified as a nonattainment area under the CAAQS for ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. It is in attainment for CO, NO₂, SO₂, and lead relative to state air standards.

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

Both the Attainment Plan and RAQS rely on information from CARB and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in the County, to project future emissions and then determine from that the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends and land use plans developed by the cities and by the County as part of the development of their respective general plans. As such, projects that are consistent with the growth assumptions used in the Attainment Plan and RAQS, do not conflict with the control measures in the Attainment Plan and RAQS, and that do not result in criteria pollutant and precursor emissions in excess of the thresholds adopted by the City, would not hinder the goal of the Attainment Plan or RAQS to bring the SDAB into compliance with the NAAQS and CAAQS for the protection of public health.

The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Multiple Use and a Community Plan land use designation of Residential/Commercial/Industrial. The site is zoned Barrio Logan Planned District (BLPD)-Redevelopment Sub-District. The project's residential uses would be consistent with the General Plan land use. The project would provide 92 units and would be within the allowable units for the zoning of the project site. Therefore, the project would not be in conflict with the Attainment Plan and RAQS.

Furthermore, as detailed in III(b) below, the project would not result in a significant air quality impact with regards to construction- and operational-related emissions of ozone precursors or criteria air pollutants. The project would also comply with existing and new rules and regulations as they are implemented by the SDAPCD, CARB, and/or USEPA related to emissions generated during construction. Impacts associated with conformance to regional air quality plans would be less than significant.

- b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

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

As discussed above in III(a), the SDAB is classified as a nonattainment area under the NAAQS for 8-hour ozone and as a nonattainment area under the CAAQS for 1-hour ozone, 8-hour ozone, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5}. The SDAB is an attainment area for all other criteria pollutants. Ozone is not emitted directly but is a result of atmospheric activity on precursors. Nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and Reactive Organic Gases (ROG), otherwise known as Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), are known as the chief "precursors" of ozone. These compounds react in the presence of sunlight to produce ozone. PM_{2.5} includes fine particles that are found in smoke and haze and are emitted from all types of combustion activities (motor vehicles, power plants, wood burning, etc.) and certain industrial processes. PM₁₀ includes both fine and coarse dust particles, and sources include crushing or grinding operations and dust from paved or unpaved roads. To determine whether a project would (a) result in emissions that would violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, (b) result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of

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

PM₁₀, PM₁₀, or exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors (NO_x and VOCs), or (c) have an adverse effect on human health, project emissions may be evaluated based on the quantitative emission thresholds established by the SDAPCD. As part of its air quality permitting process, the SDAPCD has established thresholds in Rules 20.2 and 20.3 for the preparation of Air Quality Impact Assessments (AQIAs). In the absence of a SDAPCD adopted thresholds for PM_{2.5}, the SCAQMD's screening threshold of 55 pounds per day or 10 tons per year is used.

The project would generate criteria pollutants and ozone precursors in the short-term during construction and in the long-term during operation. Construction and operation air emissions were calculated using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) 2022.1 (California Air Pollution Control Officers Association [CAPCOA] 2022). The CalEEMod program is a tool used to estimate air emissions resulting from land development projects based on California-specific emission factors. The model estimates mass emissions from two basic sources: construction sources and operational sources (i.e., area, energy, and mobile sources).

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions

Project construction would involve the demolition of two existing structures totaling 12,000 SF, vegetation clearing and grubbing, soil movement (cut and fill) during grading, and excavation for the proposed structure. The export of demolition materials would require the use of on-road haul trucks that would generate air pollutant emissions. For grading and excavation, the project would export up to 200 cubic yards (CY) of fill. These construction-related activities would result in temporary, short-term air pollutant emissions. Sources of construction-related air emissions from these activities would include the following:

- Fugitive dust from soil movement activities (e.g., grading and excavation);
- Construction equipment exhaust;
- Construction vehicle exhaust related to trips by workers, delivery trucks, and material-hauling trucks; and
- Construction-related power consumption.

Fugitive dust emissions vary greatly during construction and are dependent on the amount and type of activity, silt content of the soil, and the weather. Vehicles moving over paved and unpaved surfaces, demolition, excavation, earth movement, grading, and wind erosion from exposed surfaces are all sources of fugitive dust. Standard dust control measures would be implemented as a part of project construction in accordance with SDAPCD Rule 55. This would involve watering two times daily during grading between dozer and scraper passes, ensuring that all exposed surfaces maintain a minimum soil moisture of 12 percent, limiting vehicle speeds on unpaved surfaces to 15 mph, stabilization of dirt storage piles, and termination of grading activities if winds exceed 25 miles per hour. The project would also exceed the requirements of SDAPCD Rule 67 by using no-VOC coatings.

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

The results of the calculations for the various phases of project construction are shown in Table 1, *Maximum Daily Construction Emissions*. The data are presented as the maximum anticipated daily emissions for comparison with the SDAPCD thresholds.

**Table 1
MAXIMUM DAILY CONSTRUCTION EMISSIONS**

Activity	Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Demolition	0.7	7.6	8.2	<0.1	2.2	0.6
Clearing and Grubbing	0.5	5.7	4.0	<0.1	0.5	0.2
Grading ¹	0.9	9.7	5.7	<0.1	2.9	1.5
Building Construction	0.8	6.5	8.6	<0.1	0.9	0.4
Paving	0.6	4.9	7.4	<0.1	0.4	0.2
Architectural Coating	27.3	1.2	2.1	<0.1	0.2	0.1
Maximum Daily Emissions	27.3	9.7	8.6	<0.1	2.9	1.5
<i>SDAPCD Thresholds</i>	<i>137</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Significant Impact?</i>	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: HELIX 2023a; Appendix A

VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides;

PM₁₀ = particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter

¹ Emissions calculations for grading do not include approximately 200 cubic yards of exported soil. This would result in approximately 16 haul truck round trips over the course of 10 working days, or approximately 2 to 3 trips in a given day. These additional trips would increase pollutant emissions by a negligible amount and would not change the significance conclusions in this table.

For assessing the significance of the air quality emissions resulting from construction of the project, the construction emissions were compared to the screening thresholds shown in Table 1. As shown in the table, emissions of all criteria pollutants and ozone precursors from project construction would be far below the SDAPCD's significance thresholds. Therefore, direct impacts associated with criteria pollutants generated during project construction would be less than significant.

Long-Term (Operational) Emissions

Operational sources of emissions include area, energy, and transportation sources. Operational emissions from area sources include engine emissions from landscape maintenance equipment and VOC emissions from repainting of buildings. Energy source emissions include the combustion of natural gas for heating and hot water. The project's assumed natural gas usage was based on model defaults.

Operational emissions from mobile sources are associated with project-related vehicle trip generation. Due to the proposed project's land use and estimated trip generation, a Local Mobility Analysis was not required per the requirements in the City of San Diego's Transportation Study Manual (TSM, 2022b). CalEEMod default trip rates, vehicle speeds, trip purpose, and trip distances were applied to the conservative assumptions for vehicle trips to calculate average daily trips (ADT)

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

and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for air quality purposes. Based on CalEEMod defaults, the project would generate an estimated 500 ADT for operational uses.

Table 2, *Maximum Daily Operational Emissions*, presents the calculated operational emissions for the project. As shown in Table 2, emissions of all criteria pollutants and ozone precursors associated with the project operations would be far below the SDAPCD’s significance thresholds. Therefore, direct impacts associated with criteria pollutants generated during project operations would be less than significant.

**Table 2
MAXIMUM DAILY OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS**

Category	Pollutant Emissions (pounds per day)					
	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Area	2.53	0.09	7.58	<0.01	0.04	0.04
Energy	0.02	0.17	0.07	<0.01	0.01	0.01
Mobile	1.30	1.41	12.25	0.03	3.03	0.82
Total Daily Emissions	3.85	1.67	19.90	0.03	3.08	0.88
<i>SDAPCD Thresholds</i>	<i>137</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>550</i>	<i>250</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>55</i>
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: HELIX 2023a; Appendix A

Note: The total presented is the sum of the unrounded values.

VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; SO₂ = sulfur dioxide;

PM₁₀ = particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter

- c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Sensitive receptors (i.e., children, senior citizens, and acutely or chronically ill people) are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the general population. Sensitive land uses include schools and schoolyards, parks and playgrounds, daycare centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential communities. The nearest sensitive receptor to the project site is the surrounding residential apartment complex and the on-site daycare facility. Additionally, there are single-family residences northeast of the project across Newton Avenue. Impacts to sensitive receptors are typically analyzed for operational period CO hotspots and exposure to toxic air contaminants (TACs). An analysis of the project’s potential to expose sensitive receptors to these pollutants is provided below.

Carbon Monoxide Hotspots

Localized air quality effects can occur when emissions from vehicular traffic increase in local areas. The primary mobile source pollutant of local concern is CO, which is a direct function of vehicle idling time and, thus, traffic flow conditions. CO transport is extremely limited—it disperses rapidly with distance from the source under normal meteorological conditions. However, under certain extreme meteorological conditions, CO concentrations proximate to a congested roadway or

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

intersection may reach unhealthful levels affecting local sensitive receptors (residents, school children, the elderly, hospital patients, etc.). Typically, high CO concentrations are associated with roadways or intersections operating at unacceptable levels of service or with extremely high traffic volumes. If a project generates vehicular traffic that increases average delay at signalized intersections operating at Level of Service (LOS) E or F or causes an intersection that would operate at LOS D or better without the project to operate at LOS E or F with the project, the project could result in significant CO hotspot-related effects to sensitive receptors.

Due to the proposed project being an infill development with no increased parking associated with it, and the proximity to public transportation hubs such as the Barrio Logan Light Rail Station, it is not anticipated to generate a substantial number of trips such that the local roadway network would be adversely affected. The project would generate 480 net ADT¹. As indicated in the City 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a), the project would not exceed the City's CO hotspot screening threshold of 9,500 ADT. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to result in a CO hotspot, and impacts would be less than significant.

Toxic Air Contaminants

Construction

Diesel engines emit a complex mixture of air pollutants, including gaseous material and DPM. DPM emissions would be released from operation of the on-site construction equipment used for project construction. CARB has declared that DPM from diesel engine exhaust is a TAC. Additionally, the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment has determined that chronic exposure to DPM can cause carcinogenic and non-carcinogenic health effects. For this reason, although other pollutants would be generated, DPM would be the primary pollutant of concern.

The dose to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance or substances in the environment and the duration of exposure to the substance. Thus, the risks estimated for a maximally exposed individual (MEI) are higher if a fixed exposure occurs over a longer time period. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, health risk assessments (HRAs), which determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions, should be based on a 30-year exposure period; however, such assessments should be limited to the period/duration of activities associated with a project.

