



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 542104

I.O. 24007220

SCH No.: N/A

SUBJECT: JONES HOUSE RELOCATION – SDP: SITE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT (SDP) to relocate historic Henry B. Jones House from 4040 Fifth Avenue (the donor site), located in the Medical Complex neighborhood of the Uptown community, to 4114 Ibis Street (the receiving site), approximately one mile west, located in the Mission Hills neighborhood of the Uptown community. The 1,755-square-foot house, constructed in 1911, is located on a parcel in the CC-3-8 zone and designated Institutional in the Uptown Community Plan. Overlays on the donor site include the San Diego International Airport (SDIA) Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Notification (SDIA), Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone A (CPIOZ-A), Residential Tandem Overlay Zone, and Transit Area Overlay Zone. The 0.11-acre vacant receiving site is zoned RS-1-7 and is designated Residential—Low: 5-9 DU/AC in the Uptown Community Plan Update. Overlays on the receiving site include SDIA AIA Review Area 2, FAA Part 77 Notification (SDIA and Naval Air Station North Island), and Very High Fire Severity Zone. Legal Description of Donor Site: Lot 10, Block 3 of Map No. 1069. Legal Description of Receiving Site: Lot 8, Block 2 of Washington Heights, Map No. 1074. Applicant: Scripps Health.

- I. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** See attached Initial Study.
- II. **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** See attached Initial Study.
- III. **DETERMINATION:** The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following area: **Cultural Resources (Architectural Resources)**. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

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

V. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART I

Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)

1. Prior to the issuance of a Notice To Proceed (NTP) for a subdivision, or any construction permits, such as Demolition, Grading or Building, or beginning any construction related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Director's Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve all Construction Documents (CD) (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the 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: <http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/standtemp.shtml>.
4. The TITLE INDEX SHEET must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.
5. SURETY AND COST RECOVERY – The Development Services Director or City Manager may require appropriate surety instruments or bonds from private Permit Holders to ensure the long term performance or implementation of required mitigation measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its cost to offset the salary, overhead, and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II

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

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

Note: Failure of all responsible Permit Holders' 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
2. MMRP COMPLIANCE: This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) Number 542104 and/or Mitigated Negative Declaration Number 542104, 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 affecting the MMRP. Resolution of such conflicts must be approved by RE and MMC BEFORE the work is performed.

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

Not Applicable.

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

Note: Surety and Cost Recovery – When deemed necessary by the Development Services Director or City Manager, additional surety instruments or bonds from the private Permit Holder may be required to ensure the long term performance or implementation or required mitigation

measures or programs. The City is authorized to recover its costs to offset the salary, overhead and expenses for City personnel and programs to monitor qualifying projects.

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

DOCUMENT SUBMITTAL/INSPECTION CHECKLIST		
Issue Area	Document Submittal	Associated Inspection/ Approvals/Notes
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Preconstruction Meeting
General	Consultant Construction Monitoring Exhibits	Prior to or at Preconstruction Meeting
Cultural Resources (Historic)	Construction Monitoring	Consultant Site Visit Record submitted following each Site Visit
Bond Release	Request for Bond Release Letter	Final MMRP Inspections Prior to Bond Release Letter

C. SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS

CULTURAL RESOURCES (ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES)

HIST-1 MONITORING

1. Preconstruction Meeting [City Historic Resources staff, Developer/Construction Manager (D/CM), Project Architect (PA), Historic Architect & Monitor (HA), Relocation Contractor (RC), General Contractor (GC), Building Inspector (BI)]
 - a. Overview of Treatment Plan and Monitoring Plan as related to the historic resource on Site A.
 - b. Overview of architectural, landscape, and engineering documents as related to Site B. Also visit Site B.
 - c. Review work required to prepare the site for arrival of the building.
2. Preparation of structure for moving (D/CM, HA)
 - a. Historic Architect/Monitor to be present to observe removal of the masonry foundation, chimneys, and front steps. Other items, including disconnection/capping of utility connection, removal of exterior plumbing and electrical lines, removal non- historic porch enclosure, which are required for the relocation, shall be complete prior to the Preconstruction Meeting.
3. Pre-Move (D/CM, HA, RC, GC)

- a. Observe temporary shoring and protection.
 - b. Review storage of salvaged building materials.
 - c. Approve structure as ready for relocation.
 - d. Review preparation work at Site B prior to relocation of building for new footings, foundation, utilities, and site preparation.
4. Move to Site B (D/CM, HA, RC, BI)
 - a. Review building relocation. Review overall Treatment Plan for rehabilitation of building as well as architectural, landscape, and engineering documents prior to commencement of relocation.
 5. Continued Monitoring During Rehabilitation (D/CM, PA, HA, GC)
 - a. Monitoring to occur as required during rehabilitation.
 - b. Complete Consultant Site Visit Record forms, as needed.
 - c. Observe rehabilitation of the building in accordance with the Treatment Plan and approved architectural, landscape, and engineering documents.
 6. Final Monitoring (D/CM, PA, HA)
 - a. Prepare final punch list of items to complete according to the Treatment Plan and architectural, landscape, and engineering documents.
 7. Draft Monitoring Report (HA, BI)
 - a. Draft report of monitoring process to be submitted to the BI for review following completion of rehabilitation.
 8. Final Monitoring Report (D/CM, HA, BI)
 - a. Final Monitoring Report, review relevant documents with the BI to confirm compliance with the Site Development Permit following review and acceptance of the Draft Monitoring Report.

HIST-2 PREPARATION, RELOCATION, & REHABILITATION REQUIREMENTS

1. Preparation of the Structure Prior to Relocation:

Coordination Meeting & Monitoring: Prior to the start of any work the Project Architect/Historic Architect/Monitor and City Historic Resources staff shall meet on site with the moving contractor to review the scope of demolition, removal, salvage, temporary shoring, and relocation. Through the course of all work, the moving contractor shall notify the Historic Architect/Monitor of discovery of any architectural elements on site. The Historic Architect/Monitor shall evaluate the significance of such material prior to determining the appropriate treatment in compliance with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards)*.

All salvaged items will be stored on labeled and wrapped pallets and secured in a weather-tight, lockable, steel container that will be located at the northwest corner of the Ibis Street site adjacent to the house. Construction monitoring shall be provided prior to preparation of the building for relocation. The construction Monitor shall provide a Consultant Site Visit Record summarizing the field conditions and any recommendations for compliance with *The Standards*.

Temporary Shoring: The moving contractor shall provide and maintain necessary shoring to protect and stabilize the building during the relocation. Means and methods for temporary shoring will be determined by the moving contractor and the implementation of these procedures shall occur only after review by the Historic Architect/Monitor. The mover shall outline any proposed attachment points for anchors or beams. Historic siding or trim affected by the attachment of temporary shoring shall be removed prior to installation of shoring, catalogued, labeled and securely stored.

Windows: All windows shall be protected by plywood prior to relocation. Many of the existing windows are currently protected by plywood to prevent vandalism. Existing plywood may be kept in place, if deemed adequate by the moving contractor. Unprotected windows shall be covered with 3/4" exterior grade plywood installed in a similar manner as the existing plywood, without causing damage to the existing historic windows, frames, and trim.

Doors: There are no existing historic exterior doors. The current plywood covering shall be maintained pending the exterior rehabilitation. The plywood shall be inspected by the contractor and replaced if needed.

Masonry Foundation Walls:

Prior to relocation, samples of the faux-stone masonry foundation walls shall be salvaged for matching purposes and stored on the Ibis Street site.

Following relocation, purchase and install newly manufactured replica blocks from Classic Rock Face Blocks.

Chimneys: Prior to relocation, the historic brick chimney on the south side of the building shall be disassembled. Prior to disassembly, the chimney shall be measured and photo documented. All documentation will be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to removal of the chimney. The brick shall be catalogued, salvaged, and stored for reinstallation at the new site. The north chimney will not be salvaged or reconstructed as it is not an original feature.

