DRAFT

Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

Jericho Road Residential Project

SEPTEMBER 2024

Prepared for:

CITY OF LA MESA
8130 Allison Avenue
La Mesa, California 91942
Contact: Laura Traffenstedt

Prepared by:

DUDEK

605 Third Street
Encinitas, California 92024
Contact: Vanessa Scheidel

Printed on 30% post-consumer recycled material.

Table of Contents

SECTION **PAGE**

APPENDICES

FIGURES

TABLES

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
AB	Assembly Bill
AERMOD	American Meteorological Society/Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model
API	area of potential impact
BMP	best management practice
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CALGreen	California Building Energy Efficiency Standards
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
City	City of La Mesa
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Level
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CO_2e	carbon dioxide equivalent
County	County of San Diego
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
EDCO	EDCO Waste and Recycling
GHG	greenhouse gas
HRA	Health Risk Assessment
HU	Hydrologic Unit
HWD	Helix Water District
ips	inches per second
IS	Initial Study
L_{eq}	energy equivalent sound level
LOS	level of service
MM	Mitigation Measure
MND	Mitigated Negative Declaration
MS4	municipal separate storm sewer system
MT	metric ton
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NO_x	oxides of nitrogen
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
O_3	ozone
PDF	Project Design Feature
PM_{10}	particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter
$PM_{2.5}$	particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter
PPV	peak particle velocity
PRC	California Public Resources Code
project	Jericho Road Residential Project
RAQS	Regional Air Quality Strategy
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SB	Senate Bill
SCIC	South Coastal Information Center
SDAB	San Diego Air Basin
SDAPCD	San Diego Air Pollution Control District
sf	square feet
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SO_x	sulfur oxide
SR	State Route
SWQMP	Storm Water Quality Management Plan
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TAL	Traffic Assessment Letter
TCR	tribal cultural resource
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compound
WTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

1 Introduction

1.1 Project Overview

The proposed Jericho Road Residential Project (project) includes a request for approval of a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Site Development Plan, Design Review and Special Permit for a residential development project within a 3.49-acre project site. The General Plan Amendment and Rezone would change the General Plan designation and Zoning from Urban Residential (R1) to Multiple Unit Residential (R3).

The project site is located at 9407 Jericho Road in the northeastern area of La Mesa, California (Assessor's Parcel Number 4866701800). The site is located roughly 1 mile east of State Route (SR) 125, and 0.5 miles north of Interstate 8. The project site has been previously disturbed and is developed with the Cavalry Chapel, a surface parking lot, turf area, a playground, ornamental plantings, and associated church facilities/structures. The site has a maintained lawn made of Bermuda grass with eucalyptus trees planted along the site's perimeter. The project site is surrounded by single-family homes to the north and east, and multi-family developments to the south and west.

The proposed project includes demolition of the existing structures on site, and development of up to 73 three-story townhomes on the 3.49-acre site. The proposed townhomes would range in size from approximately 1,200 to 1,800 square feet (sf) and include two to four bedrooms.

California Assembly Bill (AB) 2097 prohibits public agencies from imposing or enforcing a minimum automobile parking requirement for residential, commercial, and other developments if the parcel is located within 0.5 miles of a major transit stop. The project site is located within 0.5 miles of a major transit stop so parking minimums do not apply; however, the project would include two garage spaces per unit plus approximately 5 guest spaces for a total of 151 parking spaces. All garages would be electric-vehicle-ready. Access to the residential area would be provided via two driveways. The first driveway would replace the existing Calvary Church driveway, aligned with Jericho Road. The second driveway would be aligned with Broadmoor Drive and serve as the west leg of the Jericho Road and Broadmoor Drive intersection.

The project would provide a total of 27,489 sf of open space area, including approximately 11,489 sf of private open space, and approximately 16,000 sf of common open space area. The common open space area amenities would include features such as decorative walkways, gathering spaces, a BBQ area with shaded seating, a tot lot and passive lawn areas for recreation. The private open space areas would consist of porches and the balconies available to each unit. The site would include approximately 31,136 sf of landscaped area. Bicycle parking would be provided in the common area located near the guest parking stalls. Once operational, the project would be all electric and would include solar panels on all proposed buildings, as required by the City of La Mesa code.

The project does not propose any off-site improvements or modifications. Thus, it is assumed that all study area roadway facilities and intersections would remain the same with the implementation of the project.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The City is the lead California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) agency responsible for the review and approval of the proposed project. Based on the findings of the Initial Study (IS), the City has made the determination that a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) is the appropriate environmental document to be prepared in compliance with CEQA per the California Public Resources Code (PRC) (PRC Section 21000 et seq.). As stated in CEQA Section

21064.5, an MND may be prepared for a project subject to CEQA when an IS has identified all potentially significant effects on the environment can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

This draft IS/MND has been prepared by the City of La Mesa (City) as the lead agency and is in conformance with Section 15070(a) of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). The purpose of the MND and the IS Checklist is to identify any potentially significant impacts associated with the proposed project and to incorporate mitigation measures into the project design, as necessary, to reduce or eliminate any significant or potentially significant effects of the project.

1.3 Public Review Process

In accordance with CEQA, a good faith effort has been made during the preparation of this IS/MND to contact affected agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in this project.

In reviewing the IS/MND, affected public agencies and the interested public should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the project's possible impacts on the environment. The Draft IS/MND and related documents are available for review on City's website here: https://www.cityoflamesa.us/1672/Projects-Under-Review.

Comments on the IS/MND may be made in writing before the end of the public review period. Following the close of the public comment period, the City will consider this IS/MND and comments thereto in determining whether to approve the proposed project.

Written comments on the IS/MND should be sent to the following address by October 14, 2024.

City of La Mesa
Community Development Department
8130 Allison Avenue
La Mesa, California 91942
Contact: Laura Traffenstedt
Email: LTraffenstedt@cityoflamesa.us

1.4 Initial Study Checklist

Dudek, under the City's guidance, prepared the IS using Appendix G of the per CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15063–15065). The CEQA Guidelines include a suggested checklist to indicate whether a project would have an adverse impact on the environment. The checklist is found in Chapter 2 of this document. Following the Environmental Checklist, Sections 2.1 through 2.21 include an explanation and discussion of each significance determination made in the checklist for the project.

For this IS/MND, the following four possible responses to each individual environmental issue area are included in the checklist:

1. Potentially Significant Impact
2. Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated
3. Less-than-Significant Impact
4. No Impact

The checklist and accompanying explanation of checklist responses provide the information and analysis necessary to assess relative environmental impacts of the project. In doing so, the City will determine the extent of additional environmental review, if any, for the project.

2 Initial Study Checklist

1. **Project title:**

   Jericho Road Residential Project

2. **Lead agency name and address:**

   City of La Mesa
   Community Development Department
   8130 Allison Avenue
   La Mesa, California 91942

3. **Contact person and phone number:**

   Laura Traffenstedt, Associate Planner
   (619) 667-1188

4. **Project location:**

   The project site is at 9407 Jericho Road in the northeastern area of the City of La Mesa, California (Assessor's Parcel Number 486-670-18-00). Refer to Figure 1, Project Location, and Figure 2, Project Site.

5. **Project sponsor's name and address:**

   Meritage Homes
   5 Peters Canyon Road, Suite 310
   Irvine, California 92606

6. **General plan designation:**

   The existing General Plan land use designation for the project site is Urban Residential. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment to change the existing General Plan designation to Multiple Unit Residential.

7. **Zoning:**

   The existing zoning for the project site is Urban Residential (R1). The project proposes a Rezone to change the existing zoning to Multiple Unit Residential (R3).

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. Attach additional sheets if necessary):**

   The proposed Jericho Road Residential Project (project or proposed project) includes a request for approval of a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Tentative Tract Map, Site Development Plan, Design Review and Special Permit for a residential development project within a 3.49-acre project site (Figure 3, Site Plan).

The General Plan Amendment and Rezone would change the General Plan designation and Zoning from Urban Residential (R1) to Multiple Unit Residential (R3).

The project site is located at 9407 Jericho Road in the northeastern area of La Mesa, California (Assessor's Parcel Number 486-670-18-00). The site is roughly 1 mile east of SR-125, and 0.5 miles north of Interstate 8. The project site has been previously disturbed and is developed with the Cavalry Chapel, a surface parking lot, turf area, a playground, ornamental plantings, and associated church facilities/structures. The site has a maintained lawn made of Bermuda grass with eucalyptus trees planted along the site's perimeter. The project site is surrounded by single-family homes to the north and east, and multi-family developments to the south and west.

The proposed project includes development of up to 73 three-story townhomes on the 3.49-acre site. The proposed townhomes would range in size from approximately 1,200 to 1,800 sf and include two to four bedrooms. California AB 2097 prohibits public agencies from imposing or enforcing a minimum automobile parking requirement for residential, commercial, and other developments if the parcel is located within a 0.5-mile walking distance of a major transit stop. The project site is located within 0.5 miles of a major transit stop so parking minimums do not apply; however, the project would include two garage spaces per unit plus approximately 5 guest spaces for a total of 151 parking spaces. Access to the residential area would be provided via two driveways. The first driveway would replace the existing Calvary Church driveway. The second driveway would be aligned with Broadmoor Drive and serve as the west leg of the Jericho Road and Broadmoor Drive intersection.

The project would provide a total of 27,489 sf of open space area, including approximately 11,489 sf of private open space, and approximately 16,000 sf of common open space area. The common open space area amenities would include features such as decorative walkways, gathering spaces, a BBQ area with shaded seating, a tot lot and passive lawn areas for recreation. The private open space areas would consist of yards and the balconies available to each unit. The total landscaped area on site would be approximately 31,136 sf.

The project does not propose any off-site improvements or modifications. Thus, it is assumed that all study area roadway facilities and intersections would remain the same with the implementation of the project.

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

The existing project site has been previously disturbed and is currently developed. The project site is in an urban area of the City surrounded by development, including single-family residential to the north and east, the Serena Vista Apartments to the south, and the Grossmont Village Condos to the west.

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

Not applicable.

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, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Yes, in compliance with AB 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18, the City, as lead agency, is responsible for conducting government to government consultation with pertinent tribal entities. Currently, the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians are the only tribe who have formally requested consultation with the City. San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians confirmed closure of consultation via email on August 23, 2024. Additional details are provided in Section 2.5, Cultural Resources, and Section 2.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, of this IS/MND.

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.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☒ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Energy
☒ Geology and Soils	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials
☐ Hydrology and Water Quality	☐ Land Use and Planning	☐ Mineral Resources
☐ Noise	☐ Population and Housing	☐ Public Services
☐ Recreation	☒ Transportation	☒ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Utilities and Service Systems	☐ Wildfire	☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

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

☐ I find that 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 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

9/9/2024
Date

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 would 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 Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
4. "Less Than Significant Impact 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.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). 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 which 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 significance

2.1 Aesthetics

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I.	**AESTHETICS** – Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project**:**				
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less-than-Significant Impact. A scenic vista is typically defined as a public view of highly valued visual and scenic resources such as the ocean and distant mountain ranges, particularly from public vantage points. As discussed in the Land Use and Urban Design Element of the City's General Plan, major transportation corridors and natural scenic resources such as Mount Helix and Mount Nebo define the geography of the City and surrounding areas. The City has also designated vistas and panoramic views throughout the City providing an overall image of a large portion of the City/outlying region (City of La Mesa 2012a). The City's General Plan does not identify any scenic vistas near the project vicinity, but the project site is visible from the top of the City's hills identified as a panoramic view within the City's General Plan. However, even with the development of the proposed project, views of the surrounding hillsides and ridgelines are not expected to be substantially obstructed from the panoramic viewing area due to the flat nature of the site, existing developed state of the site, and similar surrounding development. Additionally, the project site is positioned at a significantly lower elevation compared to properties located north and east. Due to the existing topography, the viewsheds of the surrounding single-family homes would not be substantially impaired by the proposed development.