There would be few pieces of off-road, heavy-duty diesel equipment operating at a given time during project construction, and the construction period would be relatively short, especially when compared to 30 years. In addition, as shown above in Table 1, the highest daily emission of PM₁₀ (which includes equipment emissions of DPM) during construction is estimated to be approximately 2.9 pounds per day, which would be well below the 100 pounds per day significance level threshold. These significance level thresholds were developed with the purpose of attaining the NAAQS and CAAQS, which identify concentrations of pollutants in the ambient air below which no adverse

¹ The proposed daily trip generation for the project is 552 ADT with 44 (9 in, 35 out) morning peak hour trips and 50 (35 in, 15 out) afternoon peak hour trips. This is based on a rate of 6 daily trips per dwelling unit for the 92 dwelling units for Multiple Dwelling Units (over 20 dwelling units per acre). Total net increase is 480 daily trip generation.

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

effects on the public health and welfare are anticipated. Combined with the highly dispersive properties of diesel PM, construction-related emissions would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial emissions of TACs.

The project site is located on a previous LUST case site involving gasoline-contaminated soils (Case #H32282-001). However, the case was closed in 2001, the site was deemed safe for residential use, and no further action related to the petroleum releases at the site is required. Additional information is provided in IX, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*. Therefore, given the closure of the site and that soil disturbance is expected to be minimal with only 200 cubic yards of fill export, the exposure of TACs as a result of grading would be less than significant. Impacts from construction emissions would be less than significant.

Operations

CARB siting recommendations within the *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook* suggest a detailed health risk assessment should be conducted for sensitive receptors within 1,000 feet of a warehouse distribution center, within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater), 50 feet of typical gas dispensing facilities, or within 300 feet of a dry cleaning facility that uses perchloroethylene (PCE), among other siting recommendations (CARB 2005). The project, as a residential development, does not include these types of sources and would not represent a substantial source of TACs that could affect off-site sensitive receptors. In addition, the project would not site the proposed residential use within these distances. There are no warehouse distribution centers, large gas stations, typical gas dispensing facilities, or dry-cleaning facilities that use perchloroethylene in the vicinity of the project site. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

- d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that the significance of potential odor impacts should be based on what is known about the quantity of the odor compound(s) that would result from the project's proposed use(s), the types of neighboring uses potentially affected, the distance(s) between the project's point source(s) and the neighboring uses such as sensitive receptors, and the resultant concentration(s) at the receptors. Additionally, the State of California Health and Safety Code Sections 41700 and 41705, and SDAPCD Rule 51, prohibit emissions from any source whatsoever in such quantities of air contaminants or other material which cause injury, detriment, nuisance, or annoyance to the public health or damage to property. Any unreasonable odor discernible at the property line of the project site will be considered a significant odor impact.

The project could produce odors during proposed construction activities from construction equipment exhaust, application of asphalt, and/or the application of architectural coatings; however, standard construction practices would minimize the odor emissions and their associated impacts.

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

Furthermore, odors emitted during construction would be temporary, short-term, and intermittent in nature, and would cease upon the completion of the respective phase of construction. Accordingly, the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during construction, and short-term impacts would be less than significant.

During project operation, the temporary storage of refuse could be a potential source of odor; however, project-generated refuse is required to be stored in covered containers and removed at regular intervals in compliance with the SDMC solid waste regulations, thereby precluding significant odor impacts. Furthermore, the proposed project would be required to comply with SDAPCD Rule 51 which prohibits the discharge of odorous emissions that would create a public nuisance. As such, long-term operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- Would the project:

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

The project site is developed and consists of residential buildings, asphalt concrete parking areas, and ornamental landscaping. It does not contain environmentally sensitive land (ESL) where sensitive species may be present and is not adjacent to Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). The closest MHPA is approximately 1.75 miles north of the project site and is separated from the project site by development, including roadways, parking lots, and multi-family residential structures. Consequently, the project site does not possess native vegetation that would serve as habitat area species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special status. Therefore, no direct or indirect impacts to sensitive species would occur.

- 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 US Fish and Wildlife Service?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is currently developed and consists of residential buildings, asphalt concrete parking areas, and ornamental landscaping. According to the City's Biology Guidelines (City 2018), developed land has not been assigned a tier and is not considered to have significant habitat value. Similarly,

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

impacts to developed land are not considered significant by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vegetation removal would be limited to ornamental trees. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse impact on any sensitive habitats. No impact would occur.

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

The project site is currently developed and consists of residential buildings, asphalt concrete parking areas, and ornamental landscaping. The project site does not contain wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands. No impact would occur.

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

Wildlife movement corridors are defined as areas that connect suitable wildlife habitat areas in a region otherwise fragmented by rugged terrain, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. Natural features such as canyon drainages, ridgelines, or areas with vegetation cover provide corridors for wildlife travel. The project site and immediate surrounding areas are currently developed and do not serve or have potential to serve as a wildlife corridor. Furthermore, the project site is not designated as a Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) regional wildlife corridor as it does not provide a throughway for wildlife species by connecting with major areas of off-site habitat. The project would be required to comply with federal, state, and City regulations, including avoidance of impacts to nesting bird species. Therefore, the project would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 proposed project would redevelop a portion of an existing residential development and associated parking lot. There are several trees that would be removed as part of the project to construct the new structure, courtyard, and plaza space. However, these trees are ornamental in

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

nature, and additional ornamental trees would be added as part of the project. The project would occur in a developed area that is not within an MHPA or designated as ESL; no conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The project site is not located within or adjacent to MHPA within the City's MSCP Subarea. Furthermore, the project site is currently developed and does not possess native habitat. As described in IV(d) above, the project would be required to comply with federal, state, and City regulations. Therefore, the project would not result in a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. No impact would occur.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

- Would the project:

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

According to the City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a), for the purposes of CEQA, a significant historic resource is one which qualifies for the California Register of Historical Resources or is listed in a local historic register or deemed significant in a historical resource survey, as provided under Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code. A resource that is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources, not included in a local register of historic resources, or not deemed significant in a historical resource survey may nonetheless be historically significant for the purposes of CEQA. The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds state that the determination of significance for historic buildings, structures, objects, and landscapes is based on age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, and integrity.

The project site is located within a high sensitivity area on the City's Historic Resources Sensitivity Map. City archaeological staff conducted a record search of the California Historic Resources Information System (CHRIS) digital database to determine the presence or absence of potential resources within the project site. No archaeological sites were mapped at this location. Because the project area had been previously developed with fill depths of approximately five to seven feet (Leighton and Associates, Inc. 2021, Appendix B), it was determined that the proposed grading to depths of four feet would have no potential to impact historical resources.

The City criteria for determination of historic significance, pursuant to CEQA, is evaluated based upon age (over 45 years), location, context, association with an important event, uniqueness, or structural integrity of the building. Projects requiring the demolition and/or modification of

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

structures that are 45 years or older can result in potential impacts to a historical resource. Structures proposed for demolition were built in 1994 and are not 45 years old and do not qualify as historic resources under the City's Historic Resource Guidelines. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource. Impacts would be less than significant.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

The City's determination of significance of impacts on unique archaeological resources is based on the criteria found in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines and the City's Historical Resources Guidelines. The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that an archaeological site must consist of at least three associated artifacts/ecofacts (within a 40-square meter area) or a single feature. Archaeological sites containing only a surface component are generally considered not significant. Such site types may include isolated finds, bedrock milling stations, sparse lithic scatters, and shellfish processing stations. All other archaeological sites are considered potentially significant. The determination of significance is based on a number of factors specific to a particular site, including site size, type, and integrity; presence or absence of a subsurface deposit, soil stratigraphy, features, diagnostics, and datable material; artifact and ecofact density; assemblage complexity; cultural affiliation; association with an important person or event; and ethnic importance. The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds also state that archaeological sites may comprise traditional cultural properties for the Native American community.

As described in V(a), the proposed project site has been previously disturbed with the top five to seven feet of soil consisting of fill material. No archaeological sites are mapped at this location based on the CHRIS search conducted by City archaeological staff. In addition, the 2021 Barrio Logan Community Plan states that the community of Barrio Logan represents minimal potential for cultural resources, except in areas on the southeast side of the community where recorded sites SDI-12,090 and SDI-12,092 represent a prehistoric village situated at the mouth of Chollas Creek. These sites are approximately one mile southeast of the project site, and project implementation would not impact cultural resources at these sites.

As there are no archaeological resources known to occur within the project site, the project is not anticipated to cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource and impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

As discussed above, the project site has been previously disturbed, and soils that would be disturbed during construction consist of fill material. In the unlikely event that human remains are

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

encountered during ground-disturbing activities, per the California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, all work shall cease, and the county coroner shall be contacted. Should the remains be identified as Native American, the NAHC shall be contacted within 48 hours to provide a most-likely descendant to determine appropriate actions. Compliance with the processes required by the California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would ensure impacts to human remains would be less than significant.

VI. ENERGY

– Would the project:

- a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?
-

Energy used for construction would primarily consist of fuels in the form of diesel and gasoline. Fuel consumed by construction equipment would be the primary energy resource expended over the course of construction and would include off-road equipment as well as on-road vehicles for the transportation of construction materials and construction worker commutes. Heavy-duty construction equipment associated with construction activities, haul trucks involved in the removal of construction and demolition materials, and smaller support equipment (such as lighting, air compressors, and pumps) would consume petroleum-based fuel. Construction workers would travel to and from the project site throughout the duration of construction, presumably in gasoline-powered vehicles. While construction activities would consume petroleum-based fuels, consumption of such resources would be temporary and would cease upon the completion of construction. In addition, energy usage would be limited to that necessary to construct the project. As such, construction energy usage would not be wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary.

Once operational, the project would require energy in the form of natural gas and electricity to power various appliances and equipment, including, but not limited to, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems (HVAC), water heaters, and lighting. Buildout of the project would result in an increase in operational electricity and natural gas usage when compared to the existing condition; however, the project would be required to meet the mandatory energy conservation requirements of the 2022 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (California Energy Code; Title 24, Part 6) and California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen; Title 24, Part 11) and would benefit from the efficiencies associated with these regulations as they relate to building HVAC, systems, water heaters, and lighting. In addition, the project would implement applicable greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction measures related to energy efficiency and clean energy as required by the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP; see VIII(a) below). Therefore, the project would not result in excessive amounts of energy usage or result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during project operations. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 applicable state plans that address renewable energy and energy efficiency are the California Energy Code and CALGreen, and the applicable local plan is the City's CAP. As discussed above in VI(a), the project would be required to meet the requirements of the 2022 California Energy Code and CALGreen. Further, as detailed below in VIII(a), the project would be consistent with the CAP. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and impacts would be less than significant.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- Would the project:

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

The discussion below is based on the Geotechnical Investigation prepared by Leighton and Associates, Inc. (Leighton and Associates, Inc. 2021; Appendix B) and the Seismic Risk Assessment Probable Maximum Loss Report prepared by Professional Associates Construction Services, Inc. (PACS; 2020; Appendix C).