Front Steps and Porch: Prior to relocation, the wood front steps and wing walls will be salvaged to facilitate the relocation. Prior to disassembly, the features shall be measured and photo documented. All documentation will be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to

removal. The non-historic porch enclosure will be removed to recreate the original open porch. The non-historic windows will not be salvaged or reused.

The front porch, including the porch floor, T&G ceiling, low front wall, piers, trim, and decorative brackets shall be protected in place and securely shored in order to facilitate the relocation.

2. Protection Measures at the New Site:

Security: The installation of temporary plywood covering over existing windows and doors was added to protect the building from vagrancy and vandalism. Plywood will be maintained over all window and door openings. Monitoring and visual inspection of the exterior of the building will be provided by Diocese personnel until the house is reoccupied. All salvaged items will be stored on labeled and wrapped pallets and secured in a weather-tight, lockable, steel container that will be located at the northwest corner of the Ibis Street site adjacent to the house.

Mothballing: During temporary storage, and until the building is successfully rehabilitated, it shall be securely mothballed. Mothballing shall include adequately eliminating and controlling pests, protecting the interior from moisture, providing adequate security, ensuring adequate interior ventilation, and following a maintenance and monitoring plan to ensure that the house is adequately secured and routinely inspected. Mothballing will follow the recommendations in National Park Service Preservation Brief 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings, which is attached to the end of this document.

Applicant will have the building mothballed at the conclusion of the rehabilitation work. At that time, ownership will transfer over to the Catholic Diocese. The Diocese will then be responsible for all maintenance, monitoring, and inspections of the Jones House following conclusion of relocation and exterior rehabilitation of the Jones House. Diocese work falls outside the timeframe of the project and is not a requirement of or included in the project.

Monitoring: Construction monitoring shall be provided to ensure that the building is securely stored and adequately mothballed at the new site. The Monitor shall complete a Consultant Site Visit Record summarizing the field conditions and any recommendations for compliance with *The Standards*.

3. Building Rehabilitation:

Following the relocation of the Henry B. Jones House, the exterior of the structure will be rehabilitated and repaired in accordance with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*.

Construction Monitoring: Periodic construction monitoring shall be provided during the rehabilitation process. Following periodic site visits, the construction monitor shall provide a Consultant Site Visit Record summarizing the field conditions and any recommendations for compliance with *The Standards*. Refer to the Monitoring Plan.

Rehabilitation Design: The future rehabilitation of the building shall be completed in accordance with *The Standards*. The design team includes a Historic Architect that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. The rehabilitation design will require review and approval by the City of San Diego's Development Services Department and the Historical Resources Board staff and/or Design Assistance Subcommittee prior to commencement of rehabilitation work.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION: Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to:

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Mayor's Office

Councilmember Ward – District 3

City Attorney's Office

Development Services

EAS

Historic Resources

Transportation Development

Engineering

Planning Review

Water & Sewer Development

Planning Department

Long Range Planning

Historic Resources Board

South Coastal Information Center

San Diego History Center

San Diego Archaeological Center

Save Our Heritage Organisation

San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

San Diego Central Library

Mission Hills Branch Library

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INTERESTED PARTIES

Middletown Property Owner's Assoc

Attn: R.H. Stowers, Chair

Mission Hills Heritage

Barry Hager, President

Uptown Planners

Leo Wilson, Chair

Brad Werdick, AICP, Director

Karen Ruggels, KLR PLANNING


Scripps Health

Justine Nielson, Procopio

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- () No comments were received during the public input period.
- () Comments were received but did not address the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration finding or the accuracy/completeness on the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- (X) Comments addressing the finding of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public input period. The letters and responses follow.

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.



Anna L. McPherson AICP

Senior Planner

Development Services Department

October 10, 2017

Date of Draft Report

November 3, 2017

Date of Final Report

Analyst: R. Benally

Attachments: Initial Study Checklist
Figure 1 – Location Map for Donor and Receiver Sites
Figure 2 – Site Plan for Donor Site
Figure 3 – Site Plan for Receiver Site
Figure 4 – Elevations


Appendices:

Appendix A: Historical Resources Technical Report
Appendix B: CAP Consistency Checklist

- Appendix C: Water Pollution Control Plan
 - Appendix D: Scripps Jones House Historic American Building Survey (HABS)
 - Appendix E: HABS Drawings
 - Appendix F: Scripps Jones House Monitoring Plan
 - Appendix G: Scripps Jones House Treatment Plan
-



Site Location – Donor Site (4040 Fifth Avenue)




Site Location – Receiving Site (4114 Ibis Street)



Location Map for Donor and Receiver Sites
 Jones House Relocation – SDP / Project No. 542104
 City of San Diego – Development Services Department


**FIGURE
 No. 1**

FOURTH AVE



Site Plan – Donor Site (4040 Fifth Avenue)
Jones House Relocation – SDP / Project No. 542104
City of San Diego – Development Services Department

**FIGURE
No. 2**




SITE PLAN & ROOF PLAN

SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



Site Plan – Receiving Site (4114 Ibis Street)
 Jones House Relocation – SDP / Project No. 542104
 City of San Diego – Development Services Department

**FIGURE
No. 3**



Elevations

Jones House Relocation – SDP / Project No. 542104

City of San Diego – Development Services Department

**FIGURE
No. 4**



San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.
Environmental Review Committee

30 October 2017

To: Ms. Rhonda Benally
Development Services Department
City of San Diego
1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 561
San Diego, California 92101

Subject: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
Jones House Relocation
Project No. 542104


Dear Ms. Benally:

I have reviewed the subject DMND on behalf of this committee of the San Diego County Archaeological Society.

Based on the information contained in the DMND, the Heritage Architecture report, and views of both addresses on Google Street View, and assuming the City's Historical Resources Board also concurs, we agree with the relocation of the Henry B. Jones House and with the various conditions to be imposed.

SDCAS appreciates being included in the public review of this DMND.

Sincerely,


James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson
Environmental Review Committee

cc: SDCAS President
File

Response to Comments

Letter from San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc., October 30, 2017

1. Comment noted.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project title/Project number: Jones House Relocation – SDP / 542104
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: Rhonda Benally / (619) 446-5468
4. Project location: 4040 Fifth Avenue, San Diego, California 92103
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: Scripps Health
10140 Campus Point Drive
Suite 210, AX255
San Diego, California 92121
6. General/Community Plan designation: Multiple Use / Institutional (donor site)
Multiple Use / Residential-Low: 5-9 DU/AC (receiving site)
7. Zoning: Donor Site (4040 Fifth Avenue):
CC-3-8

Receiving Site (4114 Ibis Street):
RS-1-7
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 historic Henry B. Jones House (Jones House) is a two-story Craftsman-style (Arts and Crafts) structure located at 4040 Fifth Avenue. The wood-framed structure was built in 1911 by an unknown architect and builder. The building was formally designated by the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board as HRB# 939 in 2009. □The main exterior of the building is clad with beveled horizontal wood clapboard siding. The cladding on the second floor consists of wood shingles of varying widths. The windows are mostly double hung or fixed wood units with divided upper lites. The prominent cross-gable roof with curved ends is topped with non-historic composition shingles. The original roof was likely wood shingles. The roof of the enclosed front porch is supported by two corner columns. Other decorative embellishments include shaped rafter tails, triangular knee braces, straight-cut faux-stone concrete masonry unit (CMU) foundation walls, and wood front steps. □The building contains a living room, dining room, porch (now enclosed), kitchen and powder room/ mud room on the first floor; and four bedrooms and a bathroom on the second floor. The open porch was enclosed in 1945. The interior of the porch does not appear to have been altered after it was enclosed, so the original exterior wall and front door remain. □

The Jones House is an involuntary designated historic resource [Historic Resource Board (HRB) Site #939] located in the Medical Complex neighborhood of the Uptown community in central San Diego. The Jones House is a two-story, 1,755-square foot residence built in 1911 and located at 4040 Fifth Avenue. The City of San Diego HRB involuntarily designated the Jones House as historic on November 20, 2009. The Jones House Relocation – SDP project (“project”) involves the following actions:

- Relocation of the Jones House from 4040 Fifth Avenue to 4114 Ibis Street;
- Installation and connection of new domestic water piping and meter to the existing eight-inch water main that runs north-south on Ibis Street;
- Installation and connection of new sewer lateral piping to existing eight-inch sewer line that is in the alley that forms the western boundary of the receiving site;
- New foundation on the receiving site that maintains current house orientation (front door facing east); and
- Exterior rehabilitation of the Jones House per the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

A Site Development Permit is required for the proposed Jones House relocation. Prior to relocation, the stone concrete block foundation walls and wood entry steps would be documented, catalogued, salvaged, and stored. The original extant south brick chimney would be documented, catalogued, salvaged, and reconstructed, probably using new brick due to the poor condition of the current. The main structure would be transported via truck in one piece to the vacant lot at 4114 Ibis Street, approximately one mile northwest of its current location.