Therefore, due to the relatively flat terrain of the project site and surrounding residential area, low elevation of the project site, and the project site's location on a currently developed site in an urbanized area, development

of the proposed project is not expected to impede views of existing scenic vistas, nor is the project site considered a scenic vista. Therefore, impacts associated with scenic vistas would be less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Scenic highways and routes are a unique component of the circulation system, as they traverse areas of unusual scenic or aesthetic value. The closest officially designated state scenic highway is SR-125. SR-125 extends as a designated state scenic highway from the junction of SR-94 and SR-125 to where SR-125 intersects with Interstate 8. SR-125 is approximately 0.72 miles southwest of the project site; however, the portion officially designated as a state scenic highway begins approximately 0.8 miles southwest of the project site. The project site is approximately 0.47 miles north of the closest portion of Interstate 8 identified as an eligible state scenic highway (Caltrans 2024). Additionally, a portion of SR-94 is also identified as an eligible state scenic highway; however, this eligible segment begins approximately 2.29 miles south of the project site.

The project site is not visible from any segment designated as a state scenic highway or eligible for designation as a state scenic highway. Therefore, impacts associated with state scenic highways would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. PRC Section 21071 (i.e., CEQA) defines an "urbanized area" as a "(a) an incorporated city that meets either of the following criteria: (1) has a population of at least 100,000 persons, or (2) has a population of less than 100,000 persons if the population of that city and not more than two contiguous incorporated citied combined equals at least 100,000 persons." The City of La Mesa has fewer than 100,000 persons; however, the City of La Mesa is immediately adjacent to the City of San Diego which has a population of over 1.3 million. Therefore, the City of La Mesa is considered to be located within an urbanized area as defined by CEQA.

To ensure that both current and future development within the City is designed and constructed to conform to existing visual character and quality of the surrounding built environment, the City's Municipal Code includes design standards, specific to each Zoning District, related to building height, parking, landscaping requirements, and other visual considerations. The purpose is to regulate and restrict the uses of buildings and structures, and to encourage the most appropriate use of land. The project would be subject to design review by the City and would be required to meet the City's conditions of approval, which would ensure that proposed structures and landscaping would be consistent with the City's General Plan and Municipal Code.

Additionally, development of the project would be consistent with surrounding residential development and would not degrade the existing visual character of the project site and its surroundings. The proposed project would modify the visual landscape of the site by transforming the current developed area, which consists of the Cavalry Chapel, a parking lot, turf area, a playground, and associated church facilities/structures, into 73 three-story townhomes. Building permit records indicate the church and school have existed on the site since 1960 which pre-dates La Mesa's current Zoning Ordinance. The existing

church is considered a legal nonconforming use on the site. Although the proposed multi-family residential uses would differ in land use designation and visual character in comparison to the existing church on-site, and would require City approval of the proposed land use and zoning change from Urban Residential (R1) to Multiple Unit Residential (R3), the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Lighting in the project vicinity is associated with roadway lighting and lighting associated with the existing commercial and residential uses that surround the project site. Development of the proposed project would result in new sources of light from the residential units, landscaping lighting, security lighting, and internal circulation and pedestrian lighting. Although more light sources are anticipated from the proposed project in comparison to existing conditions, the increase in lighting is not expected to be substantial in comparison to the existing similar residential development surrounding the site. Additionally, all lighting associated with the project would be required to comply with the City's Municipal Code Section 24.05.020D16, which requires lighting to be designed, installed, and maintained to prevent light spillover onto adjacent properties. Although the proposed project would result in new sources of light in the area, the project site is in an urbanized area and is surrounded by existing development with existing sources of day and nighttime lighting. The use of energy-efficient, architecturally appropriate fixtures created to alleviate glare and light pollution would be incorporated to minimize and restrict nighttime light pollution and light trespass on adjacent properties in compliance with the City's Municipal Code and the proposed design and development standards. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a significant impact related to new sources of substantial lighting and glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts would be less than significant.

2.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II.	**AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES** – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. 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)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

No Impact. The project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (CDC 2022). As a result, the proposed project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural uses.

No Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, nor Farmland of Statewide Importance exist within the immediate vicinity of the project site. The proposed project would not result in substantial changes that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use. The project site is surrounded entirely by developed land, which is designated as "Urban and Built-Up Land" by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Surrounding development adjacent to the project site include residential uses. Given the extent of development surrounding the project site, and considering the site was previously developed, the proposed project would not result in the conversion of any existing farmland, and no impact would occur.

b) ***Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?***

No Impact. The project site is not zoned for agricultural use or designated as land under the Williamson Act, nor is the project site zoned for forest land or timberland production (CDC 2022). As stated in response to Threshold 2.2(a), above, the project site has been previously disturbed and developed. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land. No impact would occur regarding conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or forest land.

c) Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?

No Impact. Please see response to Threshold 2.2(b) above. The project site is currently designated for residential use under both the City's General Plan and Municipal Code and is not zoned for forest land or timberland production (CDC 2022). According to the La Mesa General Plan Land Use and Urban Design Element the City of La Mesa does not have designated forest land. Therefore, no impacts would occur regarding forest land.

d) Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No Impact. Please see response to Thresholds 2.2(b) and 2.2(c), above.

e) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The project site is current designated for residential use under both the City's General Plan and Municipal Code and is currently being used as a church. There is no farmland nor forest land on the project site.

2.3 Air Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Report was prepared for the proposed project in April 2024 and is included as Appendix A to this IS/MND. Findings from Appendix A are summarized throughout this analysis.

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As described in Appendix A to this IS/MND, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) are responsible for developing and implementing the clean air plans for attainment and maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB); specifically, the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS).[1] The federal ozone (O_3) maintenance plan, which is part of the SIP, was adopted in 2016. The SIP includes a demonstration that current strategies and tactics will maintain acceptable air quality in the SDAB based on the NAAQS. The RAQS was initially adopted in 1991 and is updated every 3 years (most recently in 2022). The RAQS outlines SDAPCD's plans and control measures designed to attain the CAAQS for O3. The SIP and RAQS rely on information from the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and SANDAG, including mobile and area source emissions, as well as information regarding projected growth in San Diego County and the cities in San Diego County, to project future emissions and then determine from that the strategies necessary for the reduction of emissions through regulatory controls. CARB mobile source emission projections and SANDAG growth projections are based on population, vehicle trends, and land use plans developed by the County of San Diego (County) and the cities in the County as part of the development of their general plans.

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 SIP and RAQS and may contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact on air quality. Implementation of the project would result in an increase in housing of 73 residential units. The General Plan Amendment and Rezone would change the General Plan designation and Zoning from Urban Residential (R1) to Multiple Unit Residential (R3). As of 2023, the City has a persons per household ratio of 2.35 (DOF 2023). The project's 73 residential dwelling units would generate approximately 172 residents. Although not all residents of the project would be new to the City, residential development would be considered unplanned growth. Development of multi-family residential uses at the project site was not accounted for in the City's General Plan growth projections since the existing planned land use designation is Urban Residential (7 to 10 dwelling units per acre). However, the increase of 172 residents would account for a 0.2845% increase in the City's population. Therefore, the new residents would not be considered a substantial increase in the City's population.

The most recent Regional Housing Needs Assessment from SANDAG stated that La Mesa needs to build 3,797 units from 2021 through 2029 (SANDAG 2020). The City has a projected deficit of 859 very-low and 487 low income units, and 577 moderate and 1,874 above-moderate income units (SANDAG 2020). The project is expected to bring 73 units to market in 2027, which would be within SANDAG's growth projection for housing during the 6th Cycle planning horizon (i.e., April 2021 to April 2029). Therefore, the project would not conflict with SANDAG's regional growth forecast for the City.

The increase in the housing units and associated vehicle source emissions is not anticipated to result in air quality impacts that were not envisioned in the growth projections and RAQS, and this minor increase in residential units in the region would not obstruct or impede implementation of local air quality plans. Based on the analysis above, implementation of the project would not result in development in excess of

[1] For the purpose of this discussion, because the 2020 Attainment Plan has not yet been adopted by the Environmental Protection Agency as a revision to the California SIP for attaining the O_3 NAAQS, the relevant federal air quality plan is the O_3 maintenance plan. The RAQS is the applicable plan for purposes of state air quality planning. Both plans reflect growth projections in the SDAB (Appendix A).

that anticipated in local plans or increases in population/housing growth beyond those contemplated by SANDAG. As such, vehicle trip generation and planned development for the project are considered to be anticipated in the SIP and RAQS. Because the proposed land uses and associated vehicle trips are anticipated in local air quality plans, the project would be consistent at a regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the RAQS. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Air pollution is largely a cumulative impact. The nonattainment status of regional pollutants is a result of past and present development, and SDAPCD develops and implements plans for future attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS. Based on these considerations, project-level thresholds of significance for criteria pollutants are relevant in the determination of whether the project's individual emissions would have a cumulatively significant impact on air quality.

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) indicates that, where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or pollution control district may be relied upon to determine whether the project would have a significant impact on air quality. The SDAPCD has not developed thresholds of significance for air quality and health risk, however, the SDAPCD has provided emission levels under its permitting authority for new source review for which an Air Quality Impact Assessment is triggered. The County of San Diego has reviewed SDAPCD's trigger levels, as well as the Environmental Protection Agency rulemaking, and CEQA thresholds adopted by the South Coast Air Quality Management District to develop screening-level thresholds to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of project-level air quality impacts within San Diego County. The City has chosen to apply the County's screening-level thresholds for determining mass daily criteria air pollutant thresholds of significance (Appendix A). Project-related air quality impacts estimated in this environmental analysis would be considered significant if any of the applicable significance thresholds presented in Table 1 are exceeded.

Table 1. County of San Diego Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Construction Emissions			
Pollutant	**Total Emissions (Pounds per Day)**		
Coarse particulate matter (PM_{10})	100		
Fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	55		
Oxides of nitrogen (NO_x)	250		
Sulfur oxides (SO_x)	250		
Carbon monoxide (CO)	550		
Volatile organic compounds (VOCs)	75[a]		
Operational Emissions			
	Total Emissions		
Pollutant	**Pounds per Hour**	**Pounds per Day**	**Tons per Year**
Coarse particulate matter (PM_{10})	—	100	15
Fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$)	—	55	10
Oxides of nitrogen (NO_x)	25	250	40

Table 1. County of San Diego Air Quality Significance Thresholds

Sulfur oxides (SO_x)	25	250	40
Carbon monoxide (CO)	100	550	100
Lead and lead compounds	—	3.2	0.6
Volatile organic compounds (VOCs)	—	75[a]	13.7

Source: SDAPCD 2016.
Notes: SDAPCD = San Diego Air Pollution Control District.
[a] VOC threshold based on the threshold of significance for VOCs from the South Coast Air Quality Management District for the Coachella Valley as stated in the San Diego County Guidelines for Determining Significance.

Emissions from the construction phase of project components were estimated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2022.1.[2] Per preliminary project details from the project applicant, it is assumed that construction of the project would begin in May 2025 and would last approximately 22 months, matching the following schedule:

- Demolition/Site Preparation: May 2025
- Grading: May 2025—July 2025
- Paving: November 2025—December 2025
- Building Construction: December 2025—February 2027
- Architectural Coating: February 2027—March 2027

Table 2 provides the construction timeline, potential phasing, construction equipment mix, and vehicle trips assumed for estimating project-generated construction emissions. The construction schedule has been developed based on available information provided by the project applicant, typical construction practices, and CalEEMod default assumptions. Construction phasing is intended to represent a schedule of anticipated activities for use in estimating potential project-generated construction emissions.

Table 2. Construction Scenario Assumptions

Construction Phase	One-Way Vehicle Trips			Equipment		
	Average Daily Worker Trips	Average Daily Vendor Truck Trips	Average Daily Haul Truck Trips	Equipment Type	Quantity	Usage Hours
Demolition / Site Prep	12	8	20	Tractors/Loaders/ Backhoes	3	8
				Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8
Grading	16	8	72	Graders	1	8
				Scrapers	4	8
				Rubber Tired Dozers	1	8
				Skid Steer Loader	1	8

[2] CalEEMod is a statewide land use emissions computer model designed to provide a uniform platform to calculate construction and operational emissions from land use development projects. The model was developed for the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association in collaboration with multiple air districts across the state. Numerous lead agencies in the state, including SDAPCD, use CalEEMod to estimate greenhouse gas emissions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(a)(1).