Under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the California State Geologist identifies areas that are at risk from surface fault rupture, generally along active faults, where structures for human occupancy should be prevented. The project site is not within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. According to the Geotechnical Investigation for the project site (Appendix B), the Whittier-Elsinore, San Jacinto, and the San Andreas faults are major active fault systems located east of the site, and the Rose Canyon, Newport-Inglewood (offshore), and Coronado Bank are active faults located west to northwest of the site. The nearest active fault is the Rose Canyon (offshore) fault zone located approximately 1.2 miles west of the site. The risk of loss, injury, or death, involving rupture of a known earthquake fault is considered low. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

The project site, like most of southern California, is within a seismically active area and can be subject to strong seismic ground shaking. While the project site is likely to experience ground shaking in the event of an earthquake along one of the regional faults, all project components would be subject to the appropriate geotechnical design recommendations and applicable regulations, such as seismic requirements of the California Building Code. The Geotechnical Investigation for the project site (Appendix B) determined that the project site is suitable for the proposed project given incorporation of the report's recommendations. The project would be required to implement these recommendations and would not result in adverse effects in the event of strong seismic ground shaking at the project site. Additionally, the project would be required to comply with seismic requirements of the California Building Code and utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices (to be verified at the building permit stage) to ensure that potential impacts to people or structures would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. Impacts would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Liquefaction is the substantial loss of strength of poorly consolidated and saturated soils due to the effects of seismic ground motion. The passage of seismic waves through such soils can cause soil particles to become temporarily suspended in water, creating conditions very similar to quicksand. The resultant loss of strength can cause significant damage to structures as they settle, tilt or collapse. The project's Seismic Risk Assessment states that based on the review of site soil conditions and the publicly available liquefaction hazard mapping, the project site is not located in a liquefaction susceptibility area (Appendix C). In addition, the Geotechnical Investigation concluded that because the project site is underlain by dense Paralic Deposits, the potentially compressible and weathered upper portions of the surficial materials are recommended for removal, and the lack of a shallow groundwater table, the potential for liquefaction and seismic-related settlement across the project site is low (Appendix B). Therefore, the project would not result in adverse effects due to liquefaction and impacts would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

The project's Seismic Risk Assessment (Appendix C) concluded that based on the relatively flat site topography and fully developed adjacent parcels, the risk of earthquake-induced landslide is classified as low. Additionally, the field reconnaissance and geologic map analysis for the Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix B) found that the site is generally underlain by massively bedded sandstone, which indicates that the potential for landslides or large-scale slope instability of the project site is low. The project site is stable and would not become unstable as a result of project implementation. Therefore, the project site is not anticipated to be exposed to hazards related to landslide activity and impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed project would include the demolition of residential buildings, asphalt concrete parking areas, and ornamental landscaping that would remove existing ground cover and disturb exposed soils. These disturbed soils could be exposed to wind and rain, thus potentially resulting in soil erosion. The proposed project would be subject to California’s statewide General National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activities, also known as the State Construction General Permit (CGP), and therefore a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would be required prior to construction of the project and implemented during construction.

The City requires a Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) for the project, which was completed on September 15, 2023, and subsequently approved by the City (Excel Engineering 2023a; Appendix D). Generally, a SWPPP and SWQMP demonstrate how water quality during construction and operation of a project would be maintained in accordance with mandated objectives. This is achieved by employing best management practices (BMPs; see Section X, *Hydrology and Water Quality*), which typically serve a dual purpose of protecting water quality and reducing soil erosion and loss of topsoil. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, the City requires that an applicant demonstrates compliance with the required NPDES permits and regulations. As further described in the project’s SWQMP, the project would implement various BMPs, including biofiltration and runoff collection, minimizing impervious areas and soil compaction, and the establishment of native or drought tolerant vegetation following construction (see Appendix D).

Grading activities would also be required to comply with the City’s Grading Ordinance and Storm Water Standards, which would further ensure soil erosion and topsoil loss is minimized. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil and 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site is underlain by shallow undocumented artificial fill (placed during the previous grading for the development), which consists of medium dense to dense, light brown to dark and reddish-brown, dry to damp, silty sand, overlying Quaternary-aged Old Paralac Deposits, which consists of medium dense to very dense, light tan to mottled brown, damp to wet, silty sand to sandy silt to clayey sand. The existing artificial fill soil is undocumented and is considered unsuitable for supporting new structures and pavements; therefore, deepened footings or a grade beam foundation system would be provided to receive structural fill or improvements. In addition, as discussed in VII(a)(iii) and VII(a)(iv), no significant risks related to landslide or liquefaction would occur. The project would be required to comply with seismic requirements of the California Building

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

Code and utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices (to be verified at the building permit stage) to ensure that potential impacts to people or structures would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk. Compliance with a final geotechnical report prepared in accordance with the City's Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports would be required as a standard condition of approval. The project site would not become unstable as a result of project implementation and impacts would 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?

According to the project's Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix B), the soils on the project site have a very low expansion potential (Expansion Index of 10). Retaining walls and slabs would be constructed in accordance with the recommendations in the Geotechnical Investigation for construction in soils with this Expansion Index. The project would not be located on expansive soils and would not result in risks to life or property. No impact would occur.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

The project does not propose the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; the project site would be served by the existing public sewer system. Therefore, no impacts regarding the capability of soils to support such systems would occur.

- f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that a significant impact to paleontological resources could occur in formations with a high sensitivity rating if grading would exceed 1,000 cubic yards and would occur at a depth of 10 feet or more. In accordance with SDMC Section 142.0151, paleontological monitoring would be required if grading exceeds these thresholds. The project site is underlain by Undocumented Artificial Fill and Quaternary-aged Old Paralic Deposits, which has a moderate sensitivity rating for paleontological resources. The top five to seven feet of soil at the project site consists of undocumented fill, and excavation is anticipated to occur at depths of approximately four feet. Therefore, the project would not disturb soils that would require paleontological monitoring. No impacts to unique paleontological or geological features would occur.

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

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 CAP Consistency Checklist is utilized to ensure project-by-project consistency with the underlying assumptions in the 2015 CAP and to ensure that the City would achieve its emission reduction targets identified in the CAP. The CAP Consistency Checklist includes a three-step process to determine if a project would result in a GHG impact. Step 1 consists of an evaluation to determine the project's consistency with existing General Plan, Community Plan, and zoning designations for the site. Step 2 consists of an evaluation of the project's design features compliance with the CAP strategies. Step 3 is only applicable if a project is not consistent with the land use and/or zone, but is also in a transit priority area to allow for more intensive development than assumed in the CAP.

The City recently adopted its 2022 CAP which builds upon the 2015 CAP, establishing more aggressive goals to reduce GHG emissions. The 2022 CAP establishes a community-wide goal of net zero energy by 2035, thereby committing the City to an accelerated strategy to achieve GHG reductions while also requiring equity, accountability, and transparency in doing so. Further, the City recently adopted its CAP Consistency Regulations in April 2022 (SMDC Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 14, Climate Action Plan Consistency Regulations) which apply to ministerial and discretionary projects to ensure that such projects comply with the goals and objectives of the updated CAP. The City's prior GHG Significance Determination threshold allowed for project-level environmental analysis to demonstrate consistency with the CAP through use of the CAP Consistency Checklist. The recently adopted CAP Consistency Regulations replaced the City's CAP Consistency Checklist as the list of measures that can be implemented on a project-by-project basis to collectively achieve a specified emissions level as required by CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5b(1)(D). The proposed project was deemed complete prior to the CAP Consistency Regulations effective date of October 23, 2022, and therefore, per the CAP Consistency Regulations, the previous CAP Consistency Checklist and GHG 2020 significance determination guidelines were applied in evaluating potential project effects on climate change (as analyzed herein in this Initial Study).

The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Multiple Use and a Community Plan land use designation of Residential/Commercial/Industrial. The purpose of the mixed-use zones is to provide housing and jobs near commercial centers and corridors to reduce dependency on the automobile, to promote access to transit and multi-modal transportation systems, and to provide for a walkable, pedestrian-oriented setting, including infill of existing development. As detailed in the project-specific CAP Consistency Checklist (Martinez + Cutri Urban Studio Corporation 2023; Appendix E) Step 1 (Land Use Consistency), the project is consistent with these land use designations.

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

The proposed project site and parcel is zoned BLPD-Redevelopment Sub-District. The project proposes the construction of 92 multi-family affordable housing units, which would be consistent with the General Plan and 1978 Barrio Logan Community Plan land use designation and is allowed within the BLPD-Redevelopment Sub-District with approval of a density bonus through the provision of Assembly Bill 1763, which allows for greater density and increased height. The project does not propose changes to the existing land use of the site and would therefore not conflict with the adopted land use designation or intended intensity of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with the existing General Plan and Community Plan land use and zoning designations (Martinez + Cutri Urban Studio Corporation 2023; Appendix E).

Completion of Step 2 of the CAP Consistency Checklist demonstrates that the project would be consistent with applicable strategies and actions for reducing GHG emissions. This includes project features consistent with the energy and water efficient buildings strategy, as well as bicycling, walking, transit, and land use strategy. The project would include roofing materials with a minimum 3-year aged solar reflection and thermal emittance per CALGreen Regulations (California Building Standards Commission (CBSC) 2022). The project would include plumbing fixtures with restricted maximum flow rates to save water. The project would include approximately 45 bicycle spaces and 10 motorcycle stalls. Because the project is located within a transit priority area with close proximity to the San Diego Trolley's Barrio Logan station and a bus station, no parking is required or proposed.

Based on the project's consistency with existing land use and zoning designations and implementation of the Step 2 strategies and actions for reducing GHG emissions, the project would be consistent with the City's CAP Consistency Checklist and CAP assumptions, and the project's contribution of GHGs to cumulative statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, the project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment, and impacts would be less than significant.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

As described in VIII(a) above, the project would be consistent with the City's CAP Consistency Checklist, and the project's contribution of GHGs to cumulative statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable (Martinez + Cutri Urban Studio Corporation 2023; Appendix E). Therefore, the project would not conflict with City's CAP or another applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that significant impacts may occur if a project proposes the handling, storage, and treatment of hazardous materials. Materials and waste are generally considered hazardous if they are poisonous (toxicity), can be ignited by open flame (ignitability), corrode other materials (corrosivity), or react violently, explode, or generate vapors when mixed with water (reactivity). The transportation, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, as well as the potential releases of hazardous materials to the environment, are closely regulated through many state and federal laws.