The proposed relocation site is located within a residential block on Ibis Street in the Mission Hills neighborhood. Ibis Street runs north to south and is surrounded by similar period homes. The proposed relocation site is located on the west side of Ibis Street with an alley at the rear. The Jones House, once relocated, would retain its orientation and setback on the new site. The relocation site is compatible with the original character and use of the historical resource. Once relocated, the building would undergo an exterior restoration per *the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*. No interior restoration would occur, and no occupancy of the building is part of this project. As such, following exterior restoration, the building would be mothballed in accordance with the National Park Service Preservation Briefs 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings.¹

Non-original features would not be reconstructed, as these features are not historic features. The driveway onto Fifth Avenue from the donor site would be closed, with sidewalk and curb reconstructed. The driveway onto Ibis Street from the receiving site would be closed, as new site access would occur from the alley, with sidewalk and curb reconstructed

¹ The actual mothballing effort involves controlling the long-term deterioration of the building while it is unoccupied as well as finding methods to protect it from sudden loss by fire or vandalism. This requires securing the building from unwanted entry, providing adequate ventilation to the interior, and shutting down or modifying existing utilities.

The site on which the house currently sits is referred to as the “donor site” in this document. The donor site, located at 4040 Fifth Avenue, is zoned CC-3-8 and is designated as Institutional use in the Uptown Community Plan Update. Overlays on the donor site include the San Diego International Airport (SDIA) Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Part 77 Notification (SDIA), Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone A (CPIOZ-A), Residential Tandem Overlay Zone, and Transit Area Overlay Zone.

The site onto which the house is proposed to relocate is referred to as the “receiving site” in this document. The receiving site is a 0.11-acre vacant lot located at 4114 Ibis Street, approximately one mile west of the donor site, in the Mission Hills neighborhood of the Uptown community. The receiving site is zoned RS-1-7 and is designated Residential—Low: 5-9 DU/AC in the Uptown Community Plan Update. Overlays on the receiving site include SDIA AIA Review Area 2 and FAA Part 77 Notification (SDIA and Naval Air Station North Island).

The Jones House is owned by Scripps Health and is located on the Scripps Mercy Hospital campus. The house has been vacant for the last ten years and has fallen into disrepair. To prevent vandalism and vagrancy, the house’s doors and windows have been boarded, and a chain link fence has been placed around the perimeter. The Jones House was designated as historic by the City of San Diego Historic Resources Board in 2009. The receiving site is owned by the Diocese of San Diego. Scripps Health proposes to relocate the Jones House to 4114 Ibis Street. Scripps Health and the Diocese of San Diego propose to restore the Jones House at the receiving site. The restored house would be used as a residence for clergy of the Saint Vincent de Paul Catholic Parish, located nearby at 4080 Hawk Street. Scripps Health would be responsible for the exterior restoration of the house, which is the subject of the proposed project. Future interior restoration of the Jones House and occupancy would be the responsibility of the Diocese of San Diego and is not included within the proposed project. No occupancy of the house would occur under the proposed project.

The project applicant (Scripps Health) would be responsible for the relocation and exterior rehabilitation of the Jones House, in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The relocation and exterior rehabilitation includes the following:

1. The house can be moved in one piece, so no cutting or dismantling above the foundation walls would occur.
2. Exterior door and window openings would not need to be braced. Only the area around the fireplace is expected to require supplemental bracing.
3. Some items would need to be dismantled prior to the relocation. These include the CMU foundation walls, both brick chimneys, parts of the fireplace, and the front steps and wing walls.

4. Reconstruction of the CMU foundation walls would incorporate new blocks with a matching faux-stone finish. □
5. The front porch enclosure would be removed and the original open front porch would be restored.
6. The original south chimney would be transported to the new site. Reconstruction would incorporate salvaged or new matching bricks. The non-historic north chimney would not be reconstructed as it is not an original feature. □
7. The front steps and wing walls would be transported to the new site for later restoration and reconstruction. □
8. No new openings in the walls or roof are anticipated. □
9. Steel beams would be used under the house to raise and support the structure during relocation. □The final number and configuration of beams would depend on the existing floor joists and if □they are full length or spliced. □
10. The moving company expects to use three rolling dollies. Once the house has been raised and can be weighed, the exact number of dollies would be determined. A truck would then transport the house. □
11. The proposed route of the move is: from 4040 Fifth Avenue, south on Fourth Avenue (at the rear □of the house), west on Washington Street, north on Goldfinch Street, west on Fort Stockton Drive, north on Hawk Street, west on West Lewis Street, north on Ibis Street to the destination at 4114 Ibis Street. □
12. The route would require utility accommodations of overhead lines by AT&T, Cox, and SDG&E on Ibis Street. It is expected that several signal lights along Washington Street would need to be turned to accommodate the move. □

The Diocese of San Diego would be responsible for future interior improvements. The scope of the interior rehabilitation is not known at this time and is not a part of the proposed project. If feasible, depending on the eventual interior layout, representative examples of character-defining interior features would be preserved and re-used in the rehabilitated building, such as paneled doors, decorative woodwork, and built-in cabinetry. The interior is not included in the historic designation for the house. Project grading includes 85 cubic yards of export at a maximum depth of five feet.

Discretionary actions associated with the project include a Site Development Permit (SDP) in accordance with Process Four (Planning Commission decision, appealable to City Council) for a deviation from the development regulations for historical resources in accordance with Section 143.0210(e)(2)(C) and Table 143-02A of the City of San Diego Municipal Code to relocate a designated historical resource, as described in Section 143.0260. The project also requires a recommendation from the Uptown Community Planning Group and a recommendation of the Historical Resources Board in accordance with Municipal Code Section 126.0503(d)(2).

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

The donor site (4040 Fifth Avenue) is located west and south of Fifth Avenue, east of Fourth Avenue, and north of Washington Street. Various medical buildings of the Scripps Mercy Hospital campus surround the Jones House on all sides. The receiving site (4114 Ibis Street) is located west of Ibis Street, east of Jackdaw Street, North of West Lewis Street, and south of West Montecito Way. Single-family homes surround the receiving site on all sides.

Regional access to the donor site is provided via State Route 163 (SR-163) located approximately one-third mile east of the donor site. Regional access to the receiving site is provided via Interstate 5 (I-5), located less than one mile west of the receiving site, and SR-163, located approximately one mile from the receiving site.

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

NONE.