Table 2. Construction Scenario Assumptions

Construction Phase	One-Way Vehicle Trips			Equipment		
	Average Daily Worker Trips	Average Daily Vendor Truck Trips	Average Daily Haul Truck Trips	Equipment Type	Quantity	Usage Hours
Paving	16	8	0	Pavers	2	8
				Paving Equipment	2	8
				Rollers	3	8
Building Construction	20	16	0	Forklift	2	8
				Tractors/Loaders/ Backhoes	2	4
				Crane	1	4
				Generator	1	8
				Air Compressors (Gasoline)	2	8
Architectural Coating	12	0	0	Air Compressors (Diesel)	1	6

Note: See Appendix A for additional details.

The equipment mix assumptions were based on CalEEMod default assumptions based on proposed land use and information provided by the applicant and is meant to represent a reasonably conservative estimate of construction activity. For the analysis, it is assumed that heavy construction equipment would be operating at the site for up to 8 hours per day, 5 days per week. Default assumptions provided in CalEEMod were used to determine worker trips and vendor truck trips for each potential construction phase. The default CalEEMod trip distance for construction vehicles was assumed, which was a one-way distance of 11.97 miles for worker trips, 7.63 miles for vendor truck trips, and 20 miles for haul truck trips.

Implementation of the project would generate criteria air pollutant emissions from entrained dust, off-road equipment, vehicle emissions, architectural coatings, and asphalt pavement application. Based on project specific information provided by the applicant, 26,870 cubic yards of material import and 1,784 cubic yards of material export are expected from the construction of the project during the grading phase. Entrained dust results from the exposure of earth surfaces to wind from the direct disturbance and movement of soil, resulting in particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}) and particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$) emissions. Construction of project components would be subject to SDAPCD Rule 55 – Fugitive Dust Control, included as PDF-AQ-2. Compliance with Rule 55 would limit fugitive dust (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$) that may be generated during grading and construction activities. Standard construction practices that would be employed to reduce fugitive dust emissions include watering of the active sites two times per day, depending on weather conditions. During the demolition phase, haul trucks would remove approximately 1,955 tons of debris would be removed from the project site.

The proposed project would implement both construction-related and operational Project Design Features (PDFs) intended to reduce emissions of criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TACs). To ensure that the PDFs are implemented during construction and operation of the project, they will be imposed as

enforceable conditions of approval by the City. The proposed project would implement PDF-AQ-1 and PDF-AQ-2, as follows:

PDF-AQ-1: All-electric appliances and end uses (including heating, ventilation, air conditioning, and induction cooking) shall be required for project residential development. Residential units would be prohibited from having wood-burning or natural gas fireplaces, stoves, or appliances. Furthermore, the Applicant shall incorporate electric heat pumps or electric water heaters into the residential development.

PDF-AQ-2: Standard construction practices that shall be employed to reduce fugitive dust emissions include watering of the active sites two times per day, depending on weather conditions. Construction of project components would be subject to SDAPCD Rule 55 – Fugitive Dust Control. Compliance with Rule 55 would limit fugitive dust that may be generated during grading and construction activities.

Table 3 shows the estimated maximum unmitigated daily construction emissions associated with the conceptual construction phases of the project. Complete details of the emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A.

Table 3. Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Construction Year	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	Pounds per Day					
Summer						
2025	4.50	47.45	38.65	0.12	7.70	3.55
2026	0.93	7.48	10.16	0.02	0.54	0.32
Winter						
2025	1.01	8.67	11.75	0.02	0.58	0.41
2026	0.93	7.77	10.06	0.02	0.54	0.32
2027	27.09	7.44	9.98	0.02	0.51	0.29
Maximum	***27.09***	***47.45***	***38.65***	***0.12***	***7.70***	***3.55***
SDAPCD threshold	*75*	*250*	*550*	*250*	*100*	*55*
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NO_x = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM_{10} = coarse particulate matter; $PM_{2.5}$ = fine particulate matter; SDAPCD = San Diego Air Pollution Control District.
See Appendix A for complete results.
The values shown are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from CalEEMod and include quantification of PDF-AQ-2.

As shown in Table 3, daily construction emissions for the project would not exceed SDAPCD's significance thresholds. Therefore, the project's impacts related to emissions of criteria air pollutant emissions during construction would be less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would generate volatile organic compounds (VOCs), oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur oxides (SO_x), PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions from mobile sources (vehicle trips), area sources (consumer products, landscape maintenance equipment), and energy sources. Pollutant emissions associated with long-term operations were quantified using CalEEMod. Project-generated mobile source

emissions were estimated in CalEEMod based on project-specific trip rates. CalEEMod default values were used to estimate emissions from the proposed project area and energy sources.

Table 4 presents the unmitigated maximum daily emissions associated with the operation of the project in 2027 after all phases of construction have been completed. Complete details of the emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A. Emissions represent maximum of summer and winter. "Summer" emissions are representative of the conditions that may occur during the O_3 season (May 1 through October 31), and "winter" emissions are representative of the conditions that may occur during the balance of the year (November 1 through April 30).

Table 4. Estimated Maximum Daily Operational Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions

Source	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
	Pounds per Day					
Summer						
Mobile	1.62	1.00	10.47	0.02	2.21	0.57
Area	4.05	1.40	21.08	0.06	2.44	2.35
Energy	0.02	0.38	0.16	0.00	0.03	0.03
Total	**5.69**	**2.77**	**31.72**	**0.09**	**4.68**	**2.96**
Winter						
Mobile	1.59	1.09	10.02	0.02	2.21	0.57
Area	3.68	1.36	16.94	0.06	2.44	2.35
Energy	0.02	0.38	0.16	0.00	0.03	0.03
Total	**5.29**	**2.83**	**27.12**	**0.09**	**4.68**	**2.96**
County threshold	*75*	*250*	*550*	*250*	*100*	*55*
Threshold exceeded?	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**	**No**

Notes: VOC = volatile organic compound; NOx = oxides of nitrogen; CO = carbon monoxide; SOx = sulfur oxides; PM10 = coarse particulate matter; PM2.5 = fine particulate matter; <0.01 = reported value is less than 0.01.
See Appendix A for complete results.

As shown in Table 4, daily operational emissions for the project would not exceed SDAPCD's significance thresholds for any criteria air pollutant. Therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact related to emissions of criteria air pollutant emissions during operation.

The SDAB has been designated as a federal nonattainment area for O_3 and a state nonattainment area for O_3, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$. PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$ emissions associated with construction generally result in near-field impacts. The nonattainment status is the result of cumulative emissions from all sources of these air pollutants and their precursors within the SDAB. As shown in Tables 3 and 4, the emissions of all criteria pollutants from the project's construction and operations would be below the significance levels. As such, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts to air quality.

Regarding long-term cumulative operational emissions in relation to consistency with local air quality plans, the SIP and RAQS serve as the primary air quality planning documents for the state and SDAB, respectively. The SIP and RAQS rely 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. Therefore, projects that propose development that is consistent with the growth anticipated by local plans would be

consistent with the SIP and RAQS and would not be considered to result in cumulatively considerable impacts from operational emissions. The project does not conflict with the SANDAG growth projections. Thus, it would be consistent at a regional level with the underlying growth forecasts in the SIP and RAQS. As a result, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional O_3 concentrations or other criteria pollutant emissions. Cumulative impacts for construction and operation would be less than significant for the project.

c) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Specific to carbon monoxide hotspots, projects contributing to adverse traffic impacts may result in the formation of CO hotspots. To verify that the project would not cause or contribute to a violation of the CO standard, a screening evaluation of the potential for CO hotspots was conducted. The County's CO hotspot screening guidance (Appendix A) was followed to determine whether the project would require a site-specific hotspot analysis. Per guidance, any project that would place receptors within 500 feet of a signalized intersection operating at or below level of service (LOS) E (peak-hour trips exceeding 3,000 trips) must conduct a "hotspot" analysis for CO. Likewise, projects that will cause road intersections to operate at or below a LOS E (i.e., with intersection peak-hour trips exceeding 3,000) will also have to conduct a CO "hotspot" analysis. Three study intersections were included in the project's Traffic Assessment Letter: Jericho Road and Broadmoor Drive/Cavalry Church Driveway, Jericho Road and Amaya Drive, and Water Street and Amaya Drive. These intersections would be operating at LOS B or better after the implementation of the project (see Appendix J for the traffic assessment). Therefore, the proposed project would not generate traffic that would contribute to potential adverse traffic impacts that may result in the formation of CO hotspots and no hotspot analysis is required. Based on these considerations, the project would result in a less than significant impact to air quality with regard to potential CO hotspots.

In addition to impacts from criteria pollutants, project impacts may include emissions of pollutants identified by the state and federal government as TACs or hazardous air pollutants. The greatest potential for TAC emissions during construction would be diesel particulate matter emissions from heavy equipment operations and heavy-duty trucks, and the associated health impacts to sensitive receptors. The closest sensitive receptors to the project site are residences immediately adjacent to the boundary of the site. As such, a construction health risk analysis was performed for the project.

The Health Risk Assessment (HRA) is based on the methodologies prescribed in the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment document, Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines – Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments (OEHHA 2015). To implement these guidelines based on proposed project information, the SDAPCD developed a three-tiered approach where each successive tier is progressively more refined, with fewer conservative assumptions. The SDAPCD document, Supplemental Guidelines for Submission of Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program Health Risk Assessments (SDAPCD 2022), provides guidance with which to perform HRAs within the SDAB.

Health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of cancer risk. The SDAPCD recommends a carcinogenic (cancer) risk threshold of 10 in 1 million, which indicates that a person has an additional risk of 10 chances in 1 million (0.001%) of developing cancer during their lifetime as a result of the air pollution scenario being evaluated. Additionally, some TACs increase non-cancer health risk due to short-term (acute) and long-term (chronic) exposures. The SDAPCD has also adopted a hazard index less than 1.0, below which indicates that people are not likely to experience any non-cancer health effects. The

exhaust from diesel engines is a complex mixture of gases, vapors, and particles, many of which are known human carcinogens. Diesel particulate matter has established cancer risk factors and relative exposure values for long-term chronic health hazard impacts. No short-term, acute relative exposure level has been established for diesel particulate matter; therefore, acute impacts of diesel particulate matter are not addressed in this assessment.

Air dispersion modeling was performed using the Environmental Protection Agency's American Meteorological Society/Environmental Protection Agency Regulatory Model (AERMOD) modeling system (computer software) with the Lakes Environmental Software implementation/user interface, AERMOD View Version 12.0. The dispersion modeling included the use of standard regulatory default options. AERMOD parameters were selected as representative of the project site and project activities. Principal parameters of this modeling are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. AERMOD Principal Parameters

Parameter	Details
Meteorological Data	The latest three-year meteorological data (2019–2021) for the El Cajon Station were obtained from SDAPCD as the recommended meteorological station and input to AERMOD.
Urban versus Rural Option	Urban areas typically have more surface roughness, as well as structures and low-albedo surfaces that absorb more sunlight—and thus more heat—relative to rural areas. Email correspondence with the SDAPCD confirmed that the project site should be considered urban for modeling projects.
Terrain Characteristics	Digital elevation data were imported into AERMOD and elevations were assigned to receptors and emission sources, as necessary. Digital elevation data were obtained through the AERMOD View in the U.S. Geological Survey's National Elevation Dataset format with a resolution of 1 arc-second resolution.
Source Release Characterizations	The following modeling parameters for emissions sources were incorporated into AERMOD. These parameters were obtained from information published by regulatory agencies and represent the best available information at the time of this writing. ▪ Off-road equipment and trucks were modeled as a line of adjacent volume sources across the project site with a release height of 5 meters, a plume height of 10 meters, and plume width of 10 meters (SCAQMD 2008).
Receptors	To evaluate off-site receptor exposure to diesel particulate matter from project construction, Cartesian Grids were input with the following parameters: 20-meter spacing from 0 to 200 meters from the construction boundary and 100-meter spacing from 0 to 1,000 meters from the construction boundary.