Project construction may involve the use of small amounts of solvents, cleaners, paint, oils, and fuel for equipment. However, these materials are not acutely hazardous, and use of these common hazardous materials in small quantities would not represent a significant hazard to the public or environment. The use of such hazardous materials and substances during construction would be subject to federal, state, and local health and safety requirements for handling, storage, and disposal, including the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the California Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division.

The proposed project would require the export of approximately 200 cubic yards of fill. Prior to construction of the project site's previous development, over 200 soil samples were collected. Of these samples, three samples contained detectible contaminants. The sampled soils were spread throughout the previously developed site, including areas outside the proposed project. The soil was not considered a human health risk and no restrictions were placed on the site (Partner 2019; Appendix F). Grading activities, including export and fill reuse, would follow the Department of Toxic Substance Control 2015 Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Guidance Manual (California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2015). Therefore, project construction would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

Operation of the residential development would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of significant hazardous materials. Operations of the project may involve the use of small amounts of solvents and cleaners that are not acutely hazardous for routine maintenance and landscaping activities. Such materials are ubiquitous and product labeling identifies appropriate handling and use of these materials. Therefore, operation of the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that project sites on or near known contamination sources and/ or that meet one or more of the following criteria may result in a significant impact if:

- A project is located within 1,000 feet of a known contamination site;
- A project is located within 2,000 feet of a known "border zone property" (also known as a "Superfund" site) or a hazardous waste property subject to corrective action pursuant to the Health and Safety Code;
- The project site has a closed Department of Environmental Health site file;
- A project is located in Centre City San Diego, Barrio Logan, or other areas known or suspected to contain contamination sites;
- A project is located on or near an active or former landfill;
- A project is located on properties historically developed with industrial or commercial uses which involved dewatering (the removal of groundwater during excavation), in conjunction with major excavation in an area with high groundwater;
- A project is located in a designated airport influence area where the FAA has reached a determination of "hazard" through FAA Form 7460-1, is inconsistent with an Airport's Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), or is within two nautical miles of a public or public use airport; or
- A project is located on a site presently or previously used for agricultural purposes.

The project site is located within Barrio Logan and does contain a known contamination site, as discussed further in IX(d). However, the regulatory case was issued closure by the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health in April 2001 without contingencies or land use restrictions. The release associated with the project parcel is considered a historically recognized environmental condition and would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. In addition, there are eight properties within 1,000 feet of the project site identified on regulatory databases related to hazardous waste. However, these nearby sites would not be affected by project construction or operations, and they do not represent a significant environmental concern (Partner 2019; Appendix F). Due to the presence of past contaminants at the site, soil export would follow the Department of Toxic Substance Control 2015 Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Guidance Manual (California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2015).

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

In addition, the site has not been used for dewatering, is not on or near an active landfill, is not within an airport hazard zone, and is not located on a site presently or previously used for agricultural purposes.

As with typical construction, there is the possibility of accidental release of hazardous substances during construction activities. Specifically, construction activities generally include the use of fuels, oils, lubricants, paints, and solvents. Construction activities would be short-term, and the use of these materials would cease once construction is complete. The use of hazardous substances during construction would occur in compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations regarding the use and disposal of these materials. In the event of an accidental release during construction, containment and clean up would occur in accordance with existing applicable regulatory requirements, reducing impacts to a less than significant level.

During project operation, the project would include the use and transport of common hazardous materials used for maintenance and landscaping. However, compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations regarding the use and transport of such materials would ensure that potential impacts to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable accident conditions would be less than significant during project operation.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

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

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that significant impacts may occur if a project proposes the emission of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials or may handle acutely hazardous materials within one-quarter-mile of a school. There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. The nearest schools to the project site are Burbank Elementary School and Perkins K-8 School, located approximately 0.3 mile northeast and northwest of the project site, respectively. Therefore, the project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter-mile of a school. No impact would occur.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

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

See IX(b) above for applicable City 2022 Significance Determination Threshold (City 2022a) related to listed hazardous materials sites. Government Code 65962.5 stipulates that specific agencies identify and update annually a list of sites that have been reported to have certain types of contamination. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database and the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database provide information on hazardous materials sites.

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

GeoTracker provides access to regulatory data about sites that require cleanup action, including leaking underground storage tanks, Department of Defense sites, and Cleanup Program sites. EnviroStor identifies sites that have known contamination or sites where there may be reasons to investigate further. It also identifies facilities that are authorized to treat, store, dispose, or transfer hazardous waste. There are eight properties within 1,000 feet of the project site identified on regulatory databases. However, construction and operation of the project would not affect these properties and they do not represent a significant environmental concern (Partner Engineering and Science, Inc. [Partner] 2019; Appendix F).

The Phase I assessment prepared by Partner (Partner 2019; Appendix F) identified a historical recognized environmental condition on the project site. According to historical and regulatory documents reviewed in support of the Phase I assessment, San Diego Gas & Electric occupied portions of the project parcel between the mid-1940s until the late 1980s. Various chemicals were stored on the project parcel during this period, including chlorinated and non-chlorinated solvents, polychlorinated biphenyls in transformers, paints, vehicle maintenance supplies, pesticides, and herbicides. Glasson Lumber Mill occupied the project parcel in the 1930s and maintained a 280-gallon underground storage tank (UST) located at the northern corner of the project parcel, south of the Dewey Street and Newton Avenue intersection, in at least 1938.

In 1989, prior to the construction of the current site's residential development, environmental investigations were initiated at the project parcel. These investigations discovered hydrocarbon contamination at levels of potential regulatory concern and low levels of PCBs, as well as a severely corroded empty 280-gallon UST system on the project parcel. The UST system was subsequently removed from the project parcel and remedial excavation was performed in February 1993, which removed total petroleum hydrocarbon impacts to levels below laboratory detection limits. The excavation was subsequently backfilled and compacted. Additional soil and groundwater testing was conducted in April and May 1993, which revealed no detectible concentrations of contaminants in groundwater or samples collected and analyzed. Aside from the detections associated with a single discrete soil sample, single composite soil sample, and sample collected from the blind sump, no concentrations of any contaminants analyzed during the site investigation were detected. The areas associated with the detections were further investigated and/or remediated by over-excavation during the investigation.

The regulatory case was issued closure by the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health in April 2001 without contingencies or land use restrictions. Based on removal of the former UST, reduction of soil contamination to levels deemed acceptable by the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health, and case closure without contingencies or land use restrictions, the release associated with the project parcel is considered a historical recognized environmental condition. However, due to the presence of past contaminants at the site, soil export would follow the Department of Toxic Substance Control 2015 Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Guidance Manual (California Department of Toxic Substances Control 2015). The previous contamination of the project parcel would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that a project may result in a significant impact if it is located in a designated airport influence area and where the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has reached a determination of "hazard" through FAA Form 7460-1, "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration", is inconsistent with an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), or, where a ALUCP has not been adopted, is within two nautical miles of a public or public use airport. The basic function of ALUCPs is to promote compatibility between airports and the land uses that surround them to the extent that these areas are not already devoted to incompatible uses.

The project site is within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2 and the FAA Part 77 Height Notification Area of the San Diego International ALUCP (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2014) In addition, the project site is located within the AIA Review Area 2 and the FAA Part 77 Height Notification Area of the Naval Air Station North Island ALUCP (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2020). However, the site is not within a Safety Zone mapped in the San Diego International ALUCP or the Naval Air Station North Island ALUCP. In addition, the proposed structures that would be constructed by the project would not reach heights requiring FAA notification as indicated by the San Diego International ALUCP or the Naval Air Station North Island ALUCP. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working at the project site, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

The City is a participating entity in the Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (City 2023), which is generally intended to provide compliance with regulatory requirements and increase County-wide coordination associated with emergency response efforts. As part of this effort, the City's Office of Emergency Services oversees emergency preparedness and response services for disaster-related measures. For emergency evacuation, the County of San Diego General Plan identifies I-5 and State Route (SR-) 75 as emergency evacuation routes in the vicinity of the project site. The project would not involve any activities that would impair the continued use of these routes.

Construction of the proposed project could result in the need for temporary lane closures. Temporary lane closures would be for a short period of time and would be implemented in accordance with the provisions outlined in the Traffic Control Plan which would be prepared as part of the project's Traffic Control Permit and would be approved by the City prior to the start of construction activity. the Traffic Control Plan would outline measures to ensure that emergency

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

access would be maintained. Heavy construction vehicles could occasionally slow traffic along regional roadways during construction; however, such delays would be brief and infrequent. The existing driveway off Evans Street would be removed as part of the project; however, direct site access for pedestrians would be provided by the new main entry on Evans Street, and two new entries off Main Street. Vehicular access would be provided by an existing driveway off Newton Street, which provides access to the existing apartment complex surrounding the project site. Access to the emergency evacuation routes identified in the County of San Diego General Plan would be maintained. Implementation of the project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

The potential for wildland fires represents a hazard, particularly on undeveloped properties or where development exists adjacent to open space or within proximity to wildland fuels. State law requires that all local jurisdictions identify Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZ) within their areas of responsibility (California Government Code Sections 51175–51189). These maps, which are prepared by the City in collaboration with the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) determine fire hazards zones based on vegetation density, slope severity, and other relevant factors that contribute to fire severity.

According to the Official Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone Map adopted by the City’s Fire-Rescue Department for the project area, the project site and surrounding lands are not located within a VHFHSZ. Additionally, the project site is within a highly developed area that lacks native or naturalized vegetation that would be considered highly flammable. The proposed project would comply with the California Fire Code and has been reviewed by the City’s Fire-Rescue Department. The project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

- Would the project:
- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

The discussion below is based on the Hydrology Report prepared for the project (Excel Engineering 2023bc; Appendix G), and the subsequent Priority Development Project SWQMP (Excel Engineering 2023a; Appendix D), both prepared by Excel Engineering.

According to the City’s 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a), compliance with water quality standards is assured through permit conditions for private projects, such as the proposed project. The project is required to adhere to the City’s Stormwater Standards, which

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

require the preparation of a SWQMP for the project, as it is a Priority Development Project. Project-level compliance with the City's Stormwater Standards is intended ensure compliance with the regional Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit. As indicated above, a project-specific SWQMP has been prepared for the project (see Appendix D).