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

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

In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City of San Diego initiated AB 52 notification to Jamul Indian Village, and the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel via certified letter and email on July 6, 2017. On July 6, 2017, the Lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel responded via email correspondence that a consultation would not be required. The Jamul Indian Village representative concurred via email. The Environmental Analysis Section did not receive any additional request for formal consultation on this project, therefore, the AB 52 process was concluded and closed.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> | Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> | Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> | Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> | Transportation/Traffic |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> | Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Geology/Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> | Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> | Utilities/Service System |
| | | | | <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) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses”, as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or (mitigated) negative declaration. *Section 15063(c)(3)(D)*. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures Incorporated”, describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I) AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No impact. The proposed project includes the site where the Jones House is currently located (4040 Fifth Avenue – the donor site) and the site to where the house would be relocated (4114 Ibis Street – the receiving site). The donor and receiving sites are located within the Uptown community, and view areas for the Uptown community are identified in the Uptown Community Plan Update (2016). There are no public viewsheds or public view corridors identified on or near the project sites. Both project sites are located in the middle of their respective neighborhoods and are not along roadways that may function as view corridors. Public views, scenic corridors, and/or scenic vistas do not exist on either of the project sites or in the immediate project areas. No impact to a scenic vista would result.

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. Both the donor and receiving sites have been graded and previously disturbed. The donor site is currently developed with the Jones House and the receiving site is a graded, vacant lot. Due to the previous development on both sites, there are no scenic resources in the form of trees or rock outcroppings located on the sites. In addition, there are no scenic resources adjacent to the sites. No impacts to scenic resources would result.

The Jones House is a historic building located on the donor site. As discussed in V.a., below, incorporation of the Treatment Plan, Monitoring Plan, and mitigation measures for the relocation of the Jones House would mitigate impacts to this historic resource to below a level of significance. The receiving site is vacant and, therefore, houses no historic structures. Impacts to historic buildings would be less than significant with mitigation.

The donor site is near a State Scenic Highway, SR-163, located approximately one-third mile to the southeast of the donor site. SR-163 is not visible from the donor site; the donor site is not visible from SR-163, due to physical distance, topographical differences between the donor site and SR-163, and dense vegetation along SR-163. Although the donor site is in proximity to a State Scenic Highway, relocation of the Jones House would not substantially damage scenic resources along a State Scenic Highway or local roadway. The receiving site is not located in proximity to a State Scenic Highway. No impacts would result.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact. The donor site is the location of the Jones House, which is dilapidated and in need of rehabilitation. The doors and windows are boarded to deter vandalism and vagrancy, and there is a chain link fence surrounding the site. Relocation of the building would result in a vacant lot. To the immediate north and south of the donor site are surface parking lots to serve the surrounding medical campus. The vacant lot would be visually compatible with the surface parking lots, as both the vacant lot and surrounding surface parking are flat, graded areas with no visual character. No impact would result.

The receiving site is currently a graded, vacant lot, surrounded by single-family homes of varying ages. The relocated and rehabilitated Jones House would blend with the surroundings, as it is a single family of similar stature to the neighborhood. Due to the varying ages of buildings in the project vicinity, including some houses approximately the same age as the Jones House, the Jones House would be in keeping with the surrounding visual character. The proposed exterior rehabilitation of the Jones House would also be compatible with the existing quality of the receiving site surroundings. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. The donor site currently does not have sources of light, as the Jones House is vacant and does not currently have electrical service. The site also does not have sources of glare, as all windows have been boarded up. Relocation of the Jones House to the receiving site would not create new sources of light or glare, as the donor site would be left as a vacant parcel. No impacts relative to light and glare would result.

The receiving site is a graded, vacant lots located within a residential and commercial neighborhood. The site is immediately surrounded by one- and two-story single-family homes, with a mix of uses, included commercial retail, commercial office, and institutional/civic (church, school, etc.), in the adjacent areas. Although the relocation of the Jones House would introduce new glass surfaces in the form of the rehabilitated windows, this would not create a new sources of substantial glare, because the scale of the house is in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood and the ability to reflect light off the rehabilitated windows would be inhibited by surrounding buildings and existing landscaping. As such, no new sources of light would be introduced. No impacts relative to light and glare would result.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project:				
a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact. Both the donor site and the receiving site are located in a fully developed urban environment and are surrounded by existing buildings and streets. Neither the donor site nor the receiving site contains prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of Statewide Importance as designated by the California Department of Conservation. Agricultural land is not present on the sites or in the general vicinity. No impact would result.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Refer to II.a., above. There are no Williamson Act Contract Lands on or within the vicinity of the sites. Furthermore, the project would not affect any properties zoned for agricultural use or affected by a Williamson Act Contract, as there are none within the project vicinity. Agricultural land is not present on the sites or in the general vicinity of the site; therefore, no conflict with the Williamson Act Contract would result. No impact would result.

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

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

No Impact. The project would not conflict with existing zoning for or cause a rezoning of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production. No designated forest land or timberland occur on the donor or receiving sites. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Refer to II.c., above. Furthermore, the project would not contribute to the conversion of any forested land to non-forest use, as surrounding land uses are built out. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Refer to II.a. through d., above. No impact would result.

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

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

No Impact. The donor and receiving sites are located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Both the State of California and the Federal government have established health-based Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for the following six criteria pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO); ozone (O3); nitrogen oxides (NOx); sulfur oxides (SOx); particulate matter up to 10 microns in diameter (PM10); and lead (Pb). O₃ (smog) is formed by a photochemical reaction between NOx and reactive organic compounds (ROCs). Thus, impacts from O₃ are assessed by evaluating impacts from NOx and ROCs. A new increase in pollutant emissions determines the impact on regional air quality as a result of a proposed project. The results also allow the local government to determine whether a proposed project would deter the region from achieving the goal of reducing pollutants in accordance with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) in order to comply with Federal and State AAQS.

The SDAPCD and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality

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

standards in the SDAB. The County Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) was initially adopted in 1991, and is updated on a triennial basis (most recently in 2009). The RAQS outlines the SDAPCD’s plans and control measures designed to attain the state air quality standards for ozone (O₃). The RAQS relies on information from the CARB and SANDAG, including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in San Diego County and the cities in the county, to project future emissions and then determine the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by San Diego County and the cities in the county as part of the development of their general plans.

The RAQS relies on SANDAG growth projections based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by the cities and by the county as part of the development of their general plans. As such, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by local plans would be consistent with the RAQS. However, if a project proposes development that is greater than that anticipated in the local plan and SANDAG’s growth projections, the project might be in conflict with the RAQS and may contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on air quality.

The proposed project would not create a substantial increase in air pollutants. The proposed project would relocate an existing single-family home one mile west of its current location and provide exterior rehabilitation of the structure. The project is consistent with the General Plan, Community Plan, and the underlying zone. Therefore, the project would be consistent at a sub-regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS and would not obstruct implementation of the RAQS. No impact would result.

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

Less Than Significant Impact.

Short-Term (Construction) Emissions

Project construction activities (including preparing the Jones House for relocation, preparing the receiving site for the Jones House, moving the Jones House, and settling the Jones House on the receiving site) could potentially generate combustion emissions from on-site heavy-duty construction vehicles and motor vehicles transporting the construction crew, necessary construction materials, and the Jones House itself. Exhaust emissions generated by construction activities would generally result from the use of typical construction equipment that may include excavation equipment, forklift, skip loader, and/or dump truck. Variables that factor into the total construction emissions potentially generated include the level of activity, length of construction period, number

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

of pieces and types of equipment in use, site characteristics, weather conditions, number of construction personnel, and the amount of materials to be transported on- or off-site. It is anticipated that construction equipment would be used on-site for four to eight hours per day; however, construction would be short-term (approximately five months from initiation of relocation efforts until the Jones House is fully relocated, settled, and restored) and impacts to neighboring uses would be minimal and temporary.

Excavation, grading, and relocation activities can cause fugitive dust emissions. Construction of the project would be subject to standard measures required by a City of San Diego grading permit to reduce potential air quality impacts to less than significant. These measures include, but are not limited to, compliance with SDMC 142.0710, which prohibits airborne contaminants from emanating beyond the boundaries of the premises upon which the use emitting the contaminants is located. Some example measures are watering three times daily, reducing vehicle speeds to 15 miles per hour on unpaved or use architectural coatings that comply with San Diego Air Pollution Control District Rule 67.0 [i.e., architectural coatings that meet a volatile organic compounds (VOC) content of 100 grams per liter (g/l) for interior painting and 150 g/l for exterior painting] would be used during construction. Therefore, impacts associated with fugitive dust are considered less than significant, and would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. No mitigation measures are required.