Notes: AERMOD = American Meteorological Society/EPA Regulatory Model; SDAPCD = San Diego Air Pollution Control District; See Appendix A for additional information.

Based on results from the HRA, the maximally exposed individual resident off site would be located at the multi-family residences adjacent to the project site to the south. The results from the HRA prior to mitigation are included in Table 6.

Table 6. Construction Activity Health Risk Assessment Results Prior to Mitigation

Impact Parameter	Units	Project Impact	CEQA Threshold	Level of Significance
Off Site				
Cancer Risk	Per Million	59.7	10.0	**Potentially Significant**
HIC	Not Applicable	0.04	1.0	Less than Significant

Source: Appendix A
Notes: CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act; HIC = Chronic Hazard Index.

As shown in Table 6, the results of the HRA demonstrate that the TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions would result in cancer risk above the 10 in 1 million threshold and Chronic Hazard Index less than 1. Therefore, TAC emissions from construction of the project would result in a potentially significant impact and thus mitigation is required.

Mitigation required to minimize potentially significant air quality impacts during construction of the project include the following:

MM-AQ-1: Prior to the commencement of construction activities for the project, the Applicant shall require its construction contractor to demonstrate that all 25-horsepower or greater diesel-powered equipment is powered with California Air Resources Board–certified Tier 4 Final engines, and that all construction equipment with engines less than 25 horsepower be electrically powered.

An exemption from this requirement may be granted if (1) the Applicant documents equipment with Tier 4 Final and electric engines are not reasonably available, and (2) the required corresponding reductions in criteria air pollutant emissions can be achieved for the project from other combinations of construction equipment. Before an exemption may be granted, the Applicant's construction contractor shall (1) demonstrate that at least two construction fleet owners/operators in the City of La Mesa or County of San Diego were contacted and that those owners/operators confirmed Tier 4 Final and electric equipment could not be located within the City of La Mesa or County of San Diego during the desired construction schedule; and (2) the proposed replacement equipment has been evaluated using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) or other industry standard emission estimation method and documentation provided to the City to confirm that necessary project-generated emissions reductions are achieved.

Table 7 summarizes the results of the construction HRA after implementation of Mitigation Measure (MM)-AQ-1 for construction of the proposed project.

Table 7. Construction Activity Health Risk Assessment Results After Mitigation

Impact Parameter	Units	Project Impact	CEQA Threshold	Level of Significance
Off Site				
Cancer Risk	Per Million	6.3	10.0	Less than Significant
HIC	Not Applicable	0.004	1.0	Less than Significant

Source: Appendix A
Notes: CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act; HIC = Chronic Hazard Index.

As shown in Table 7, with the inclusion of MM-AQ-1, TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions would result in cancer risk below the 10 in 1 million threshold and Chronic Hazard Index would be less than 1. Therefore, the project would result in a less-than-significant impact with mitigation related to exposure to TAC emissions during construction.

Construction and operation of the project would not result in emissions that exceed SDAPCD's emission thresholds for any criteria air pollutants. The SDAPCD thresholds are based on the SDAB complying with the NAAQS and CAAQS which are protective of public health; therefore, no adverse effects to human health would result from the project. Regarding VOCs, some VOCs would be associated with motor vehicles and construction equipment, and others are associated with architectural coatings and asphalt off-gassing, the emissions of which would not result in exceedances of SDAPCD's thresholds. Additionally, SDAPCD Rule 67.0.1 restricts the VOC content of coatings for both construction and operational applications. In addition, VOCs and NO_x are precursors to O_3, for which the SDAB is designated as nonattainment with respect to the NAAQS and CAAQS (the SDAB is designated by the Environmental Protection Agency as an attainment area for the 1-hour O_3 NAAQS standard and 1997 8-hour NAAQS standard). The VOC and NO_x emissions associated with project construction could minimally contribute to regional O_3 concentrations and the associated health impacts. Due to the minimal contribution during construction and operation, as well as the existing air quality in coastal San Diego areas, health impacts would be considered less than significant. Similar to O_3, construction of the project would not exceed thresholds for PM_{10} or $PM_{2.5}$ and would not contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for particulate matter. Due to the minimal contribution of particulate matter during construction and operation, health impacts would be less than significant.

Lastly, nitrogen dioxide (NO_2) health impacts are associated with respiratory irritation, which may be experienced by nearby receptors during the periods of heaviest use of off-road construction equipment. However, these operations would be relatively short term, and the off-road construction equipment would be operating on various portions of the site and would not be concentrated in one portion of the site at any one time. Construction of the project would not contribute to exceedances of the NAAQS and CAAQS for NO_2 because NO_x emissions (which includes NO_2) would be less than the applicable SDAPCD threshold. Based on the preceding considerations, health impacts from project-related criteria air pollutant emissions would be less than significant.

In summary, the results of the HRA demonstrate that TAC exposure from construction diesel exhaust emissions would be less than significant with implementation of MM-AQ-1. In addition, health impacts associated with criteria air pollutants would be less than significant. Based on these considerations, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

d) Would the project result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Odors would be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction of the project. Odors produced during construction would be attributable to concentrations of unburned hydrocarbons from tailpipes of construction equipment and architectural coatings. Such odors are temporary and for the types of construction activities anticipated for project components, would generally occur at magnitudes that would not affect substantial numbers of people.

Due to the subjective nature of odor impacts, the number of variables that can influence the potential for an odor impact, and the variety of odor sources, there are no quantitative or formulaic methodologies to

determine if potential odors would have a significant impact. Examples of land uses and industrial operations that are commonly associated with odor complaints include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing facilities, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities. In addition to the odor source, the distance between the sensitive receptor(s) and the odor source, as well as the local meteorological conditions, are considerations in the potential for a project to frequently expose the public to objectionable odors. The project would include a residential development, which is not expected to produce any nuisance odors. Therefore, impacts related to odors caused by the project would be less than significant.

2.4 Biological Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

A Biological Resources Memorandum was prepared for the proposed project in January 2024 and is included as Appendix B to this IS/MND. Findings from Appendix B are summarized throughout this analysis. For the purpose of the analysis herein, the biological study area (study area) covers the approximately 3.49-acre project site.

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project site is currently developed with a church, parking lot, and associated amenities, and the site is surrounded by existing development on all sides. Historic aerials show that the site has existed in its current disturbed and developed condition since as early as 1964. Topography of the site is mostly flat, with downward slopes around the perimeter of the flatter grade open areas (Appendix B).

The project site does not support any native vegetation communities and is comprised of identified vegetation communities including, disturbed habitat (1.46 acres) and developed land (2.03 acres). Areas mapped as developed land include paved areas, structures currently associated with an active church facility, and ornamental plantings. Disturbed habitat in the eastern part of the site consists of patches of mowed non-native Bermuda grass (*Cynodon dactylon*) mixed with non-native and invasive herbaceous species. Disturbed habitat in the western part of the site consists of compacted dirt as well as patches of mowed non-native grass and invasive herbs. This western area is used for additional church parking.

The vast majority of vegetation on the site is non-native and ornamental. Two native plant species were observed, Laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*) and California buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*). Both of the native species were present in very small amounts and were mostly located on the slope on the eastern side of the property, but were surrounded by non-native and ornamental plant species and did not constitute a native vegetation community. There are no streams, or aquatic or riparian resources on the project site.

Special-Status Plants

No special-status plant species were observed during the field survey. Historical occurrences of special-status plant species recorded in the vicinity of the project site consist of species that are not expected to occur on or adjacent to the site, due to either the developed and disturbed condition of the site or the absence of suitable habitat for the specific species. Given the developed and disturbed nature of the site, it is unlikely that rare plants would occur on site. The majority of vegetation observed on site was non-native or ornamental, and the two native species encountered are not considered rare or special-status. The Biological Resources Memorandum prepared for the project site determined the project would not result in impacts to special-status plants (Appendix B).

Special-Status Wildlife

Historical occurrences of special-status wildlife recorded in the vicinity of the Project site consist of records of species that are not expected to occur on or adjacent to the site, due to either the developed and disturbed condition of the site or the absence of suitable habitat for the specific species. Given the urban, developed, and frequently disturbed nature of the site, it is unlikely that special-status species would use

the site for nesting, breeding, or foraging. Aside from openings to street, the site is mostly fenced with tall chain-link fencing. The site is also surrounded by streets and other urban development and would not serve as a corridor for terrestrial or aquatic wildlife movement.

The majority of wildlife species observed during the field survey conducted on January 30, 2024, consisted of common small bird species that often occur in urban environments, as well as one raptor species. Structures, ornamental trees, and bushes on the site have the potential to support common species of nesting small birds such as black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*), house finch (*Haemorhous mexicanus*), house wren (*Troglodytes aedon*), and Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*). Mature trees such as eucalyptus on and nearby the site perimeter have the potential to support nesting raptors that are tolerant of human disturbance and urban settings. However, no inactive or active raptor nests were detected in the mature eucalyptus trees located on or immediately adjacent to the site during the survey, and raptors often re-use old nest sites. A red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*) was observed calling and perching on the fence on the eastern side of the site, but then moved northeast to an area with larger pine trees not immediately adjacent to the site. The Biological Resources Memorandum prepared for the project site determined the project would not result in impacts to special-status wildlife.

Migratory birds, which could nest in structures or ornamental vegetation and trees on or adjacent to the site, are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. To comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, a pre-construction nesting bird survey would need to be conducted if demolition or clearing and grubbing occurs within the nesting season (January 15 through August 31). Although no migratory birds or nests were found during the biological site survey, impacts to migratory birds could be significant without implementation of a nesting bird survey (MM-BIO-1). Implementation of MM-BIO-1 would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level (see MM-BIO-1 outlined below).

b) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less-Than-Significant Impact. As described in the response to Threshold 2.4(a), the project site is entirely developed. No riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities were identified as present on the site. Direct impacts to sensitive vegetation communities would be completely avoided, and impacts would be limited to developed and disturbed habitat. Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities would be less than significant.

c) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As described in response to Threshold 2.4(a), the project site is entirely developed and extensively disturbed. No wetlands or vernal pools were observed during the field survey. There would be no Impact to state or federally protected wetlands because these resources are not present and would not be impacted by the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is in a developed area and is surrounded by streets and other urban development. A majority of the project site is surrounded by chain-link fencing. The site does not include any creeks or riparian habitats that could be used by migratory fish or wildlife species and due to the urban environment it does not serve as a wildlife corridor for terrestrial or aquatic wildlife movement. Therefore, impacts to wildlife corridors would be less than significant.

e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Less-than-Significant Impact. There are no City policies or ordinances, including tree preservation ordinances that are applicable to the project site. According to La Mesa's Municipal Code Section 24.02.037, the City maintains a Tree Policy Manual that provides for policies and guidelines for the planting, care, preservation, maintenance, and removal of trees within the public right-of-way and on private property. The project would remove the existing non-native trees on site and would implement landscaping as outlined in the conceptual landscaping plan prepared for the project. The project would incorporate more trees and landscaping than currently exists on site. The proposed project would not conflict with any ordinance regarding tree preservation, and impacts related to this issue would be less than significant.

f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City of La Mesa Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan (City of La Mesa 1998) is a local habitat conservation plan prepared pursuant to the Natural Community Conservation Planning Act to supplement the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program Subregional Plan. The San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program is intended to provide for the protection and conservation of the region's sensitive plant and wildlife species habitat while continuing to allow appropriate levels of development and growth. The project site is within a developed area of the city and is not within a preserve or core biological area of the La Mesa Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan, nor contains any species protected by the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program or any other Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

MM-BIO-1 Nesting Bird Surveys. Construction-related ground-disturbing activities (e.g., clearing/grubbing, grading, and other intensive activities) that occur during the nesting season (January 15 through August 31) shall require a one-time biological survey for nesting bird species to be conducted by a qualified biologist within the limits of work within 72 hours prior to construction. This survey is necessary to ensure avoidance of impacts to nesting raptors and/or birds protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and California Fish and Game Code, Sections 3503 and 3513. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and mapped on the construction plans or a biological resources figure, and the information provided to the construction supervisor and any personnel

working near the nest buffer. Active nests shall have "no work zone" buffers established around them (e.g., 250 feet for passerines to 500 feet for raptors) by the project biologist in the field with brightly colored flagging tape, conspicuous fencing, or other appropriate barriers or signage. The project biologist shall serve as a construction monitor during those periods when construction activities occur near active nest areas to avoid inadvertent impacts to these nests. The project biologist may adjust the 250-foot or 500-foot setback at his or her discretion depending on the species and the location of the nest (e.g., if the nest is well protected in an area buffered by dense vegetation). However, if needed, additional qualified monitor(s) shall be provided in order to monitor active nest(s) or other project activities in order to ensure all of the project biologist's duties are completed. Once the nest is no longer occupied for the season as determined by the project biologist, construction may proceed in the setback areas.