Currently, drainage from the site is directed into 12-inch storm drain lines in the parking lots and directed to Main Street, where it follows into a storm drain inlet. The project would consist of development within a previously developed area and would increase impervious area within the project site by 4 percent. Runoff from the roof of the proposed buildings would be captured with roof drains and would be conveyed by either area drains or sheet flow to one of four biofiltration basins. All other water that falls on the project site would be routed to the biofiltration basins through area drains or sheet flow. Water in the biofiltration basin would flow through the basin's media, and when water exceeds the basin capacity it would overtop a catch basin where it would be piped to one of three outlets that lead to the street. From here, all three of the outlets flow along the existing gutter and confluence to the west corner of the site.

During construction, the project would be required to comply with the NPDES Construction General Permit and implement BMPs to reduce pollutants in the stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. Typical construction-related BMPs include temporary soil stabilization (e.g., straw mulch, wood mulch, drainage swales), temporary sediment control (e.g., silt fence, sediment track, fiber rolls, sandbag barrier), de-watering, vehicle equipment maintenance and cleaning, and tire cleaning. In addition, the project would implement hydromodification BMPs which would consist of four biofiltration basins that would implement pollutant and hydromodification control.

Adherence to the NPDES Construction General Permit during construction and the City's Stormwater Standards during operation would ensure that the project does not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

In addition to NPDES requirements, states are required to identify and document polluted surface water bodies, with the resulting documentation referred to as the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments. This list of water bodies identifies the associated pollutants and total maximum daily loads (TMDLs), along with projected TMDL implementation schedules/ status. A TMDL establishes the maximum amount of an impairing substance or stressor that a water body can assimilate and still meet water quality standards and allocates that load among pollution contributors. The San Diego RWQCB is responsible for developing the 303(d) list in the San Diego region. The project lies within the San Diego Bay Watershed of the Pueblo San Diego Hydrologic Unit. The receiving waters for the project site that are currently listed as impaired (based on the 2020 303[d] List) include San Diego Bay, which is listed for pollutants including benthic community effects, sediment toxicity, indicator bacteria, dissolved copper, lead, and zinc (RWQCB 2020). Implementation of applicable BMPs (see Appendix D) would ensure that the proposed project would not create adverse water quality impacts to San Diego Bay. These include biofiltration and runoff collection, minimizing impervious areas and soil compaction, and the establishment of native or drought tolerant vegetation following construction.

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

The project is not anticipated to otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state there may be significant impacts on groundwater supplies if a project would result in decreased aquifer recharge because the area available for aquifer recharge is reduced. This may occur when more than one acre of impermeable hardscape is installed where well-water is utilized or where a well would be installed. A significant impact may also occur if commercial or multi-residential projects propose the use of groundwater as a source of water supply.

The City, which would provide water to the project site, purchases water from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), the regional wholesale water provider. In all, groundwater comprises five percent of the SDCWA water portfolio according to the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). The project would retain the existing public water service connections and would not use groundwater. The project site is currently impervious and does not allow for significant groundwater recharge. There is no groundwater production currently occurring at the project site; therefore, there would be no disruption to any existing groundwater production. Upon implementation of the project, water would be filtered through proposed stormwater BMPs that provide pollutant control, ensuring pollutants are removed from infiltrated groundwater. In addition, the project site is not within a groundwater basin with an adopted groundwater sustainability plan. Therefore, the project would not deplete groundwater supplies, degrade groundwater quality, or interfere with groundwater recharge. No impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: | | | | |
| i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that a significant impact related to erosion or siltation may occur if a project would grade, clear, or grub more than one acre of land, especially into slopes over a 25 percent grade, and would drain into a sensitive water body or stream or result in uncontrolled runoff.

The project site currently consists of apartment buildings, parking lot, and various landscaped areas. There is one 12-inch storm drain line comprised of two inlets in the existing parking lot that intakes flows from the northwest section of parking lot. The storm drain extends southeast intakes it reaches Main Street and conveys flows into the street through a sidewalk outlet. Runoff from the buildings and adjacent walkways flow into area drains that connect to the 12-inch storm drain line.

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

The remainder of the parking lot surface flows to another sidewalk outlet on main street where it is conveyed along the street to the public stormdrain system. As part of the project, runoff from the roof of the proposed buildings would be captured with roof drains and would be conveyed by either area drains or sheet flow to one of four biofiltration basins. All other water that falls on the project site would be routed to the biofiltration basins through area drains or sheet flow. Water in the biofiltration basin would flow through the basin’s media, and when water exceeds the basin capacity it would overtop a catch basin where it would be piped to one of three outlets that lead to the street. From here, all three of the outlets flow along the existing gutter and confluence to the west corner of the site. At this location, 100-year runoff flows would be decreased from a pre-development rate of 7.661 cubic feet per second (CFS) to a post-development rate of 5.700 CFS (Excel 2023b). Therefore, the resulting runoff would not be uncontrolled such that downstream erosion or siltation would occur. In addition, the project would not involve the grading, clearing, or grubbing of more than one acre of land, and slopes within the project site are not over a 25 percent grade. Impacts would be less than significant.

- ii) 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"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The City’s 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that significant impacts may occur if a project would result in a flood hazard on other properties or if the project proposes to develop within the 100-year floodplain identified in the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) maps.

The proposed project site is within FEMA Zone X, which is an area of minimal flood hazard that is determined to be outside the 500-year flood level and protected by levee from the 100-year flood level. Since the project components would be located outside of the floodplain, the project would not alter flooding conditions surrounding the project site. As discussed in X(a), the project would consist of development within a previously developed area and would increase the impervious area within the project site by 4 percent. As described in X(c)(i), flows during 100-year storm events would decrease from 7.661 CFS to 5.700 CFS under the project condition, which includes four biofiltration basins. These changes in hydrology by the proposed project would not substantially increase the rate or volume of runoff such that on- or off-site flooding would occur. The project is not anticipated to result in substantial increases in runoff that contribute to flooding and no approval by FEMA is anticipated to be required. Impacts would be less than significant.

- iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

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

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

As discussed in X(a), the project would result in a 4 percent increase in impervious surfaces. The additional runoff that would result from the proposed project would be collected and treated in one of four biofiltration basins, and if the basin capacity is reached water will flow into a catch basin where it would be piped to one of three outlets that lead to the street. From here, all three outlets would flow along the existing gutter and confluence to the west corner of the site. Runoff rates during 100-year storm events would decrease from 7.661 CFS to 5.7 CFS under the project condition, which includes four biofiltration basins, and the project would not result in the capacity of the City's storm water drainage system being exceeded. In addition, as detailed in X(a), runoff from the project site during both construction and operation would be treated such that it would comply with the applicable water quality standards and would not be a substantial source of polluted runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

See X(c)(ii). No development within the floodplain is proposed and the project would not impede or redirect flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

See X(c)(ii) for discussion of impacts related to flood hazard zones. The project site is located approximately 0.3 mile from the Pacific Ocean and at a minimum elevation of 43 feet above mean sea level. According to the 2021 Barrio Logan Community Plan, the Barrio Logan area is vulnerable to tsunamis due to its coastal location; however, the unique form of San Diego Bay, Point Loma and the Coronado Island-Silver Strand landmasses would absorb the initial effects of a tsunami, making the hazard relatively less severe compared to other coastal areas of California. There are also no enclosed bodies of water near the project site that could result in a seiche. Further, potential pollutants would be appropriately stored at the project site and would not be anticipated to be released in the unlikely event of project inundation. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

As discussed in X(b), there is no sustainable groundwater management plan applicable to the project. The RWQCB is responsible for the adoption and implementation of water quality control plans, issuance of discharge permits, and performs other functions in relation to regulating the region's water quality. The Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Basin Plan) is prepared by the RWQCB and defines the existing and potential beneficial uses and water quality objectives for coastal waters, groundwater, surface waters, imported surface waters, and reclaimed waters in the basin. The Basin Plan identifies the project site as within the San Diego Mesa hydrologic area of the Pueblo San Diego hydrologic unit (908.20). As identified in X(a), downstream

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

receiving waters listed as impaired on the Section 303(d) List include the San Diego Bay (for benthic community effects, sediment toxicity, indicator bacteria, dissolved copper, lead, and zinc).

Runoff that would result from the proposed project would be collected and treated in one of four biofiltration basins, and if the basin capacity is reached water will flow into a catch basin where it would be piped to one of three outlets that lead to the street. From here, all three outlets would flow along the existing gutter and confluence to the west corner of the site. The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable storm water quality standards during construction and operation. Conformance with the Basin Plan water quality objectives would be demonstrated through compliance with applicable regulations and implementation of construction and post-construction BMPs. Thus, the project would be consistent with the Basin Plan.

The project would comply with the existing NPDES permits, including the Construction General Permit and MS4 permit via compliance with the City's Stormwater Standards. Adherence to these permit conditions would ensure that that project does not obstruct implementation of the water quality control plan and impacts would be less than significant.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

The physical division of an established community typically refers to the construction of a linear feature, such as a highway or railroad tracks, or removal of a means of access, such as a local road or bridge that would impact mobility within an existing community or between a community and outlying area. The project would be constructed within the existing Mercado Apartments property. The proposed project would be within a 0.98-acre area of a 4.34-acre project parcel which encompasses the entirety of the existing and proposed Mercado Apartments and would not encroach into any surrounding properties. Pedestrian facilities would be maintained surrounding the project site and no features would be constructed outside of the existing property such that existing communities would be divided or access would be altered. The project would not physically divide an established community and no impacts would occur.

- b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that land use impacts may be significant if a project would be inconsistent or conflict with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a community or general plan, an adopted land use designation or intensity, or other adopted plans.

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

The project site has a General Plan land use designation of Multiple Use and a 1978 Barrio Logan Community Plan land use designation of Residential/Commercial/Industrial. The purpose of the mixed-use zones is to provide housing and jobs near commercial centers and corridors to reduce dependency on the automobile, to promote access to transit and multi-model transportation systems, and to provide for a walkable, pedestrian-oriented setting, including infill of existing development. The proposed project site is zoned BLPD-Redevelopment SubDistrict. This zone was intended to provide small-scale, mixed-use, and pedestrian-oriented development.

The project proposes the construction of 92 multi-family affordable housing units, which would be consistent with the General Plan and 1978 Barrio Logan Community Plan land use designation and is allowed within the BLPD-Redevelopment Sub-District zone with approval of a density bonus. The project does not propose any changes to the existing land use designation or zoning of the project site. The project would not conflict with the adopted land use designation or intended intensity of the project site.