Long-Term (Operational) Emissions

There would be no operational emissions associated with the proposed project. Future use of the rehabilitated Jones House as a residence by the Diocese of San Diego would generate minimal additional auto trips. The project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. No operational impacts would result.

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

No Impact. The SDAB is considered a non-attainment under Federal standards for O₃ (8-hour standard). As described above in response III(b), construction operations temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants. However, construction emissions would be temporary and short-term in duration. Implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to a less than significant level. Construction of the

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>mixed-use development in the region would not create considerable ozone or PM₁₀ from construction and operation. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standards. No impact would result.</p>				
<p>d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Less Than Significant Impact.

Short-Term (Construction) Odors

Project construction could result in minor amounts of odor compounds associated with diesel heavy equipment exhaust during construction. These compounds would be emitted in various amounts and at various locations during construction. Sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the receiving site include the residences surrounding the project site. However, construction activities would be temporary, and the main use of heavy equipment would be during the first stages of site preparation and relocation. After construction is complete, there would be no objectionable odors associated with the project. Thus, the potential for odor impacts associated with the project is less than significant.

Long-Term (Operational) Odors

The project includes no operational emission sources, as the project would leave the rehabilitated house vacant and mothballed on the receiving site. As such, the project would not create any sources of long-term odor. No impacts would result relative to operational odors.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

No Impact. The donor and receiving sites are fully developed within an urbanized area. No native habitat is located on or adjacent to either site. As such, the proposed project would not directly or through habitat modification effect any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by CDFW or USFW. Additionally, the

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

project sites are located outside the City's Multi-Habitat Preservation Area (MHPA). No impacts 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Refer to IV.a., above. The project would not directly or indirectly impact any riparian habitat or other plant community.

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

No Impact. The project sites are fully developed and do not contain any Federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Also, refer to IV.a., above. Therefore, no impacts would result.

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

No Impact. No formal and/or informal wildlife corridors are located on or near the project sites, as the sites are located within a fully urbanized area. Also, refer to IV.a., above. No impacts would result.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances	<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
protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				

No Impact. Refer to IV.a., above. The project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Refer to IV.e., above. The proposed project is not located within a Multiple Species Conservation (MSCP) Program area. The project would not conflict with the provisions of the MSCP. No impact would result.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises. Before approving discretionary projects, CEQA requires the Lead Agency to identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (Sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (Sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

A Secretary of Interior-qualified professional (in history or architectural history) (36 CFR Part 61) performed the photo-recordation and documentation consistent with the standards of the National Park Service (NPS) Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) documentation. HABS documentation is described by the NPS as “the last means of preservation of a property; when a property is to be demolished, its documentation provides future researcher access to valuable information that otherwise would be lost.” The HABS record for the Henry B. Jones House consists of measured drawings, digital photographs, and written data that provide a detailed record that reflects the

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

Henry B. Jones House’s historical significance. The HABS documentation materials have been placed on file with the City of San Diego, San Diego History Center, and the San Diego Central Library.

Archaeological Resources

Less Than Significant Impact. The project area is characterized a shaving high sensitivity for archaeological resources. However, due to the disturbed nature of the project sites and the minimal grading required for the project, it is unlikely that archaeological resources would be encountered. The donor site has been previously disturbed and is currently developed with the Jones House. The receiving site has been previously disturbed and is currently a graded vacant lot. There would be no grading the donor site, and grading on the receiving site would be minimal (85 cubic yards of export) and shallow (grading depth not to exceed five feet). Based upon these factors, impacts to Historical Resources in the form of archeological resources are not anticipated. Impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

Built Environment

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project involves the relocation of the Jones House, which is a city-designated historic resource (HRB#939) located at 4040 Fifth Avenue in San Diego. The house has been vacant for numerous years. The building has been donated to St. Vincent Catholic Church and would be moved to a vacant lot owned by the Catholic Diocese at 4114 Ibis Street, approximately one mile west of its present location. Once relocated, the building would undergo an exterior restoration per *The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* and would be mothballed pending interior improvements in accordance with the National Park Service Preservation Briefs 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings.

A Historical Resources Technical Report (HRTR) was prepared by Heritage Architecture & Planning (2017) to evaluate the potential eligibility of resources located within the project study area for listing in the Federal and State registers of historic resources. The HRTR is included in Appendix A. In addition, the HRTR addresses proposed project effects on identified historic resources in accordance with local, State, and Federal regulatory requirements.

Federal, State, and local historic preservation programs provide specific criteria for evaluating the potential historic significance of a resource. Although the criteria used by the different programs (as relevant here, the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources, and the City of San Diego Register of Historical Resources) vary in their specifics, they focus on many of the same general themes. In general, a resource need only meet one criterion in order to be considered historically significant. Another area of similarity is the concept of integrity — generally defined as the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the resource’s period of significance. Federal, State, and local historic preservation programs require that resources maintain sufficient integrity in order to be identified as eligible for listing as historic.

The Jones House does not qualify under any of the National and California Register criterion. Completed in 1911, the Jones House is locally designated under HRB Criterion C on the City of San Diego Register of Historical Resources as HRB #939. It achieved its significance for its architecture as a good example of a Craftsman (Arts and Crafts) two-story residence. The building maintains its architectural details, is well maintained, and has not undergone any major changes to its historical fabric. Its period of significance is 1911, encompassing the original construction.

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

In addition to meeting one of the local, State, or Federal criteria, a property must also retain a significant amount of its historic integrity to be considered eligible for listing. Historic integrity is made up of seven aspects: location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The following is an integrity analysis of the Jones House.

The Jones House was constructed in 1911, in the growing Hillcrest area of San Diego. The building was designed and constructed specifically for use as two-story, single family residence. The building has not been moved since its construction and therefore, it has retained its integrity of location. The setting of the Jones House has significantly changed from primarily residential along Hillcrest Drive (now Fifth Avenue), to commercial and medical complexes. The change initiated with the realignment of the original Hillcrest Drive (now Fifth Avenue), and the construction of the 11-story hospital directly across the street in 1966. Accordingly, the setting has substantially changed so that the property at 4040 Fifth Avenue no longer retains its setting element for integrity purposes.

There have been no major alterations or changes to the resource that have impacted or diminished the building's form, plan, space, structure, or style. While there have been some changes to the building outside of its period of significance, these changes would be considered small or negligible when considering the property as a whole and the extant character-defining features, which reflect its form, plan, space, structure, and style. The building is representative of its Craftsman architectural style and has retained a combination of its elements to convey its design and retain its design integrity.

The workmanship evident in the Jones House is represented in its standard construction details and in its highly stylized Craftsman design. The workmanship, particularly in the ornamentation of the 1911 building, exemplifies the popular style from the period. The Jones House has had some alteration since its construction in 1911, including the enclosure of the front porch in 1945. However, the Jones House retains the majority of its original and historic-period materials at the exterior. Because the building is reasonably intact in its location, design, workmanship, and materials, it retains the feeling of a period of time, that is, as a Craftsman style two-story residence. Additionally, although the building is unoccupied, the Jones House continues to retain its association with the residential development of the community of Hillcrest.

City of San Diego Significance Determination Thresholds identifies various activities what would cause damage or have an adverse effect on a historic resource, including:

- Relocation from Original Site: The proposed project includes the relocation of the Jones House to an off-site location approximately one mile west of its current setting.
- Alteration or Repair of a Historic Structure: An exterior repair and restoration of the Jones House following its relocation would be completed in accordance with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*.