If construction activities, particularly clearing/grubbing, grading, and other intensive activities, stop for more than 3 days, an additional nesting bird survey shall be conducted within the proposed impact area.

2.5 Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The following analysis is based, in part, on the Built Environment Inventory and Evaluation Report prepared by Dudek in March 2024 (Appendix C), and the Cultural Resources Inventory Report prepared by Dudek in April 2024 (Appendix D).

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As defined by the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.), a "historical resource" is considered to be a resource that is listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), has been identified as significant in a historical resource survey, or is listed on a local register of historical resources. Under CEQA, a project may have a significant effect on the environment if it may cause "a substantial adverse change in

the significance of an historical resource" (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5[b]). If a site is listed or eligible for listing in the CRHR, or included in a local register of historic resources, or identified as significant in a historical resources survey (meeting the requirements of PRC Section 5024.1[q]), it is a historical resource and is presumed to be historically or culturally significant for the purposes of CEQA (PRC Section 21084.1; 14 CCR 15064.5[a]).

As outlined in Appendix C, the project proposes the demolition of the three existing buildings on the project site associated with Cavalry Church for the construction of 73 townhomes and associated amenities. The Built Environment Inventory and Evaluation Report prepared for the site evaluated built environment resources consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These efforts included a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, the development of a study area or area of potential impact (API), an intensive-level survey of the API for built resources of historic age (45 years of age or older); building development and archival research, the creation of appropriate historic contexts, and recordation and evaluation of 14 historic-era properties located in the API under the NRHP, CRHR, and City of La Mesa listing criteria.

Dudek's archival research and field survey found 14 historic-era properties in the API. None of the subject properties were previously recorded. Dudek concludes that none of the subject properties are eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, or La Mesa's local register due to a lack of significant associations and architectural merit. The recommended California Historical Resource Status Code for these properties is 6Z, indicating that they were found ineligible for the NRHP, CRHR, and local designation through a survey evaluation. The project site contains three buildings including the Calvary church with connected sanctuary on its east elevation constructed in 1959 and two educational buildings constructed in 1973, located north of the church.

For the reasons stated above and detailed in Appendix C, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts to historical resources.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As outlined in the Cultural Resources Inventory prepared for the project site (Appendix D), a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) was conducted for the project area and a 1-mile search buffer. The SCIC records search indicated that no cultural resources intersect the project area. However, 34 previous cultural resources have been recorded within the 1-mile search buffer of the project site.

In addition to the records search, a search of the Sacred Lands Files from the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was conducted in January 2024. A response letter was received via email from the NAHC on February 15, 2024, stating that the results were positive. As a result, Dudek mailed outreach letters on February 19, 2024, to all Native American group representatives included on the NAHC contact list. These letters attempted to solicit additional information relating to Native American resources that may be impacted by the project. No responses have been received to date.

A pedestrian survey was also conducted on the project site that did not identify any visible cultural resources within the project area. A Native American monitor from Red Tail Environmental Inc. was present during the pedestrian survey.

As discussed in response to Threshold 2.5(a), due to the presence of historic-age buildings in the project area, there is a moderate sensitivity for identifying unanticipated historic-age subsurface archaeological deposits during project construction. Based on consultation with the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-5, outlined below, are proposed. Implementation of MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-5 would reduce potential unanticipated project impacts to cultural resources to less than significant.

c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. No prehistoric or historic burials were identified within the project site as a result of the records search, NAHC Sacred Lands File search, or the pedestrian survey. Although no burials were identified, there still remains the potential to unearth unidentified resources during project construction. Project implementation of MM-CUL-6 would ensure that potential impacts related to human remains as a result of project construction would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure

MM-CUL-1 Prior to the issuance of a Grading Permit, the Applicant/Property Owner shall enter into a pre-excavation agreement with the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians**.** A copy of the signed agreement shall be included in the Grading Plan Submittals for the Grading Permit. The agreement shall include, but not limited, outlining provisions and requirements for addressing the treatment of cultural resources; project grading and developing scheduling; terms of compensation for the monitors; treatment and final disposition of any cultural resources, sacred sites, and human remains discovered on the site; and establishing on-site monitoring provisions and/or requirements for professional Tribal monitors during ground disturbing activities.

MM-CUL-2 Prior to the issuance of a Grading Permit, the Applicant/ Property Owner or Grading Contractor shall retain a Qualified Archaeologist/Principal Investigator, meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, to oversee and establish monitoring efforts as needed (increase, decrease, or discontinue monitoring frequency) based on the observed potential for construction activities to encounter cultural deposits or material.

MM-CUL-3 The Qualified Archaeologist and San Pasqual Native American Monitor shall attend all applicable pre-construction meetings with the General Contractor and/or associated Subcontractors to present the archaeological monitoring program. The Qualified Archaeologist and San Pasqual Native American Monitor shall be present on-site full-time during all initial ground disturbing activities to confirm there are no subsurface deposits. If disturbed sediments (e.g., fill) or other sediments and formations are identified that do not have the potential to contain cultural resources, and in consultation with the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indian, monitoring may be reduced or terminated.

MM-CUL-4 In the event cultural resources (sites, features, or artifacts), are encountered during project-related ground disturbing activities, all work occurring within 100 feet of the

discovery will immediately stop until the qualified archaeologist in consultation with the San Pasqual Native American Monitor shall evaluate the significance of the find and determine whether additional study is warranted. Non-Native American resources shall be curated at an appropriate qualified repository in San Diego County that meets federal standards per 36 CFR Part 79.

In the event Native American Cultural resources are identified during project-related ground disturbing activities, the following procedures shall be carried out for final disposition; One or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed in consultation with the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians. Evidence of such shall be provided to the City of La Mesa.

1. Preservation-In-Place of the cultural resources. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in the place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resource(s).

2. Reburial of the cultural resource(s) on the Project property. The Preservation Site(s) will be located within the Project site development envelope of the Project, as determined by the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians and the Applicant/Property Owner. The measures for reburial shall include, at least, the following: Measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any future impacts in perpetuity. Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed, with an exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded. Any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate. Listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the confidential Monitoring Report.

3. If there are no areas to repatriate any cultural resource(s) that are found on the Project property, the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians will take possession of the cultural resource(s) and will repatriate the cultural resource(s) at a later time.

MM-CUL-5 Prior to the release of the grading bond, a monitoring report and/or evaluation report, if appropriate, which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of the archaeological monitoring program, shall be submitted by the Qualified Archaeologist, along with the San Pasqual Native American monitor's notes and comments, to the City of La Mesa for approval. The monitoring report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center.

MM-CUL-6 In accordance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, if human remains are found, the County Coroner shall be notified within 24 hours of the discovery. No further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains shall occur until the County Coroner has determined, within two working days of notification of the discovery, the appropriate treatment and disposition of the human remains. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in Sacramento within 24 hours. In accordance with California Public Resources Code, Section 5097.98, the NAHC must immediately notify those persons it believes to be the most likely descended (MLD) from the deceased Native American. The MLD shall complete their inspection within 48

hours of being granted access to the site. The designated Native American representative would then determine, in consultation with the Applicant/Property Owner, the disposition of the human remains.

2.6 Energy

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy – Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) ***Would the project result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?***

Less-than-Significant Impact.

Construction

Electricity

Temporary electric power for as-necessary lighting and electronic equipment (such as computers inside temporary construction trailers) would be provided by San Diego Gas & Electric. The electricity used for such activities would be temporary, would be substantially less than that required for project operation, and would have a negligible contribution to the project's overall energy consumption.

Natural Gas

Natural gas is not anticipated to be required during construction of the project. Fuels used for construction would primarily consist of diesel and gasoline, which are discussed below under the Petroleum subsection. Any minor amounts of natural gas that may be consumed as a result of project construction would be substantially less than that required for project operation and would have a negligible contribution to the project's overall energy consumption.

Petroleum

Heavy-duty construction equipment associated with construction activities would rely on diesel fuel. Construction workers would travel to and from the project site throughout the duration of construction. It is

assumed in this analysis that construction workers would travel to and from the site in gasoline-powered passenger vehicles.

Heavy-duty construction equipment of various types would be used during each phase of project construction. Appendix A lists the assumed equipment usage for each phase of construction.

Fuel consumption from construction equipment, haul trucks, vendor trucks, and worker vehicles was estimated by converting the total carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions from each construction phase (see Table 10 in Section 2.8) to gallons using the conversion factors for CO_2 to gallons of gasoline or diesel. The conversion factor for gasoline is 8.78 kilograms per metric ton CO_2 per gallon, and the conversion factor for diesel is 10.21 kilograms per metric ton CO_2 per gallon (The Climate Registry 2021). The estimated diesel fuel usage from construction is shown in Table 8.

Table 8. Total Proposed Project Construction Petroleum Demand

Scenario	Off-Road Equipment (diesel)	Haul Trucks (diesel)	Vendor Trucks (diesel)	Worker Vehicles (gasoline)
	Gallons			
Project Construction	44,836	12,179	5,827	3,418
	Total Petroleum Consumed for Project Construction			66,259

Source: Appendix A

In summary, construction of the project is anticipated to consume 3,412 gallons of gasoline and 66,259 gallons of diesel. The project will be subject to CARB's In-Use Off-Road Diesel Vehicle Regulation that applies to certain off-road diesel engines, vehicles, or equipment greater than 25 horsepower. The regulation (1) imposes limits on idling, requires a written idling policy, and requires a disclosure when selling vehicles; (2) requires all vehicles to be reported to CARB (using the Diesel Off-Road Online Reporting System) and labeled; (3) restricts the adding of older vehicles into fleets starting on January 1, 2014; and (4) requires fleets to reduce their emissions by retiring, replacing, or repowering older engines, or installing Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategies (i.e., exhaust retrofits). The fleet must either show that its fleet average index was less than or equal to the calculated fleet average target rate, or that the fleet has met the Best Achievable Control Technology requirements. Therefore, impacts to energy resources during construction would be less than significant.

Operation

Electricity

The operation of the project would require electricity for multiple purposes, including cooling, lighting, and appliances. Additionally, the supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water would indirectly result in electricity usage. Electricity consumption associated with project operation is based on the CalEEMod outputs presented in Appendix A.

CalEEMod default values for energy consumption for each land use were applied for the project analysis. Energy use in buildings is divided by the program into end use categories subject to Title 24 requirements (end uses associated with the building envelope, such as the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning

system) and those not subject to Title 24 requirements (such as appliances, electronics, and miscellaneous "plug-in" uses).

Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations serves to enhance and regulate California's building standards. The most recent amendments to Title 24, Part 6, referred to as the 2022 standards, became effective on January 1, 2023. The project would consume approximately 303,160 kilowatt-hours per year during operation (Appendix A).