Noise compatibility guidelines in the Noise Element of the General Plan specify that multi-family residential uses are compatible where exterior noise levels are below the 60 Community Noise Equivalent Noise Level (CNEL) standard. These uses would be conditionally compatible where exterior noise levels are between 60 and 70 CNEL and are not compatible in areas where exterior noise levels exceed 70 CNEL. The primary noise sources surrounding the project include vehicular and rail traffic. Modeling conducted by the project's noise consultant indicates that noise levels affecting the project's exterior use areas would be below the 60 CNEL noise compatibility guidelines. Noise levels at the project's facades, however, would range from 55 CNEL to 71 CNEL (dBF 2024). Because façade noise levels may exceed 60 CNEL, interior noise levels may exceed City and State of California 45 CNEL standards for interior noise levels. The City requires a standard exterior-to-interior noise analysis prior to building permit issuance as a condition of approval to ensure that interior noise levels in habitable spaces would not the exceed 45 CNEL interior standard. The project would therefore not conflict with applicable land use compatibility policies related to noise, and impacts would be less than significant.

As detailed in Section XIII, Noise, below, the project would potentially conflict with the City's Construction Noise Ordinance (SDMC Section 59.5.0404). Project construction activities would exceed the 75 dBA L_{EQ} at a sensitive receptor (adjacent residential uses). Mitigation measure NOI-1 would be required to reduce this impact to below a level of significance. See Section XIII, Noise, for further details.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

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

- Would the project:

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

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that if a project is within a Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 2, significant impacts must be determined in consultation with City staff by considering if the site is large enough to allow for economically feasible aggregate mining or, if the site is too small for economically feasible resource extraction, if the project would preclude mining adjacent to or surrounding the site. Additionally, a project may result in a significant impact if an economically feasible mineral extraction operation is the site's current use, and the site is not exhausted.

According to the Conservation Element of the City's General Plan, the project site is classified as MRZ 3, which is defined as areas containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated from available data. However, the project site is not used for mineral resource extraction nor is it planned to be used for mineral resource extraction based on land use designation and zoning. The project site has been previously developed with residential uses. Therefore, development of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource and no impact would occur.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Refer to XII(a) above. The project site is not used for mineral resource extraction nor is it planned to be used for mineral resource extraction based on land use designation and zoning. The project site has been previously developed. No impact would occur.

XIII. NOISE

- Would the project result in:

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

The discussion below is based on the Exterior Noise Analysis Report prepared by dBF Associates, Inc. (dBF) for the proposed project (dBF 2024; Appendix H).

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

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) identify that a significant impact would occur if:

- Traffic generated noise would result in exterior noise levels that exceed 65 dBA CNEL for residential and noise-sensitive land uses; 70 dBA CNEL for office, churches, and professional uses; and 75 dBA CNEL for commercial land uses. Residential uses must also not be exposed to noise levels resulting in interior noise levels exceeding 45 dBA CNEL.
- The project would generate operational noise levels at the property line exceeding the City's Noise Ordinance Standards.
- Temporary construction noise would exceed an hourly noise level (denoted as L_{EQ}) of 75 dBA L_{EQ} at a sensitive receptor. In addition, construction activity must comply with the hours and days when construction is allowed according to SDMC Section 59.5.0404, unless a permit states otherwise.
- Noise levels during the breeding season for the coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, southern willow flycatcher, least tern, cactus wren, tricolored blackbird or western snowy plover would exceed 60 dBA or existing ambient noise level if above 60 dBA.

Construction Noise

The nearest noise-sensitive land uses include the residential uses on the project parcel, and single-family residences approximately 55 feet east of the site across Evans Street. Project construction would require the demolition of two existing 2-story buildings, a trash enclosure, and parking lots. Construction noise modeling indicates that construction noise from demolition work would generate noise levels up to approximately 70 A-weighted decibels (dBA), as measured over the 12-hour workday (L_{EQ} [12-hour]) at the residences across Evans Street to the east. Construction noise related to demolition work would be approximately 78 dBA L_{EQ} (12-hour) at occupied residences within the project parcel (dBF 2024). Similarly, construction noise from grading operations would be approximately 73 dBA L_{EQ} (12-hour) at residences across Evans Street and would be approximately up to 79 dBA L_{EQ} at occupied residences within the project parcel. As such, project construction noise could exceed the City's Construction Noise Ordinance at the on-site residences and mitigation would be required to reduce this potential impact to below a level of significance. Mitigation measure NOI-1 requires the preparation and implementation of a construction noise management plan to control noise to 75 dBA L_{EQ} at nearby noise-sensitive receptors. With implementation of mitigation measure NOI-1, noise levels from construction would be reduced to below 75 dBA L_{EQ} (12-hour) (dBF 2024), and impacts would be less than significant.

Operational Noise

The project building would install rooftop HVAC units, with a parapet screen at least as tall as the units. Assuming the use of 3-ton HVAC units running continuously, noise modeling of the HVAC units indicates that they would generate noise levels of 40 dBA L_{EQ} (1-hour) when measured at nearby

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

property lines (dBF 2024). The SDMC’s applicable noise limits for multi-family residential are 45 dBA L_{EQ} (1-hour) during nighttime hours. Noise generated by the proposed project’s HVAC units would therefore be less than significant.

The project would generate approximately 480 ADT to nearby roadways (HELIX 2023a). As a general rule of thumb, the doubling of a noise source would lead to a doubling of noise levels, which corresponds to an increase of 3 dBA. Newton Avenue, which would be the primary access road for the proposed project, currently carries an existing volume of 2,210 daily vehicles (Linscott, Law, and Greenspan [LLG] 2023; Appendix I). Assuming all 480 project trips would be routed to this roadway, traffic volumes would not double and traffic noise levels would have an increase of less than 3 dBA CNEL. As this increase in traffic noise would be less than 3 dBA, it would be considered not perceptible to the average person and less than significant. Therefore, the project would not cause an increase in traffic noise that would expose off-site uses to substantial increases in traffic noise and impacts related to operational traffic noise would be less than significant.

- b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

A significant vibration impact would occur if the project would result in construction-related groundborne vibration that exceeds the Caltrans criteria for continuous or frequent intermittent sources at human receptors or nearby buildings. For continuous or frequent intermittent sources, vibration is “barely perceptible” at 0.01 in/sec peak particle velocity (PPV) and “distinctly perceptible” at 0.04 in/sec PPV (Caltrans 2013). Damage to “older residential structures” could occur at 0.3 in/sec PPV. The distances within which each vibration limit would be acceptable are provided in Table 3, *Construction Vibration Levels*.

**Table 3
CONSTRUCTION VIBRATION LEVELS**

Equipment	Vibration Level (PPV)	Distance		
		0.01 in/sec	0.3 in/sec	0.04 in/sec
Small Vibratory Roller	0.022 in/sec at 100 feet – 0.029 in/sec at 99 feet	205-263 feet	9-12 feet	58-75 feet
Hand-Operated Tamper	0.0079 in/sec at 49.2 feet	40 feet	2 feet	11 feet
Walk-Behind Compactor	0.0039 in/sec at 49.2 feet	21 feet	1 foot	6 feet
Excavators, Dozers, Loaders, Motor Grader, Backhoe	0.089 in/sec at 25 feet	182 feet	8 feet	52 feet
Trucks, Reach Lift	0.076 in/sec at 25 feet	158 feet	7 feet	45 feet
Small Bulldozer	0.003 in/sec at 25 feet	8 feet	-	2 feet

Source: dBF 2024; Appendix H

As seen in Table 3, vibration levels may cause damage to older residential structures if vibratory rollers are used within 12 feet of an older residential structure. The use of a hand-operated tamper

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

may be distinctly perceptible to receptors at 11 feet. The closest structures to the project site are not anticipated to be located within these distances. Vibration damage would therefore not occur as a result of construction, and the use of a hand-operated damper would not be distinctly perceptible to nearby receptors.

Vibration levels may reach the “distinctly perceptible” 0.04 in/sec significance level when excavators, dozers, loaders, motor graders, or backhoes are in use within 52 feet of a receptor. In addition, a small vibratory roller may cause an impact if used within 75 feet of a receptor. Because existing residents would be located within these distances, vibration from construction equipment may be distinctly perceptible. Mitigation measure NOI-2 would reduce potential impacts from vibration to below a level of significance.

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

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

The closest airports to the project site are San Diego International Airport, located approximately 2.8 miles to the northwest, and Naval Air Station North Island, located approximately 4.6 miles to the west. The project site is not within the 60 to 65 dB CNEL contour as shown on Exhibit 2-1, Noise Contour Map of the San Diego International ALUCP (San Diego County Airport Land Use Commission 2020). In addition, the project site is not within the 60 to 65 dB CNEL contour as shown in Exhibit 4 of the Naval Air Station North Island ALUCP (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2020). The project site is not within the noise contours for other airports in the region. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels and impacts would be less than significant.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

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

The project would provide additional housing on a site that is zoned BLPD-Redevelopment Sub-District, which allows residential uses. The project does not propose any changes to the existing land use designation or zoning of the project site. The project is not extending infrastructure. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The project site is currently developed with multi-family residential units. The project proposes to demolish two existing two story buildings on the property totaling approximately 12,000 SF, in addition to the on-site parking lot and trash enclosure. However, the project proposes to subsequently construct one new four-story structure encompassing six substructures, totaling 100,169 SF, creating 92 units of affordable housing residential apartments. The creation of additional affordable housing units would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing; rather, it would increase affordable housing opportunities in the area. During construction of the project, second-story units would be vacant during demolition as a condition of approval. In addition, mitigation measure NOI-1 could lead to the temporary relocation of certain residents of the existing building during specified construction activities. However, the displacement of these current residents would only occur during specific construction periods and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The project would ultimately increase the housing supply available at the site. The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing and impacts would be less than significant.

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 ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

i) Fire protection

The City's 2022 Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2022a) state that a project's consistency with the applicable community plan (in terms of number, size, and location of public service facilities) should first be evaluated when considering impacts related to public services. Typically, direct impacts could result from the construction of public service facilities needed to serve a project and indirect impacts could occur where a project constructs more than 75 dwelling units or 100,000 sf of non-residential building area.

The project would include the development of 92 multi-family residential units, and therefore would require additional fire protection services within the project site. However, the project site is located in a developed area where fire protection services are already provided by San Diego Fire Station #7, located 0.25 mile northwest of the project site. According to the Barrio Logan Community Plan, Fire Station #7 requires expansion in order to adequately respond to incidents in the Barrio Logan area. However, the incremental increase in population and therefore increase in fire protection services needed would not itself require the provision of this expanded facility.

The project would be constructed in accordance with applicable building and fire codes and would comply with City and Fire Department requirements.