Relocation and alteration (rehabilitation) of the Jones House results in a significant impact to the historic resources, as relocation is considered to be not consistent with *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Mitigation measures in the form of the Treatment Plan, the Monitoring Plan, and the HABS documentation for the proposed project would be required. Additionally, the Jones House

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

would then be mothballed following the National Park Service Preservation Briefs 31: Mothballing Historic Buildings. Incorporation of these mitigation measures and procedures would mitigate impacts to a historic resource to below a level of significance.

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

No Impact. Refer to V(a).

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

No Impact. According to Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California (1975), the project sites are underlain by Lindavista formation and Mission Valley formation. According to the Significance Determination Thresholds (2016) of the City of San Diego, Lindavista formation has a moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources within the Uptown community; Mission Valley formation has a high sensitivity. Projects in moderate sensitivity formations that excavate more than 2,000 cubic yards to a depth of ten feet or more require paleontological monitoring during construction to mitigate for potential effects on paleontological resources; project in high sensitivity formations that excavate 1,000 cubic yards to a depth of ten feet or more require paleontological monitoring during construction to mitigate for potential effects on paleontological resources. The project proposes 85 cubic yards of export at a maximum depth of five feet. The project does not meet the impact threshold. No impacts would result.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to V.A. above, additionally no formal cemeteries or human remains are known to exist on-site or in the vicinity. Furthermore, should human remains be discovered during ground-disturbing activities associated with preparation of the receiving site, work would be required to halt in that area and no soil would be exported off-site until a determination could be made regarding the provenance of the human remains via the County Coroner and Native American representative, as required. The project would be required to treat human remains uncovered during construction in accordance with the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the | <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
<p>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.</p>				

Less Than Significant Impact. During the late Pliocene, several new faults developed in Southern California, creating a new tectonic regime superposed on the flat-lying section of Tertiary and late Cretaceous rocks in the San Diego region. One of these fault systems is the Rose Canyon Fault Zone, which is considered the most significant fault within the San Diego Metropolitan area. The principal known onshore faults in southernmost California are the San Andreas, San Jacinto, Elsinore, Imperial, and Rose Canyon faults, which collectively transfer the majority of this deformation. The balance of the plate margin slip is taken by the offshore zone of faults which include the Coronado Bank, Descanso, San Diego Trough, and San Clemente faults, which lie off the San Diego and northern Baja California coastline. Most of the offshore faults coalesce south of the international border, where they come onshore as the Agua Blanca fault which transects the Baja, California peninsula.

The Rose Canyon Fault was first recognized by Fairbanks in 1893. He described the feature as an area of uplifting or folding from La Jolla Bay to the Soledad Hills. Since that time, numerous others have mapped the Rose Canyon Fault and have attributed the formation of several physiographic features such as, Mount Soledad, Mission Bay, and San Diego Bay to the activity along the fault. The Rose Canyon Fault Zone (RCFZ) consists of predominantly right-lateral strike-slip faults that extend southwest to southeast through the San Diego metropolitan area. Movement along the fault zone is generally complex and consists of various combinations of oblique, normal and strike-slip motion. The fault zone extends offshore at La Jolla and continues north-northwest subparallel to the coastline. To the south in the San Diego downtown area the fault zone appears to splay out into a group of generally right-normal oblique faults extending into San Diego Bay.

There are no known active faults have been mapped at or near the project sites. The nearest known active surface fault is the San Diego section of the Newport-Inglewood-Rose Canyon fault zone, which roughly follows I-5 freeway, approximately one mile west of the receiving site. The site is not located within a State of California Earthquake Fault Zone (EFZ). Additionally, both the donor and receiving site are located in Geologic Hazard Category 52: Other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, Low risk. Therefore, the risk of fault rupture is considered low. Impacts would be less than significant.

- ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less Than Significant Impact. The donor and receiving sites are considered to lie within a seismically active region, as can all of Southern California. Specifically, the Rose Canyon fault zone

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

located approximately one mile west of the receiving site is the “active” fault considered having the most significant effect at the project sites from a design standpoint. The effect of seismic shaking would be diminished by adhering to the California Historical Building Code. Because the project is required to follow the California Historical Building Code, impacts relative to seismic ground shaking are considered less than significant.

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

No Impact. Liquefaction and dynamic settlement of soils can be caused by strong vibratory motion due to earthquakes. Liquefaction is typified by a loss of shear strength in the affected soil layer, thereby causing the soil to behave as a viscous liquid. Due to underlying geologic formation and geologic hazard category, the project site is not at risk seismic-related ground failing, including liquefaction. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Evidence of landsliding was not observed on the project sites. Further, given the topography of the donor and receiving sites, the likelihood for seismically induced landsliding is considered to be remote. No impact would result.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Construction of the project would temporarily disturb receiving site soils during grading activities, thereby increasing the potential for soil erosion to occur. Additionally, donor site soils may be exposed following removal of the Jones House. The use of standard erosion control measures and implementation of storm water best management practices requirements, however, during construction would preclude impacts. 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"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Less Than Significant Impact. Please see VI.a.iv and VI.a.iii. The project site is located within geologic hazards zone 52 as shown on the City's Seismic Safety Study Zone 52 is characterized by other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain with favorable geologic structure, low risk. Additionally, the project would be constructed consistent with proper engineering design, in

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

accordance with the California Building Code. Utilization of appropriate engineering design measures and standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that potential impacts from geologic hazards 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to VI.c. The project would be constructed consistent with proper engineering design, in accordance with the California Building Code. Utilization of appropriate engineering design measures and standard construction practices, to be verified at the building permit stage, would ensure that potential impacts from geologic hazards would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The project receiving site would be served by a public sewer system. No impact would occur.

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

No Impact. In December 2015, the City of San Diego adopted its Climate Action Plan (CAP). The CAP establishes a baseline for 2010, sets goals for GHG reductions for the milestone years 2020 and 2035, and details the implementation actions and phasing for achieving the goals. To implement the state’s goals of reducing emissions to 15 percent below 2010 levels by 2020, and 49 percent below 2010 levels by 2035, the City will be required to implement strategies that would reduce emissions to approximately 10.6 MMT CO₂e by 2020 and to 6.4 MMT CO₂e by 2035. The CAP determined that, with implementation of the measures identified therein, the City would exceed the state’s targets for 2020 and 2035. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)(3), 15130(d), and 15183(b), a project’s incremental contribution to a cumulative GHG emissions effect may be determined not to be cumulatively considerable if it complies with the requirements of the CAP. The City has adopted

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

a CAP Consistency Checklist (Updated June 2017). Compliance with the CAP Consistency Checklist demonstrates that a project would not generate greenhouse gas emission that may have a significant impact on the environment.

A CAP Consistency Checklist was prepared for the proposed project. The CAP Consistency Checklist is included in Appendix B. Through the CAP Consistency Checklist, project compliance with the CAP was demonstrated. Additionally, the project represents no new greenhouse gas emissions, beyond temporary construction vehicles, as the relocation and rehabilitation of the Jones House would not intensify allowable use from what exists currently. No impacts relative to the generation of greenhouse gas emissions would result.

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

No Impact. Refer to VII.a., above. The project as proposed is consistent with the CAP and would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. No impacts would result.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

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

No Impact. The proposed project would relocate and rehabilitate an existing historic house. During project relocation and rehabilitation, small amounts of solvents and petroleum products could be utilized; and although minimal amounts of such substances may be present during construction, they are not anticipated to result in a significant hazard to the public. There would be no operation phase of the project, as the project does not propose occupancy. Therefore, there would be no routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor would there be ongoing maintenance as part of the proposed project. Any hazardous materials or waste generated during the relocation and rehabilitation of the Jones House would be managed and used in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws and regulations; the project would not be a significant hazard to the public or environment. No impacts would result.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident	<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
conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				

No Impact. The proposed project would relocate and rehabilitate a historic house. As such, the project would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, which may result in a foreseeable upset or accident involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. The project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances, or waste. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Neither the donor nor receiving site has not been identified as a hazardous materials site pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment relative to known hazardous materials sites No impacts would occur.