Natural Gas

As stated in PDF-AQ-1, the project would not use any natural gas fireplaces, stoves, or appliances. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in the consumption of natural gas.

Petroleum

During operations, the majority of fuel consumption resulting from the project would involve the use of forklifts and motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site.

Petroleum fuel consumption associated with motor vehicles traveling to and from the project site is a function of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a result of project operation. CalEEMod estimates that the annual VMT attributable to the project is expected to be 1,126,537 total miles per year. Similar to the construction worker and vendor trips, fuel consumption from worker and truck trips are estimated by converting the total CO_2 emissions from operation of the project to gallons using the conversion factors for CO_2 to gallons of gasoline or diesel. Calculations for annual mobile source fuel consumption are provided in Table 9.

Table 9. Operational Annual Mobile Source Petroleum Demand

Fuel	Source	Vehicle MT CO2	kg/CO2/Gallon	Gallons
Gasoline	Vehicles	214	8.78	24,374
Diesel	Vehicles	189	10.21	18,511
			Total	**42,885**

Sources: Trips and vehicle CO_2 (Appendix A); kg/CO_2/Gallon (The Climate Registry 2021).
Notes: MT = metric ton; CO_2 = carbon dioxide; kg = kilogram

As shown in Table 9, total petroleum consumption for the project annually is estimated to be 42,885 gallons.[3]

Summary

Over the lifetime of the project, the fuel efficiency of the vehicles being used by the residents of the project is expected to increase. There are numerous regulations in place that require and encourage increased fuel efficiency. For example, CARB has adopted a new approach to passenger vehicles by combining the control of smog-causing pollutants and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions into a single coordinated package of standards. The new approach also includes efforts to support and accelerate the number of plug-in hybrids and zero-emission vehicles in California (CARB 2017). Additionally, in response to SB 375, CARB adopted the goal of reducing per-capita GHG emissions from 2005 levels by 8% by the year 2020 and 13%

[3] For context, California *California consumed approximately 26 billion gallons of petroleum in 2022 (EIA 2024).*

by the year 2035 for light-duty passenger vehicles in the SCAG planning area. This reduction would occur by reducing VMT through the integration of land use planning and transportation. As such, the amount of gasoline and petroleum consumed as a result of vehicular trips to and from the project site during operation would decrease over time, due to advances in fuel economy.

In summary, implementation of the project would increase the demand for electricity at the project site and petroleum consumption in the region during construction and operation. However, as the project would be consistent with current regulations and policies, including the State Building Energy Efficiency Standards, the project would not be wasteful, inefficient, and would not result in unnecessary energy resource consumption. The project's energy consumption demands during construction and operation would conform to the State's Title 24 standards such that the project would not be expected to wastefully use gas and electricity. Since the proposed project would comply with Title 24 conservation standards, the proposed project would not directly require the construction of new energy generation or supply facilities or result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy. Moreover, vehicle usage associated with the project would use less petroleum due to advances in fuel economy and potential reduction in VMT over time. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would be subject to and would comply with, at a minimum, the California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (24 CCR, Part 6). Part 6 of Title 24 establishes energy efficiency standards for residential and nonresidential buildings constructed in California in order to reduce energy demand and consumption. The proposed project would also be subject to Part 11 of Title 24, also known as the CALGreen building standards. CALGreen institutes mandatory minimum environmental performance standards for all ground-up, new construction of commercial, low-rise residential, high-rise residential, state-owned buildings, schools, and hospitals, as well as certain residential and non-residential additions and alterations. Construction and operation of the proposed project is not expected to conflict with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

2.7 Geology and Soils

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The following analysis is based, in part, on the Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation prepared by LGC Geotechnical Inc. in June 2023, which is included as Appendix E, and the Paleontological Records Search, which is Confidential Appendix F.

a) Would the project directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is in tectonically active Southern California. However, no active or potentially active fault is known to exist at the project site, nor is the site situated within an Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone. The nearest faults include the Mission Gorge fault, which is approximately 4.76 miles west of the project site and La Naction Fault, which is approximately 4.82 miles west of the project site. Based on the lack of active or potentially active faults underlying the project area, the potential for surface rupture is low and the project site would not be subject to a greater seismic risk than other locations within the region. Additionally, per the Alquist–Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, because the project site is not located in an Alquist–Priolo Fault Zone, the proposed project would not place any prohibited uses (e.g., uses containing structures with a capacity of 300 people or more; uses with the potential to severely damage the environment or cause major loss of life; or specific civic uses including police and fire stations, schools, hospitals, rest homes, nursing homes, and emergency communication facilities) within an Alquist–Priolo Fault Zone (Appendix E). Thus, the potential for loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault is considered low.

The proposed project would be designed in accordance with applicable California Building Code criteria, including those specific to resistance to seismic shaking. Furthermore, the proposed project would be constructed in accordance with other applicable City regulations and current seismic design specifications of the Structural Engineers Association of California. These required seismic design considerations are used to minimize structural damage in the event of ground shaking. Therefore, the proposed project's impacts associated with rupture of a known earthquake fault and strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Liquefaction typically occurs when a site is subjected to strong seismic shaking, on-site soils are cohesionless, groundwater is encountered within 50 feet of the surface, and soil relative densities are less than approximately 70%. The project site is not located in an area of liquefaction susceptibility on the County's Liquefaction Hazard Map and during the Geotechnical Evaluation, groundwater was not encountered to the maximum explored depth of 14 feet. Liquefaction and seismic settlement potential on the site are considered negligible due to very hard/dense native soils (Appendix E). Therefore, project impacts associated with liquefaction would be less than significant.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact. The project site is relatively flat with a descending slope along the southern and eastern project boundaries and an ascending slope at the northern boundary. The project site primarily consists of disturbed and developed land, including the development of Cavalry Chapel, a surface parking lot, turf area, a playground, and associated church facilities/structures. Moreover, the project site is not within a

Landslide Zone (CDC 2023). Additionally, the Geotechnical Evaluation determined that regional geologic mapping and local topographic expressions do not indicate the presence of large-scale landslides within or adjacent to the project site (Appendix E). Therefore, the project site is not considered susceptible to landslides and no impact would occur.

b) Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is relatively flat with a descending slope along the southern and eastern project boundaries and an ascending slope at the northern boundary. The project site and surrounding area are fully developed. Construction activities would be required to comply with the City's Grading Ordinance, which contains design standards and performance requirements that must be met. Due to the low probability of liquefaction, the potential for lateral spreading is considered low to avoid or reduce, to an acceptable level, excessive erosion in addition to the City's Best Management Practices for Construction Activities, which includes sediment control. Furthermore, in accordance with Municipal Code requirements (Municipal Code 14.29.090), the proposed project would implement all recommendations pertaining to soil erosion or loss of topsoil as contained within the Geotechnical Evaluation prepared for the project (Appendix E). As such, impacts related to soil erosion and the loss of topsoil would be less than significant.

c) Would the project 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?

No Impact. As described above, the project site is relatively flat with a descending slope along the southern and eastern project boundaries and an ascending slope at the northern boundary. Please refer to the analysis above under Threshold 2.7(a)(iv) regarding the potential for landslides. Lateral spreading is a type of liquefaction induced ground failure resulting from liquefaction. Due to the low probability of liquefaction, the potential for lateral spreading is considered low. The Geotechnical Evaluation determined that the potential for landslides, liquefaction, or slope instabilities to occur is negligible (Appendix E). The proposed project would be required to comply with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Evaluation regarding earthwork activities. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The Geotechnical Evaluation determined that site soils are anticipated to be of low expansion potential (EI of 50 or less per ASTM D4829). The proposed project would be required to comply with the recommendations established in the Geotechnical Evaluation regarding earthwork activities to ensure the project would not create a direct or indirect risk to future residents (Appendix E). As such, impacts related to expansive soils would be less than significant.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. The proposed project would not include septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. The proposed project would construct private on-site sewer lines which would connect to existing City infrastructure. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The proposed project is within the Coastal Plain Region of the Peninsular Ranges Geomorphic Province. This province is a 900-mile-long northwest-southeast-trending structural block that extends from the tip of the Baja California Peninsula to the Transverse Ranges (i.e., the San Bernardino and San Gabriel Mountains in Southern California). A paleontological survey was prepared for the project to confirm geologic mapping and locate any potential paleontological resources (Confidential Appendix F). A paleontological records search performed by the San Diego Natural History Museum identified two documented fossil collection localities within a 1-mile radius of the project site. The recorded fossil collection localities are from the Mission Valley Formation. However, due to the developed nature of the project site, geologic exposures were not present and no paleontological resources have been identified.

According to surficial geological mapping by Tan (2002) at a scale of 1:24,000, Todd (2004) at a 1:100,00 scale, and the International Chronostratigraphic Chart by Cohen et al. (2023), the study area is underlain by the middle to late Eocene-age (approximately 37 million years ago to 42 million years ago) Pomerado Conglomerate (map unit Tp) and the middle Eocene-age (approximately 43 million years ago) Mission Valley Formation (map unit Tmv). Most of the project area is mapped as Mission Valley Formation; however, there are small amounts of the overlying Pomerado Conglomerate mapped in the northeastern portion of the project site. The Mission Valley Formation is named for deposits on the south wall of Mission Valley on the west side of State Highway 163 (Kennedy and Moore 1971). It has a maximum thickness of 60 meters and is characterized as a highly friable and fossiliferous marine sandstone (Kennedy 1975). The Mission Valley Formation is conformably overlain by the Pomerado Conglomerate, which has a maximum thickness of 55 meters. It was named for exposures located at the divide between Carroll Canyon and Poway Valley along Pomerado Road, east of the project area in the Poway quadrangle (Peterson and Kennedy 1974). It is described as a massive cobble conglomerate with sandstone interbeds and contains both marine and non-marine facies (Kennedy 1975).

A paleontological survey was conducted by Dudek paleontologist Samuel Allen on February 23, 2024, to inspect exposed geology in order to confirm geologic mapping and locate any potential paleontological resources. Due to the vegetated and developed nature of the project area, geologic exposures were not present and no paleontological resources were located.

A paleontological records search request was sent to the San Diego Natural History Museum on February 1, 2024, and the results were received on February 13, 2024 (SDNHM 2024). The San Diego Natural History Museum has two documented fossil collection localities within a 1-mile radius of the project site. The recorded fossil collection localities are from the Mission Valley Formation. The San Diego Natural History Museum did not report any Pomerado fossil localities within 1 mile of the project site; however, they did indicate the formation has produced significant invertebrate and vertebrate fossils within San Diego County (SDNHM 2024).

The fluvial and nearshore marine deposits of the Pomerado Conglomerate underlie the northeastern portion of the project site. The San Diego Natural History Museum did not report any fossil localities from the Pomerado Conglomerate within a 1-mile radius of the project; however, both the lower conglomerate member and the upper conglomerate member of the Pomerado Conglomerate have yielded remains of terrestrial mammals (e.g., insectivores, primates, rodents, and artiodactyls) (SDNHM 2024). The upper

conglomerate member produced an important and diverse terrestrial mammal fauna (e.g., *Hypertragulus*, *Hyaenodon*, *Mesohippus*, opossums, insectivores, and rodents). The middle Miramar Sandstone Member has yielded nearshore marine invertebrate fossils (e.g., clams and snails) and a few terrestrial mammals (e.g., *Protoreodon*, *Leptoreodon*, and *Miacis*) (Deméré and Walsh 1993). The Pomerado Conglomerate has high paleontological resource sensitivity or potential.