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

The project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area, substantially increase the need for new fire protection staff or new facilities, or require the construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities. Impacts to fire protection would be less than significant.

ii) Police protection;

The San Diego Police Department provides law enforcement services in the project area. The project site would function as an increase in density of the existing Mercado Apartments, which is located in a developed urbanized area where police protection services are already provided. Considering this, impacts to police protection facilities would be minimal as the project area is already served by the San Diego Police Department. Additionally, the project is consistent with the allowable land use of the site, and therefore is consistent with growth projections that were utilized to forecast demand for future public facilities. No new public facilities related to police protection would be required. The proposed Impacts to police protection would be less than significant.

iii) Schools;

The project would involve the construction of 92 multi-family residential units and would therefore lead to additional school-aged individuals living in the area. The public-school facilities which serve the project site include Burbank Elementary School, located 0.3 mile northeast of the project site, Perkins K-8 School, located 0.33 mile northwest of the project site, and San Diego High School, located 1.65 miles north of the project site. According to the San Diego General Plan, the San Diego Unified School District sets a maximum enrollment of 700 students for elementary schools, 1,500 students for middle schools, and 2,000 students for high schools. For the 2023-2024 school year, enrollment at Burbank Elementary School was 316 students, enrollment at Perkins K-8 School was 389 students, and enrollment at San Diego High School was 1,954 students.

The project would not cause these school facilities to exceed enrollment restrictions and would therefore not require the provision of additional school facilities in order to maintain performance objectives for the schools serving the project site. In addition, the provision of School Impact Fees would reduce the impacts of new development on enrollment in the district. SB 50 states that the fees imposed by school districts shall constitute the exclusive method of considering and mitigating impacts on school facilities caused by a development project. Such payment shall provide "full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act...on the provision of adequate school facilities" (Government Code Section 65995(h)). Therefore, the proposed impacts to schools would be less than significant.

iv) Parks; or

Barrio Logan has two parks to serve the community: the City's Chicano Park and the Port District's Cesar Chavez Park. The development of the proposed 92 residential units would lead to population growth and therefore an increase in the use of these park facilities. The project is consistent with the allowable land use of the site, and therefore is consistent with growth projections that were utilized

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

to forecast demand for future public facilities, including parks. The project would not require the provision of additional park facilities and impacts would be less than significant.

- v) Other public facilities?

Library services to the Barrio Logan neighborhood are provided by Logan Elementary School, located 0.6 mile northeast of the project site, and the San Diego Central Library, located 1 mile northwest of the project site. The development of the proposed 92 residential units would lead to population growth and therefore an increase in the use of these library facilities. However, the project is consistent with the allowable land use of the site, and therefore is consistent with growth projections that were utilized to forecast demand for future public facilities, including libraries or other public facilities serving the project area. The project would not require the provision of additional library facilities or other public facilities and impacts would be less than significant.

XVI. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

The 1978 Barrio Logan Community Plan (City 1978) outlines various recreation opportunities within the community, including existing parks, planned and proposed parks, and other recreation facilities. The proposed development of 92 multi-family residential units would lead to population growth and therefore an increase in the use of recreational facilities. However, the project is consistent with the allowable land use of the site, and therefore is consistent with growth projections that were utilized to forecast demand for future recreational facilities in the area. Impacts to recreational facilities would be 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?

The proposed project would include the construction of an outdoor courtyard and plaza space, which could include recreational opportunities for residents. However, the potential impacts of their construction are evaluated throughout this report. As discussed in XVI(a) above, the project is consistent with the allowable land use of the site and is therefore consistent with growth projections that were utilized to forecast demand for future recreational facilities in the area, including the planned recreational facilities identified in the 1978 Barrio Logan Community Plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION

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

Transportation plans and policies for the region include the City of San Diego Pedestrian Master Plan, General Plan Mobility Element, City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan, and SANDAG San Diego Regional Bike Plan. The project proposes 92 multi-family dwelling units and the expected trip generation for the project is approximately 552 Average Daily Trips (ADT) with 44 (9 in, 35 out) morning (AM) peak hour trips and 50 (35 in, 15 out) evening (PM) peak hour trips. This is based on a rate of 6 trips per dwelling unit (for a site with a density of greater than 20 dwelling units per acre). As a small project under 1,000 ADT that is consistent with the community plan and zone, the project was screened out of preparing a Local Mobility Analysis per the City's Transportation Study Manual (City 2022b).

In addition, the project would re-construct portions of the sidewalk along the frontage and does not propose any changes to the public transit system, bicycle lanes, or pedestrian circulation. The project would not conflict with transportation plans or policies. The entirety of the Barrio Logan neighborhood is a transit priority area, which is an area located within one-half-mile of an existing or planned major transit stop, such as the San Diego Trolley's Barrio Logan station. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

To satisfy the CEQA guidelines updated after the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 743, the potential transportation impact of the proposed project are based on VMT. Public Resources Code Section 20199, enacted pursuant to SB 743, identifies VMT as an appropriate metric for measuring transportation impacts along with the elimination of auto delay/level of service for CEQA purposes statewide.

Thus, in compliance with SB 743, the project's potential impact was assessed by conducting VMT analysis per the City's Transportation Study Manual (City 2022b). Per the SANDAG Region SB 743 ABM2+ (Base Year 2016) screening maps for residential projects, the project is located in Census Tract 50 and would be expected to generate 11.3 miles VMT per resident. This is 59.9 percent of the regional average VMT per resident of 18.9. The significance threshold is 85 percent of the regional average; therefore, the project is screened out from a VMT analysis since it is located in a VMT

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

efficient area of below 85 percent of the regional mean VMT per Resident and presumed to have a less than significant transportation VMT 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

No design features or incompatible uses that would increase potential hazards are proposed. The project would be consistent with the City's engineering and fire access standards and would not result in hazardous conditions. Access to the site would be provided by an existing driveway on Newton Avenue. As such, the proposed project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

The project would not result in inadequate emergency access. The project design was subject to City Fire review and approval for consistency with all design requirements to ensure that no impediments to emergency access would occur. The project would not result in inadequate emergency access and impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

– Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

As mentioned in V(b), although the project site is located within a high sensitivity area on the City's Historic Resources Sensitivity Map, no archaeological sites have been mapped at this location in CHRIS, and the site has been previously graded and the upper five to seven feet of the site is comprised of fill. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse effect to a Tribal Cultural Resource (TCR) that is listed or eligible for listing in the CHRIS, or in a local register of historical resources as defined by the Public Resources Code. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

TCRs include sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, and sacred places or objects that have cultural value or significance to a Native American Tribe. TCRs 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 culturally affiliated geographic area (Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 (a)).

In accordance with the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1, Assembly Bill 52, the City distributed notification letters on February 28, 2024, to the local Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area. No tribes requested consultation and no TCRs were otherwise identified on the site. Impacts would be less than significant.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

- Would the project:

a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which would cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project consists of additional development on a previously developed site. The project site is currently served by existing underground water, stormwater, and sewer lines located within the adjacent streets. Infrastructure improvements would be limited to connections with these underground utility lines located within the adjacent streets. Additionally, utility improvements would occur at the project site as part of the project, impacts of which are considered throughout this Initial Study. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The 2020 City UWMP serves as the water resources planning document that assesses the current and future water supply and needs for the City. The City’s current and approved future water supplies consist of: (1) water purchased from the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA), either directly transferred or stored in various reservoirs; (2) local supplies including groundwater, capture of local runoff from rainfall within seven of its nine surface reservoirs, and Pure Water which is approved and in progress; and (3) recycled water for non-potable water use. Purchased water from SDCWA is the largest portion of the City’s overall water supply. In 2015, a significant drought year, SDCWA water accounted for 97 percent of the City’s total water supply as the availability of local surface water was lower than in normal hydrologic years. Imported water from SDCWA accounted for about 89 percent on average from 2016 to 2020. Implementation of the project would not result in new or expanded water entitlements from the water service provider. The project would be consistent with the existing land use and zoning designations for the project site, and therefore would be consistent with existing water demand projections contained in the UWMP for normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Therefore, the project would not use excessive amounts of water beyond projected available supplies, and impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) 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 demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The proposed project would require additional wastewater treatment to serve the residents of the additional 92 multi-family residential units. However, the project site is currently developed and wastewater treatment is provided to the existing buildings. Although the additional units that would be constructed by the project would require additional wastewater treatment, it would be an incremental increase in the currently provided wastewater treatment and the proposed project would be in compliance with the site zoning and land use designations that are utilized for programmatic wastewater treatment infrastructure planning. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

A Waste Management Plan (WMP) was prepared for the project to identify the solid waste that would be generated by construction and operation of the project and to identify measures to reduce those impacts to waste generation (HELIX 2023b; Appendix J). During pre-construction demolition, clearing/grubbing, and grading, the project would produce 2,401 tons of excavated soils, green

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

waste, asphalt/concrete, and other Construction and Demolition (C&D) waste, and divert 2,015 tons of these materials from the landfill. Approximately 386 tons of solid waste material generated during pre-construction is anticipated to be disposed of as non-recyclable/ non-reusable waste at a local landfill, for an overall pre-construction diversion rate of 84 percent².

During construction, the project would produce approximately 121 tons of solid waste (metal, concrete, concrete/steel, asphalt, brick/masonry, wood, drywall, carpet/carpet padding, mixed debris, and trash), and divert 92.1 tons of solid waste materials from the landfill. The diverted material would consist of clean, source-separated (segregated) recyclable and/or reusable material, as well as mixed debris, to be deposited at the recycling/reuse facilities identified in the City's Certified C&D Recycling Facility Directory. Approximately 29 tons of solid waste material generated during construction is anticipated to be disposed of as non-recyclable/non-reusable waste at a local landfill, for an overall diversion rate during construction of approximately 76 percent. With the combined pre-construction and construction phases, the project would produce 2,522 tons of solid waste and would divert 2,107 tons. This would result in the diversion and reuse of 80 percent of the waste material generated from the project from the landfill, which would meet the City's current 75 percent waste diversion goal. Therefore, solid waste management impacts associated with project construction would be less than significant.

During occupancy, it has been estimated that the project would generate an additional 104 tons of waste per year over existing conditions. Using an estimated 50-percent diversion rate, 52 tons per year are calculated to be diverted to recycling/reuse facilities. An additional 52 tons per year, or 50 percent of occupancy material generated, are estimated to be disposed of as non-recyclable/non-reusable waste at a local landfill. The project would also comply with organic waste diversion pursuant to SB 1383, which requires diversion of a minimum of 50 percent of organic waste generated on site, and a minimum of 75 percent of organic waste generated on site by 2025. Thus, the project is expected to achieve a waste diversion rate of greater than 50 percent overall. Additional waste reduction, recycling, and diversion measures would further reduce the project's operational waste disposal.