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

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

No Impact. The basic function of ALUCPs (or Compatibility Plans) 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. With limited exception, California law requires preparation of a compatibility plan for each public-use and military airport in the state. Most counties have established an airport land use commission (ALUC), as provided for by law, to prepare compatibility plans for the airports in that county and to review land use plans and development proposals, as well as certain airport development plans, for consistency with the compatibility plans. In San Diego County, the ALUC function rests with the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA), as provided in Section 21670.3 of the California Public Utilities Code.

The donor site is within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2 and FAA Part 77 Noticing Area for San Diego International Airport (SDIA). The receiving site is within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) Review Area 2 and FAA Part 77 Noticing Area for SDIA, as well as AIA Review Area 2 for Naval Air Station (NAS) North Island. Although the project sites are located within airport land use plan areas, the project would not result in a safety hazard residing in the project areas. Review Area 2 is defined by the combination of the airspace protection and overflight boundaries beyond Review Area 1. Only airspace protection and overflight policies and standards apply within Review Area 2. Because the project involves relocation of a two-story house, the building height would not impede airspace protection or violate overflight policies. No impacts would result.

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

No Impact. The project sites are not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. The project proposes relocation and rehabilitation of an existing historic house. Relocation would be within the urbanized Uptown community. No change to the existing circulation network would occur. The proposed project would not impair or physically interfere with the implementation of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project would not significantly interfere with circulation or access. No impact to an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan would result.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact. Both the project donor and receiving sites are located within urbanized developed areas and do not interfere with any wildland spaces. No impact would result.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Form DS-560, Storm Water Requirements Applicability Checklist, was completed for the proposed project, and it was determined that a Water Pollution Control Plan was to be completed for the project. Nasland Engineering prepared a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) (May 31, 2017) for the proposed project, which is included as Appendix D.

Potential impacts to existing water quality standards associated with the proposed project would include minimal short-term construction-related erosion/sedimentation. Conformance to best management practices (BMPs) outlined in the WPCP and conformance with the City's Storm Water Standards would prevent and effectively minimize water quality impacts. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any existing water quality standards or discharge requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

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

No Impact. The project does not require the construction of wells or the use of groundwater. No groundwater would be utilized at either the donor site or the receiving site. Water permeation would continue to occur through both sites through landscaping and other surfaces not covered in structures or pavement. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. There are no streams or rivers within the project boundary. Run-off patterns of the donor site would not be affected, as no groundwork is proposed, besides that required to remove the Jones House. Additionally, per the project's WPCP, the project would not alter the existing run-off patterns of the receiving site. Therefore, the project would not substantially alter any existing drainage patterns. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Run-off patterns of the donor site would not be affected, as no groundwork is proposed, besides that required to remove the Jones House. Per the project's WPCP, the existing receiving site terrain slopes gradually from west to east and sheet flows into the existing curb and gutter system on Ibis Street, which slopes from north to south. Runoff then flows south down the curb and gutter system to a curb inlet on West Lewis Street. Grading activities would not alter from the existing runoff patterns. Utility trenched would be replaces in kind with the same materials as existing in asphalt concrete paving, PCC paving, and landscape areas. As such, no impact to the amount of runoff would result.

e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or	<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
planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				

No Impact. Refer to IX.a. through IX.d., above. The project would not exceed the capacity of the existing or planned storm water drainage system. No impact would result.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to IX.a., above. The project would implement construction BMPs in the form of pollution prevention BMPs and post construction BMPs, as outlined in the WPCP and as required by the City's Storm Water Standards. Adherence to the standards would preclude a cumulatively considerable contribution to water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. According to a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance rate map (FEMA, 2012), the donor and receiving sites are not located within a floodplain or floodway. Based on a review of topographic maps, the sites are not located downstream of a dam or within a dam inundation area. The potential for flooding at the donor and receiving sites is not expected. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Refer to IX.a., above. No impact would result.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

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

No Impact. The project would utilize existing right-of-way and roadways. The project would not physically divide the community. No impact would result.

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

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

No Impact. The Uptown Community Plan identifies the donor site for Institutional uses and the receiving site as Residential-Low: 5-9 DU/AC. Relocating the Jones House from the donor site to the receiving site is entirely consistent with the Community Plan. The General Plan identifies both sites as Multiple Use, and the relocation of a single-family home is consistent with that designation, as residential is one of the many uses accommodated under the Multiple Use designation. No impacts would result.

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

No Impact. Refer to IV.f., above.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project?

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

No Impact. There are no known mineral resources located on either of the project sites. The urbanized and developed nature of the sites and vicinity would preclude the extraction of any such resources. The project sites are not currently being utilized for mineral extraction and do not contain any known mineral resources that would be of value to the area. No impact would result.

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

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

No Impact. Refer to XI.a., above. The project area has not been delineated on a local General Plan, specific plan, or other land use plan as a locally important mineral resource recovery site, and no such resources would be affected with project implementation. No impact would result.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Noise associated with the relocation and rehabilitation of the Jones House would be short-term and related to the physical preparation and relocation of the Jones House. Preparation of the Jones House includes the placement of steel beams under the Jones House, jacking the house up, and the removal of certain features, such as the brick chimneys and porch steps. The Jones House would then be transported via truck to the receiving site, one mile west of the present location. The physical relocation include the necessity to coordinate tree trimming as necessary; San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E, AT&T, and Cox temporary relocation of power and communication lines; and a CHP escort, if needed. Once at the donor site, the Jones House would remain elevated five feet to allow for the final foundation to be constructed to match the house. Preparation and relocation of the Jones House would create temporary noise that would cease once the house was placed. Additionally, construction would be prohibited between the hours of 7 p.m. and 7 a.m., Sundays, and legal holidays, per the City of San Diego Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the Municipal Code, Section 59.5.0404 (Ordinance). Noise control measures would include maintaining construction equipment in proper working condition, and placing staging equipment away from sensitive noise receptors. The project would comply with the City Noise Ordinance, and construction noise impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. The proposed project includes the relocation of the Jones House from 4040 Fifth Avenue to 4114 Ibis Street, approximately one mile west of the present location. Work effort the project includes preparation of the Jones House for relocation, preparation of the receiving site, the physical relocation of the Jones House, and placement on the receiving site. These activities would not result in the generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels, as the project does not include the typical activities that would create ground borne vibration and noise, such as pile driving or operating heavy earth-moving equipment. Additionally, construction would be prohibited between the hours of 7 p.m. and 7 a.m., Sundays, and legal holidays, per the City of San Diego Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the Municipal Code, Section 59.5.0404 (Ordinance). Noise control measures would include maintaining construction equipment in proper working condition, and placing

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

staging equipment away from sensitive noise receptors. The project would comply with the City Noise Ordinance, and construction noise impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. Substantial increases in ambient noise levels would not result from the project. Project noise would be short-term, related to the relocation and rehabilitation of the Jones House. Following relocation and rehabilitation, all noise levels would be those associated with urban environments and would not create substantial permanent increased in ambient noise levels above what currently occurs in the vicinity of the donor and receiving sites. Impacts relative to ambient noise would not result.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to XII.a.

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

No Impact. The project sites are located within the Airport Influence Area and the FAA Part 77 Noticing Area for SDIA, as well as the FAA Part 77 Noticing Area for NAS North Island (receiving site only). The project sites are located outside all airport noise contours included on the policy map for noise. As such, the project sites would not be exposed to excessive aircraft noise. No impact would result.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project	<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
area to excessive noise levels?				