The Mission Valley Formation, which consists of marine and fluvial deposits, underlies the majority of the project site. The San Diego Natural History Museum reported two fossil localities from the Mission Valley Formation within a 1-mile radius of the project site. These localities produced fossil remains of terrestrial vertebrates, including a partial skull, jaw, appendicular (limb) elements, and teeth of *Protoreodon walshi*, which is a primitive oreodont (SDNHM 2024). In addition, the museum reported fossil teeth from a small camel (*Protylopus stocki*). The marine facies of the Mission Valley Formation have yielded numerous, well-preserved remains of marine invertebrates and vertebrates, including microfossils (e.g., foraminifers), macroinvertebrates (e.g., clams, snails, crustaceans, and sea urchins), and vertebrates (e.g., sharks, rays, and bony fish) (SDNHM 2024). The museum also reported the following taxa from the fluvial portions of the Mission Valley Formation: petrified wood and remains of terrestrial fossil mammals (e.g., opossums, insectivores, bats, primates, rodents, artiodactyls, and perissodactyls). The Mission Valley Formation has high paleontological resource sensitivity or potential.

No paleontological resources were identified within the project site as a result of the paleontological records search or desktop geological and paleontological review, and the project site is not anticipated to be underlain by unique geologic features. However, potential impacts to paleontological resources that may be unearthed during construction is considered a potentially significant impact. However, implementation of MM-GEO-1 would ensure that potential impacts to paleontological resources during construction activities would be reduced to less than significant. By retaining a qualified paleontological monitor and preparing a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program, potential paleontological resources can be identified and recovered.

Mitigation Measure

MM-GEO-1 Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program and Paleontological Monitoring. Prior to commencement of any grading activity on site, the applicant/developer or its designee shall retain a qualified paleontologist per the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) 2010 guidelines to prepare a Paleontological Resources Impact Mitigation Program (PRIMP) for the project. The PRIMP shall be consistent with the SVP 2010 guidelines and outline requirements for: preconstruction meeting attendance and worker environmental awareness training; where paleontological monitoring is required within the project site based on construction plans and/or geotechnical reports; and, procedures for construction monitoring, fossil salvage and data recovery, laboratory preparation and curation of the fossils into the permanent fossil collections of an appropriate regional repository and production of a final paleontological mitigation report.

In addition, a qualified paleontological monitor shall be on site during initial rough grading and other significant ground-disturbing activities (including augering greater than 2 feet in diameter) in areas underlain by the Mission Valley formation or Pomerado Conglomerate. No paleontological monitoring is necessary during ground disturbance within artificial fill, if determined to be present. In the event that paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) are

unearthed during grading, the paleontological monitor shall temporarily halt and/or divert grading activity to allow recovery of paleontological resources. The area of discovery shall be roped off with a 50-foot radius buffer. Once documentation and collection of the find is completed, the monitor shall allow grading to recommence in the area of the find. Any fossil lab or curation costs (if necessary due to fossil recovery) are the responsibility of the City of La Mesa or its designee.

2.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The section herein is based on findings from the Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Report prepared for the proposed project, included as Appendix A to this IS/MND.

a) Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Less-than-Significant Impact. There is no numeric emissions-based threshold by which the City could evaluate whether project emissions would exceed a threshold of significance as indicated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(2). However, a discussion of proposed project construction and operational GHG emissions is included for informational purposes below.

Table 10 shows the estimated annual GHG construction emissions associated with the project. Complete details of the construction emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A.

Table 10. Estimated Annual Construction GHG Emissions

Year	CO_2	CH_4	N_2O	R	CO_2e
	Metric Tons				
2025	392.27	0.02	0.02	0.14	399.72
2026	250.76	0.01	0.01	0.08	253.79
2027	28.59	0.00	0.00	0.01	28.92
Total	**671.62**	**0.03**	**0.03**	**0.23**	**682.43**
				Amortized Emissions (30 years)	*22.75*

Source: CalEEMod Version 2022.1.
Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; CO2 = carbon dioxide; CH4 = methane; N2O = nitrous oxide; CO2e = carbon dioxide equivalent. See Appendix A for complete results. <0.01 = reported value is less than 0.01.

As shown in Table 10, the estimated total GHG emissions from construction of the project would be approximately 682 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e). When amortized over 30 years, the estimated annual GHG emissions from construction of the project would be approximately 23 MT CO_2e per year.

Table 11 shows the estimated annual GHG operational emissions associated with the project. As discussed above, total annual operational emissions were combined with amortized (30 years) construction emissions.

Table 11. Summary of Operational GHG Emissions

Emissions Source	MT CO_2	MT CH_4	MT N_2O	MT R	MT CO_2e
Mobile	401.78	0.02	0.02	0.54	408.04
Area	67.11	0.07	0.00	—	68.89
Energy	160.65	0.01	0.00	—	161.15
Water	6.71	0.08	0.00	—	9.40
Waste	4.83	0.48	0.00	—	16.90
Refrigerants	—	—	—	0.09	0.09
Total	641.08	0.67	0.02	0.64	664.47
				Amortized Construction Emissions (20 years)	22.75
				Total Project Emissions	***687.22***

Source: See Appendix A for complete results.
Notes: GHG = greenhouse gas; MT = metric tons; CO_2 = carbon dioxide; CH_4 = methane; N_2O = nitrous oxide; CO_2e = carbon dioxide equivalent. <0.01 = reported value is less than 0.01.

As shown in Table 11, implementation of the project would result in approximately 687 MT CO_2e per year including amortized construction emissions. Complete details of the construction emissions calculations are provided in Appendix A.

The City adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) on March 13, 2018, which is a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Consistency with the CAP would demonstrate that the proposed project also would generate GHG emissions that have a less-than-significant impact on the environment. As shown below, the proposed project is consistent with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, and therefore, the proposed project would generate GHG emissions that would have a less-than-significant impact on the environment.

b) Would the project generate conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City's adopted CAP outlines actions that the City will undertake to achieve its proportional share of state GHG emissions reductions (City of La Mesa 2018). The CAP is a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5.

The City's CAP contains a baseline inventory of GHG emissions for 2010, a projection of emissions to 2020 and 2035, emissions reduction targets with implementation of the CAP, and 2050 emissions planning. The

City emitted a total of 422,672 MT CO_2e in 2010. Transportation was the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the City (58%), with energy use contributing the majority of the remainder (35%). Accounting for future population and economic growth, the City projected GHG emissions of 376,142 MT CO_2e in 2020 and 341,047 MT CO_2e in 2035 (City of La Mesa 2018). The 2020 reduction target was selected to implement the City's General Plan Environmental Impact Report Mitigation Measure 4.5-5, GHG-1, which calls for a CAP and a 15% GHG reduction (City of La Mesa 2013a). The CAP also includes a reduction target to reduce emissions below the 2010 baseline by 53% by 2035, consistent with state targets. Therefore, the City must implement strategies that reduce emissions to 359,271 MT CO_2e in 2020 and 237,640 MT CO_2e in 2035. By meeting the 2020 and 2035 targets, the City will meet the 2030 state goal identified in SB 32 and maintain a trajectory to meet its proportional share of the 2050 state target identified in Executive Order S-3-05 (City of La Mesa 2018).

The City has not established a significance threshold under the City's CAP, but the CAP includes reduction measures, strategies, and actions that the City will implement to reduce GHG emissions. In addition, the City's General Plan includes various objectives and policies to facilitate alternative modes of transportation, reduce waste, conserve water, and promote the efficient and sustainable use of energy. The proposed project was assessed for consistency with the City's General Plan and CAP (see Tables 12 and 13).

Evaluation of Project Consistency with the City of La Mesa's General Plan

On July 9, 2013, the City Council adopted the City's General Plan (City of La Mesa 2013b). The Land Use and Urban Design Element and the Conservation and Sustainability Element include objectives and policies that support the reduction of GHG emissions. Table 12 includes the proposed project's consistency with those objectives.

Table 12. Consistency with City of La Mesa's General Plan Objectives

General Plan Objectives	Project Consistency
Objective UD-3.1. Development that is architecturally and environmentally sensitive and is compatible with neighboring design and scale.	The proposed project would comply with the current CALGreen standards. The proposed project has been designed to include landscape throughout the project site that would provide shade trees.
Objective CS-1.1. Create compact, mixed-used projects with amenities to enhance the City's natural setting.	The proposed project would be consistent with this objective. The proposed project includes multi-family residential use, as well as landscaping that would enhance La Mesa's natural setting.
Objective CS-1.4. Collaborate with partner agencies, utilities and businesses to support a range of energy efficiency and conservation measures.	The proposed project would comply with the current Title 24 standards, Part 6 and Part 11 (CALGreen). Additionally, as a result of PDF-AQ-1, the project would incorporate electric-vehicle-ready parking garages and energy-conserving spray foam in attics.
Objective CS-2.1. Facilitate solid waste reduction measures.	The proposed project would comply with the waste diversion requirements of Assembly Bill 341 and Senate Bill 1383.
Objective CS-2.2. Reduce the level of pollutants entering the air.	The proposed project would comply with California Air Resources Board and San Diego Air Pollution Control District requirements.

Table 12. Consistency with City of La Mesa's General Plan Objectives

General Plan Objectives	Project Consistency
Objective CS-3.1. Facilitate a reduction of automobile dependency in favor of affordable alternative, sustainable modes of travel.	The project site is adequately served by existing public transit, including being located approximately 0.5 miles from the Amaya Drive Light Rail Station. As such, the proposed project would facilitate use of alternative transit over automobile dependency. Furthermore, bike parking would be provided in the project site.

Source: City of La Mesa 2013b.

Evaluation of Project Consistency with the City of La Mesa's Climate Action Plan

There is no numeric emissions-based threshold by which the City could evaluate whether project emissions would exceed a threshold of significance as indicated in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.4(b)(2). However, the City adopted a CAP on March 13, 2018, which is a plan for the reduction of GHG emissions in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5. Table 13 summarizes the proposed project's consistency with those strategies.

Table 13. Consistency with City of La Mesa's Climate Action Plan Strategies

Climate Action Plan Strategies	Project Consistency
Strategy E-2 Shade Tree Program. Develop a shade tree program to require developers and property owners to plant shade trees.	The proposed project has been designed to include landscape throughout the project site that would provide shade trees.
Strategy E-5 Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Program. Install solar PV systems on residential and non-residential property in the community, and identify opportunities for municipal installations on City property.	The project would comply with the current Title 24 solar requirements.
Strategy E-6 Solar Hot Water Heater Program. Install solar water heaters in new construction and building retrofits.	As stated in PDF-AQ-1, the project would incorporate electric water heaters and would comply with the current Title 24 solar requirements.
Strategy E-7 Solar Ready Construction. Incorporate solar-ready design into new construction, including building orientation for maximum solar exposure, pre-wiring and pre-plumbing for solar PV and solar hot water, and roof system construction that can handle additional loads from potential future solar installations.	The project would comply with the current Title 24 solar requirements.
Strategy E-8 Zero Net Energy Construction. Implement California's zero net energy building standards for new residential construction starting in 2020 and new non-residential construction starting in 2030.	Proposed project construction would comply with the applicable Title 24 standards, Part 6 and Part 11. As stated in PDF-AQ-1, the project would require all-electric appliances.
Strategy T-1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Development. Continue to plan for and construct safe, attractive bicycle and pedestrian paths and facilities within the community, and provide education programs aimed at increasing use of alternative transportation options.	Currently, the closest Class II bike lanes to the project site are along Amaya Drive. Contiguous sidewalks are also provided on both sides of Amaya Drive and Jericho Road. The project would include the construction of bicycle parking. The proposed project does not conflict

Table 13. Consistency with City of La Mesa's Climate Action Plan Strategies

Climate Action Plan Strategies	Project Consistency
	with City's Smart Growth – Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Plan and would comply with Strategy T-1.
Strategy T-4 Mixed-Use and Transit-Oriented Development. Continue to encourage mixed-use and transit-oriented development through land use and zoning designations to support alternative transportation opportunities.	The proposed project includes multi-family residential use, in an area served by existing transit (i.e., located approximately 0.5 miles from the Amaya Drive Light Rail Station).
Strategy W-2 Water Sensitive Landscape Design and Irrigation. Conserve water through efficient landscaping design and irrigation.	Proposed project landscape would comply with the City's Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (MWELO) state requirements.
Strategy SW-1 Food Scrap and Yard Waste Diversion. Work with local waste hauler to develop residential food scrap and compostable paper collection program.	The proposed project would not interfere with the City's pursuit of developing and implementing a residential food scrap and recycling program.
Strategy SW-2 Construction & Demolition Waste Diversion Program. Continue to enforce the City's construction and demolition waste diversion ordinance.	Proposed project construction would comply with the City of La Mesa's (City) 75% construction and demolition waste diversion requirement, California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), and CALGreen.
Strategy SW-3 75% Waste Diversion Goal. Maximize waste diversion efforts community-wide with particular focus on organic and recyclable waste.	The proposed project would comply with the waste diversion requirements of Assembly Bill 341 and Senate Bill 1383.
Strategy GI-2 Expanded Urban Forestry Program. Increase La Mesa's urban forest canopy coverage to reduce impacts of the heat island effect, improve stormwater management, provide additional habitat, and maximize carbon sequestration.	The proposed project would incorporate additional trees on site, which would increase the City's urban forest canopy coverage.