Based on the quantified waste generation and diversion rates discussed above, the project would exceed the state of California's 75 percent solid waste diversion rate for waste produced during the pre-construction and construction phases. The project would fail to meet the 75 percent waste reduction target annually once the buildings are occupied. However, the WMP for the project prescribes mandatory measures, including waste reduction, recycling, and diversion measures, an organic waste collection service, diversion of green waste, and other measures which would reduce the impact on solid waste reduction goals to below a level of significance. The project would be required to comply with the WMP measures as a condition of approval.

²The project's WMP does not include approximately 200 cubic yards of soil, or 260 tons, which require export during pre-construction grading. Estimated tonnage was based on the City' Construction and Demolition Conversion Rate Table, which identifies an excavated soil weight of 1.3 tons per cubic yard (City 2016). Excavated soil is anticipated to be diverted at a rate of 100 percent to one of the facilities from the City's Certified Construction and Demolition Recycling Facility Directory. This additional soil export would therefore not require disposal at a local landfill and does not affect the conclusions of the WMP.

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

The project would be above the City's 2022 Significance Determination Threshold (City 2022a) for direct and cumulative impacts. However, through compliance with waste diversion measures included in the project specific WMP, plus implementation of sustainability and efficiency features, the project's direct solid waste impact would be less than significant and the project's contribution to a cumulative solid waste generation would be reduced to a level that is less than cumulatively considerable.

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

Refer to XX(d), above. The prescribed measures identified within the WMP for the project would be followed; therefore, the project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

XX. WILDFIRE

- If located in or near state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

See IX(f). The County of San Diego General Plan Safety Element identifies I-5, which is 0.18 mile northeast of the project site, and SR-75, which is directly northwest of the project site, as potential evacuation routes. The project site is in a developed area with access to these major roadways that would allow for emergency evacuation. The existing driveway off Evans Street would be removed as part of the project; however, direct site access for pedestrians would be provided by the new main entry off Evans Street, and two new entries off Main Street, in addition to a new vehicular service access driveway off Main Street. Vehicular access would be provided by an existing driveway off Newton Street, which provides access to the existing apartment complex surrounding the project site. Access to the emergency evacuation routes identified in the County of San Diego General Plan would be maintained. During construction of the project, heavy construction vehicles could interfere with emergency response to the site or emergency evacuation procedures in the event of an emergency (e.g., vehicles traveling behind the slow-moving truck). However, such trips would be infrequent and temporary. Therefore, the project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

As discussed above in Section IX, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the project site and adjacent land is not located within an identified VHFHSZ. In addition, the project site is within a highly developed area that lacks native or naturalized vegetation that would be considered highly flammable. The project would be consistent with the land use and zoning designations for the site. The project's proposed habitable structure would be equipped with automatic alarm and sprinkler systems and would have fire resistant construction per Chapter 7A of the California Building Code. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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's infrastructure improvements would be limited to on-site vehicular access improvements and connections to utility lines surrounding the project site. Such improvements would not exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment. No fuel breaks, emergency water sources, or power lines would be installed by the project. Therefore, the installation and maintenance of project infrastructure would not exacerbate fire risks. Impacts related to installation and maintenance of infrastructure 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The project site and immediately surrounding areas are flat and are not located within a flood inundation zone, and the potential risk of downslope flooding or landslide hazards is considered low (see also Section VII, *Geology and Soils*). Further, as the project has been designed in accordance with City standards for grading and drainage control, the project would not increase the quantity or rate of runoff from the subject site with project implementation, thereby minimizing the potential for the project to contribute to significant risk including downstream flooding as a result of runoff or drainage changes. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to significant risks, including from downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire instability, or drainage changes. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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?

The project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, cause fish or wildlife populations to drop below self-sustaining levels or threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. The project does not have the potential to cause direct and indirect impacts to sensitive vegetation communities and habitat for sensitive animal species. The project is not expected to impact resources related to major periods of California history or prehistory.

- 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)?

Cumulative environmental impacts are those impacts that by themselves are not significant, but when considered with impacts occurring from other projects in the vicinity would result in a cumulative impact. Related projects considered to have the potential of creating cumulative impacts in association with the project consist of projects that are reasonably foreseeable and that would be constructed or operated during the life of the project. The project would occur within a developed portion of a property operating as a residential development.

Criteria pollutant and precursor pollutant emissions generated during project construction and operation are not anticipated to exceed the SDAPCD screening thresholds, and therefore would not be cumulatively considerable. Similarly, the project would have a less than significant impact in relation to GHG, which is inherently discussed in terms of cumulative impacts. The generation of 480 new vehicle trips would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts related to pollutant emissions, GHG emissions, or VMT.

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

Impacts related to biological resources would be less than significant. Therefore, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts to sensitive animal species or habitats.

No known cultural resources are known to occur within the project area, and the project would not require grading below existing fill material found at the site. Therefore, impacts related to cultural and tribal cultural resources would be less than significant, and the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable impact to cultural resources.

Potential impacts related to hazardous materials would be less than significant. The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health regulatory case related to the known contamination site within the proposed project site has been closed with no contingencies or land use restrictions. Implementation of the project would not result in cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials.

The project would be consistent with the land use and zoning designations for the project site, which allow the residential land use. The project components would induce population growth; however, the project would be within the allowable land use and zoning, and therefore this potential growth has been accounted for in growth projections for the area. Cumulatively considerable impacts as a result of population growth are not anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Other future projects within the surrounding area would be required to comply with applicable local, state, and federal regulations to reduce potential impacts to less than significant, or to the extent possible. As such, the project is not anticipated to contribute to potentially significant cumulative environmental impacts. Cumulative impacts related to implementation of the project would be less than significant with implementation of the noted mitigation measures.

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

Potentially significant impacts to the environment resulting from the proposed project have been identified for the area of noise, specifically in regard to potential adverse effects related to noise and vibration during construction of the project. However, with the implementation of mitigation measures NOI-1 and NOI-2, impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance.

The project is located on a known contamination site; however, the regulatory case was issued closure by the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health in April 2001 without contingencies or land use restrictions, and hazardous sites within the vicinity of the project site do not represent a significant environmental concern. Other issue areas that could potentially create substantial adverse effects on human beings such as risk of fire or floods were determined to be less than significant. Thus, as analyzed throughout this Initial Study Checklist, no substantial adverse effects on human beings, either indirectly or directly, would occur because of project implementation and therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

APPENDICES

(Under Separate Cover)

- Appendix A Air Quality Technical Report
- Appendix B Geotechnical Investigation
- Appendix C Seismic Risk Assessment Probable Maximum Loss (PML) Report
- Appendix D Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP)
- Appendix E Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist
- Appendix F Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report
- Appendix G Hydrology Report
- Appendix H Exterior Noise Analysis Report
- Appendix I Traffic Volumes
- Appendix J Waste Management Plan

REFERENCES

- California Building Standards Commission (CBSC). 2022. CALGreen (CCR Title 24, Part 11). Available at: <https://www.dgs.ca.gov/BSC/CALGreen>.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2018. California Important Farmland Finder. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/>. Accessed March 2024.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2015. Preliminary Endangerment Assessment Guidance Manual. October. Available at: https://dtsc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/31/2023/06/PEA_Guidance_Manual.pdf.
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2013. Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. September.
- dBF Associates, Inc. (dBF). 2024. Exterior Noise Analysis Report. July 11. Attached as Appendix H to this report.
- Excel Engineering. 2023a. Priority Development Project (PDP) Storm Water Quality Management Plan (SWQMP). September 15. Attached as Appendix D to this report.
- 2023b. Hydrology Report. January 23. Attached as Appendix G to this report.
- HELIX Environmental Planning (HELIX). 2023a. Air Quality Technical Report. January. Attached as Appendix A to this report.
- 2023b. Waste Management Plan. April. Attached as Appendix J to this report.
- Leighton and Associates, Inc. 2021. Geotechnical Investigation. December 9. Attached as Appendix B to this report.
- Linscott, Law, and Greenspan (LLG). 2023. Mercado Project – Existing + Project Traffic Volumes. February 7. Attached as Appendix I to this report.
- Martinez + Cutri Urban Studio Corporation. 2023. Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist. Attached as Appendix E to this report.
- Partner Engineering and Science, Inc. (Partner). 2019. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report. November 19. Attached as Appendix F to this report.
- Professional Associates Construction Services, Inc. (PACS). 2020. Seismic Risk Assessment Probable Maximum Loss (PML) Report. July 8. Attached as Appendix C to this report.

San Diego, City of (City). 2023. Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan: City of San Diego Annex.

2022a. California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. September. Available at:

https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/september_2022_ceqa_thresholds_final.pdf.

2022b. Transportation Study Manual (TSM). September 19. Available at:

<https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/10-transportation-study-manual.pdf>.

2021. Barrio Logan Community Plan and Local Coastal Program. December.

2018. Land Development Code Biology Guidelines. February 1. Available at:

https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/amendment_to_the_land_development_manual_biology_guidelines_february_2018_-_clean.pdf.

2016. City of San Diego Construction & Demolition Debris Conversion Rate Table. June 6.

1997. Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan. Available at:

<https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/programs/mscp/pdf/subareafullversion.pdf>.

1978. Barrio Logan Harbor 101 Community Plan. Adopted November 30. Available at:

<https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/community/profiles/pdf/cp/cpblfull.pdf>.


San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). 2016. Final 2016 Revision to the Regional Air Quality Strategy for San Diego County. December

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority. 2020. Naval Air Station North Island Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Adopted October 1. Available at:

https://www.san.org/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/API/Entries/Download?EntryId=16157&Command=Core_Download&language=en-US&PortalId=0&TabId=807.

2014. San Diego International Airport Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Adopted April 3. Available at:

https://www.san.org/DesktopModules/Bring2mind/DMX/API/Entries/Download?EntryId=2990&Command=Core_Download&language=en-US&PortalId=0&TabId=807.




I:\PROJECTS\I\MAAC_08400\00005_MercadoAptmnts\Map\ISMIND\ISMIND.aprx Fig1_Regional : 08400.5.1 : 6/13/2024 - SAB

Source: Base Map Layers (SanGIS, 2016)



○ Project Site
⬮ Project Parcel




I:\PROJECTS\IWAAC_08-00\00005_MercadoAptmnts\Map\ISMIND\ISMIND.aprx Fig2_Vicinity - 08400.5.1 : 6/13/2024 - SAB



Source: Aerial (NearMap, 2019)

I:\PROJECTS\MAAC_08400\00005_MercadoAptmnts\Map\SMND\Fig 3_SitePlan.mxd 08400.5.1.6/13/2024 - SAB



Project Site

Source: Martinez + Cutri, 2022