No Impact. The project sites are not located within vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact would result.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

No Impact. The project proposes to relocate and rehabilitate an existing historic house. The Jones House would be relocated from one Uptown neighborhood (Medical Complex) to another (Mission Hills), resulting in no net increase or decrease in housing within the community. The relocation and rehabilitation of the Jones House would result in the increase of a single residential unit within the Mission Hills community on a site identified for such use. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Both the donor and receiving sites would continue to be served by existing roads and infrastructure and the project does not propose the expansion of roads or infrastructure. Indirect growth would not occur. The Jones House is currently vacant and has been for approximately ten years; no active housing on the donor site would be displaced with the relocation of the Jones House. There is no existing housing within the receiving site. No housing would be displaced by relocation of the Jones House to the receiving site. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. Refer to XIII.a., above. No impact would result.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

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

i) Fire Protection

No Impact. The project sites are located in urbanized areas where fire protection services are already provided. With the relocation of a single home within one area of the Uptown Community to another, the project would not adversely affect existing levels of fire protection services to the area, and would not require the construction of new or expanded governmental facilities. No impacts to fire protection would result.

ii) Police Protection

No Impact. The project sites are located in an urbanized area where police protection services are already provided. With the relocation of a single home within one area of the Uptown Community to another, the project would not adversely affect existing levels of police protection services to the area, and would not require the construction of new or expanded governmental facilities. No impacts to police protection would result.

iii) Schools

No Impact. The project sites are located in urbanized areas where schools are already provided. With the relocation of a single home within one area of the Uptown Community to another, the project would not adversely affect existing levels of school services to the area, and would not require the construction of new or expanded school facilities. No impacts to schools would result.

v) Parks

No Impact. The project sites are located in urbanized areas where parks are already provided. With the relocation of a single home within one area of the Uptown Community to another, the project would not adversely affect existing levels of park services to the area, and would not require the construction of new or expanded park facilities. No impacts to parks would result.

vi) Other public facilities

No Impact. The project sites are located in an urbanized area where other public facilities are already provided. With the relocation of a single home within one area of the Uptown Community to another, the project would not adversely affect existing levels of public services to the area, and would not require the construction of new or expanded public facilities. No impacts to public facilities would result.

XV. RECREATION

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No Impact. The project would not increase the use of existing parks or recreational facilities, as the project would generate no new population. Impacts to existing neighborhood and regional parks would not result.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, as the project would generate no new population. Impacts to recreational facilities would not result.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. The project is consistent with the Uptown Community Plan land use designation and underlying zone. The project would not change existing circulation patterns on area roadways. The project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of

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

effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. The project is not expected to cause a significant short-term or long-term increase in traffic volumes, and therefore, would not adversely affect existing levels of service along area roadways. Therefore, no impact would result.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Refer to response XVI.a. A single-family dwelling generates nine average weekday trips, with one trip during the morning (AM) peak hour and one trip during the afternoon (PM) peak hour. The Jones House would generate the same number of trips at the donor site as it would at the receiving site. As such, the project would not generate substantial new vehicular trips nor would it adversely affect any mode of transportation in the area. Therefore, the project would not result in conflict with any applicable congestion management program, level of service standards, or travel demand measures. No impacts would result.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Implementation of the project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, as the project is not located within the immediate vicinity of an airport or airstrip and would not be constructed at a height that would impair air travel. No impact would result.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No Impact. Removal of the Jones House from the donor site would not result in increased hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. On the receiving site, no increased hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use would occur. Relocation of the Jones House would require travel of approximately one mile on public streets through established neighborhoods. All City regulations

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

pertaining to relocation and moving of structures would be adhered to. Placement of the Jones House on the receiving site would be consistent with all applicable setback and siting requirements and would not result in design features that could create hazards. The project would not include any elements that could create a hazard to the public. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. The project would relocate the Jones House to a vacant lot and would rehabilitate the house on-site. No alteration to emergency access would occur. No impacts would result.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No Impact. The project would relocate the Jones House to a vacant lot and would rehabilitate the house on-site. No alteration to public transit programs or bicycle or pedestrian facilities would occur. No impacts would result.

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

No Impact. The project proposes the relocation and rehabilitation of the Jones House, which has been determined to be historic, within a built-out neighborhood of the City of San Diego. There are no tribal cultural structures on either the donor or receiving sites, and no impacts to tribal historic resources would occur. No tribal cultural resources are located on the project site that meet the criteria for listing on the local, State, or Federal registers as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k). No impact would result. See also XVII (b).

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

No Impact. In accordance with the requirements of Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City of San Diego initiated AB 52 notification to Jamul Indian Village, and the lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel via certified letter and email on July 6, 2017. On July 6, 2017, the lipay Nation of Santa Ysabel responded via email correspondence that a consultation would not be required. The Jamul Indian Village representative concurred via email. The Environmental Analysis Section did not receive any additional request for formal consultation on this project, therefore, the AB 52 process was concluded and closed. No impacts would result.

XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

No Impact. The project sites are located in urbanized and developed areas within the Uptown Community. The proposed project is consistent with the Uptown Community Plan, and adequate municipal sewer services are available to serve the project. Wastewater would not be treated on-site. No impact to wastewater treatment would result.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. As part of the relocation of the Jones House, new domestic water piping and meter would be installed and connected to the existing eight-inch water main line that runs north and south on Ibis Street. Additionally, new sewer lateral piping would be installed and connected to the existing eight-inch sewer line that is in the alley west of the receiving site. Site work for these utilities would include utilities and erosion control measures. These features of the project relocation would result in less than significant impacts to water and wastewater.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Require or result in the construction of new | <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
storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				

No Impact. Refer to IX.e., above. The project would not exceed the capacity of the City's existing storm water drainage system and would not require the expansion of the system. No new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required. No impacts would result.

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

No Impact. The project proposes relocation of the Jones House within the same community. Water demands would remain the same as exists currently. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. The project proposes relocation of the Jones House within the same community. Wastewater treatment demands would remain the same as exists currently. No impact would result.

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

No Impact. The project proposes relocation of the Jones House within the same community. Solid waste demands would remain the same as exists currently. No impact would result.

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

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Refer to XVII.f., above.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

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

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The project proposes relocation and rehabilitation of the Jones House. Neither the donor or the receiving project sites contain biological resources, and development of the project would not 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 have the potential result in significant impact to cultural resources (historic resources). Mitigation measures have been incorporated to reduce impact to less than significant.

<p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable futures projects)?</p>	<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
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Less Than Significant Impact. The project may have the potential to result in significant impact to cultural resources (architectural resources). However, impacts would be fully mitigated. Therefore, they would not result in a considerable cumulative impact. 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.

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

Less Than Significant Impact. Relocation and rehabilitation of the Jones House would not cause environmental effects that would significantly directly or indirectly impact human beings. All impacts identified as being significant have been mitigated to below a level of significance. For this reason, all environmental effects fall below the thresholds established by the City of San Diego. Impacts would be less than significant.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plans: Uptown Community Plan, 2016

II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

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

III. Air Quality

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

IV. Biology

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

V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources)

- City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines
- City of San Diego Archaeology Library
- Historical Resources Board List
- Community Historical Survey:
- Site Specific Reports:
 - Henry B. Jones House Historical Resources Technical Report
 - Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Henry B. Jones House
 - Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) Henry B. Jones House Drawings
 - Henry B. Jones House Relocation & Rehabilitation Monitoring Plan
 - Henry B. Jones House Relocation & Rehabilitation Treatment Plan

VI. Geology/Soils

- City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study

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

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Site Specific Report:
Jones House Relocation Project Climate Action Plan Consistency Checklist

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

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

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)
 Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program-Flood Boundary and Floodway Map
 Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html
 Site Specific Report:
Nasland Engineering, Water Pollution Control Plan, 2017

X. Land Use and Planning

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

XI. Mineral Resources

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

XII. Noise

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

___ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG
___ Site Specific Report:

XIII. Paleontological Resources

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

XIV. Population / Housing

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

XV. Public Services

X City of San Diego General Plan
X Community Plan

XVI. Recreational Resources

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

XVII. Transportation / Circulation

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

XVIII. Utilities

___ Site Specific Report:

XIX. Water Conservation

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