Source: City of La Mesa 2018.

The CAP demonstrates that, with implementation of applicable General Plan objectives and policies, coupled with state and federal actions and execution of CAP measures and actions, the City will reduce GHG emissions in alignment with state goals established by AB 32 and SB 32 and maintain a trajectory to meet its proportional share of the 2050 state target identified in Executive Order S-3-05. As described above, the proposed project would be consistent with applicable General Plan objectives and policies and CAP strategies. Furthermore, the project is located approximately 0.5 miles from the Amaya Drive Light Rail Station. The project is located in proximity to a high-quality transit stop (i.e., the Light Rail Station), which should reduce single-occupancy vehicle usage. As such, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purposes of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The proposed project's impact would be less than significant.

In summary, the project is not expected to generate GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment, and would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. The impact would be less than significant.

2.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on a site that 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Short-Term Construction Impacts

Less-than-Significant Impact. Potentially hazardous materials would likely be handled on the project site as part of project construction. These materials would include gasoline, diesel fuel, lubricants, and other petroleum-based products required to operate and maintain construction equipment. Handling of these potentially hazardous materials would be temporary and would coincide with the short-term construction phase of the project.

Although these materials would likely be stored on the project site, storage would be required to comply with the guidelines set forth by each product's manufacturer and with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to the storage of hazardous materials. Consistent with federal, state, and local requirements, the transport of hazardous materials to and from the project site would be conducted by a licensed contractor. Any handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would comply with all relevant federal, state, and local agencies and regulations, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the County Fire Department Hazardous Materials Division. Therefore, short-term construction impacts related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

Long-Term Operational Impacts

Less-than-Significant Impact. As a residential land use, potentially hazardous materials associated with operation of the project would include those materials typically associated with cleaning and maintenance activities. Although these materials would vary, they would generally include household cleaning products, solvents, paints, fertilizers, and herbicides and pesticides. Many of these materials are considered household hazardous wastes, common wastes, and universal wastes by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, which considers these types of wastes common to businesses and households and to pose a lower risk to people and the environment than other hazardous wastes when properly handled, transported, used, and disposed of (EPA 2022). Federal, state, and local regulations typically allow these types of wastes to be handled and disposed of under less-stringent standards than other hazardous wastes, and many of these wastes do not need to be managed as hazardous waste.

In addition, any potentially hazardous material handled on the project site would be limited in quantity and concentration, consistent with other similar residential uses located in the City, and any handling, transport, use, and disposal of such material would comply with applicable federal, state, and local agencies and regulations. Furthermore, as mandated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, all hazardous materials stored on the project site would be accompanied by a Materials Safety Data Sheet, which would inform on-site personnel and residents of the necessary remediation procedures in the case of accidental release (OSHA 2012). Therefore, long-term operational impacts associated with the use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Historical uses of the project site include the existing Church, associated structures and amenities. The site is currently zoned as Urban Residential (R1). The site was partially developed with several multi-purpose buildings by 1962, and the site has been used by the church since then. As discussed under Threshold 2.9(a) above, construction of the project would entail transport, use, and/or disposal of potentially hazardous materials including, but not limited to diesel fuel, gasoline, equipment fluids, concrete, cleaning solutions and solvents, and lubricant oils. As described above, the project would be required to comply with all standards required through federal, state, county, and municipal regulations, in addition to project-specific plans review by the City, which would ensure potential impacts related to hazardous materials would not be significant.

The project would involve the operation and maintenance of new residentials development. Maintenance of the proposed residential land uses and associated amenities would likely involve the use of landscaping chemicals, fertilizers, and various other commercially available products for cleaning. These materials could be stored on the project site, but storage would be required to comply with the guidelines established by the manufacturer's recommendations. Consistent with federal, state, and local requirements, the transport, removal, and disposal of hazardous materials from the project site would be conducted by a permitted and licensed service provider. Any handling, transport, use, or disposal must comply with all applicable federal, state, and local agencies and regulations. Therefore, with the required compliance with all applicable regulations, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The nearest school to the project site is Northmont Elementary School, located approximately 0.19 miles north of the project site. Although the project would be located within 0.25 miles of a school, the project would not emit substantial hazardous emissions or include handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes. Additionally, Northmont Elementary School is buffered from the project site by existing apartments, condos, and single-family homes. As previously stated, the project's compliance with all standards required through federal, state, county, and municipal regulations, in addition to project-specific plans reviewed by the City, would ensure potential impacts to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would not be substantial. Therefore, impacts associated with the emitting or handling or hazardous materials within 0.25 miles of a school would be less than significant.

d) Would the project be located on a site that 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The following hazardous waste site lists, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control's EnviroStor database, the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker site, the Cortese list, or other lists compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, were reviewed, and the project did not appear one any of these lists (CalEPA 2024; DTSC 2024; SWRCB 2024). According to the State Water Resources Control Board's GeoTracker site, there has never been any

leaking underground storage tank cases on the project site. There is a leaking underground storage tank cleanup site located approximately 1,120 feet southwest of the project site (SWRCB 2024). This case was considered completed as of August 1999. Cases are considered closed when the appropriate regulatory agency has determined that no further action is required for further land use because actions were taken to adequately remediate the release, or because the release was minor, presents no environmental risk, and no remedial action is necessary. Though closed, they remain on the Cortese List for informational purposes. This site has not been evaluated and no potential contaminants of concern have been identified. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is approximately 4.5 miles south of Gillespie Field Airport. The project site is not within any of the Gillespie Field Airport Influence Areas Safety Zones. The majority of the City, including the project site, is within Montgomery Field Airport Influence Area Review Area 2 (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2024). Review Area 2 is within the airspace protection and/or overflight notification areas. There are limits on the heights of structures in areas of high terrain, which would not apply to the project. The project site is not within 2 miles of a public airport and would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the area as the proposed residential use is consistent with existing surrounding land uses. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

f) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. According to the General Plan Safety Element, the Emergency Operations Plan governs the operations of the City during a disaster. The emergency operations plan includes the Continuity of Operations Plan, the Annex Q Evacuation Supplement, the Care & Shelter Standard Operating Procedure, the California Emergency Management Agency Crosswalk, and the After-Action Report/Corrective Action Survey. This plan addresses response to moderate evacuation scenarios, including the identification of evacuation points and general routes (City of La Mesa 2012b).

The proposed project would be required to abide by the standards set forth in the La Mesa Emergency Operations Plan. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to impact any roadway or staging areas that are identified in any emergency planning documents and would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. As required under the California Fire Code, the proposed project would be required to present development plans which afford fire and emergency responders suitable fire access roads dimensions and surfaces (Chapter 5, Section 503.1 through Section 503.4 of the California Fire Code), an adequate number of emergency rated entrances to the community (Appendix D, Section D106 of the California Fire Code), and entryway gate access for first responders (Chapter 5 of the California Fire Code, Section 503.6). The proposed point of entry and site plans will be reviewed by Heartland Fire & Rescue and would be required to meet the qualifications for emergency access to and from the project site. Therefore, impacts related to emergency response or emergency evacuation as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant.

g) Would the project expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is not located in any Fire Hazard Severity Zones (CAL FIRE 2023). The closest identified Fire Hazard Severity Zone is approximately 10 miles east of the project in Granite Hills. The project site is a currently developed lot that is relatively flat, surrounded by existing development on all sides. The proposed project would be required to comply with all applicable state and local fire codes, including compliance with the California Fire Code and La Mesa Fire Department, which require a design that affords fire and emergency responders suitable fire access roads dimensions and surfaces (Chapter 5, Sections 503.1 through 503.4 of the California Fire Code). All preliminary and final site plans would be reviewed by City staff and servicing Fire Department staff.

For the reasons stated above, and considering the project site is located in an urbanized area surrounded on all sides by existing development, implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfires, and impacts would be less than significant.

2.10 Hydrology and Water Quality

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The following analysis is based, in part, on the Preliminary Drainage Study (Appendix G) and Storm Water Quality Management Plans (SWQMPs) (Appendix H) prepared for the project by Hunsaker & Associates in July 2023, and on the Water Study (Appendix K) and Sewer Study (Appendix L) prepared by Dexter Wilson Engineering in August 2023.

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts to water quality. In addition to sediment erosion from ground-disturbing activities on the project site, fuels, oils, lubricants, and other hazardous substances used during construction could be released and potentially impact water quality.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System State Water Resources Control Board region-wide municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) Permit - Order No. R9-2013-0001, as amended by Orders R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100, and Construction General Permit Order No. 2022-0057-DWQ for stormwater discharges and general construction activities, and would incorporate standard best management practices (BMPs), such as regular cleaning or sweeping of construction areas and impervious areas, and filtration media screens. In compliance with the Construction General Permit, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, including an erosion control plan, will be prepared for the project, prior to issuance of grading permits, that would specify construction BMPs that would be implemented during construction to minimize impacts to water quality. Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program, which was prepared to implement strategies that effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges to the MS4 and reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water to the maximum extent practicable.

Compliance with the General Permit and the City of La Mesa Municipal Code Section 7.18.100 would ensure construction activities would not degrade water quality. Additionally, as outlined in Appendix G to this IS/MND, runoff from the project site would be collected by proposed inlets and routed via the proposed

storm drain system toward two underground storage facilities. The underground storage facilities serve to meet hydromodification and peak flow attenuation requirements and to store the water quality designed captured volume and releasing it at a specified flow rate to a downstream modular wetland, which will address water quality concerns. The peak flow would be routed through their respective vault riser structures and discharged into the proposed 18-inch storm drain near the entrance of the site. The runoff would then confluence with the off-site existing 39-inch storm drain on Amaya Drive and flow south similarly to existing conditions to eventually discharge into the San Diego River which empties into the Pacific Ocean. The peak flow for the project development has been calculated in accordance with the San Diego County Hydrology Manual, County of San Diego Department of Public Works Flood Control Division, June 2003 (Appendix G). With implementation of recommendations in the Drainage Report prepared for the proposed project, and incorporation of the SWQMP and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, and compliance with applicable City and state regulations, impacts related to water quality would be less than significant.

b) Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would redevelop a site that is already substantially developed with buildings and paved parking areas. Groundwater recharge areas typically occur along streambeds and other areas of high soil permeability. The City does not lie within a groundwater basin, but it is close to three groundwater basins: the San Diego River Valley Groundwater Basin, the El Cajon Groundwater Basin to the east of La Mesa, and the Mission Valley Groundwater Basin to the west. The groundwater table within the project site was not encountered at a measured depth of 14 feet below the surface (Appendix E) and it is not anticipated that de-watering would be required during construction. The project site is not considered an important recharge area, and development on the site would not interfere substantially with sustainable groundwater management of the basin. Additionally, development associated with the project would be required to comply with CALGreen standards for water efficiency and therefore would not impede sustainable management of groundwater resources. Groundwater use is not proposed for either construction or operation of the project. As the project would not use groundwater for construction or operation, and would not interfere with infiltration and groundwater recharge, implementation of the proposed project would not decrease groundwater basins through increasing water demand on site or impede sustainable groundwater management of any groundwater basin, and impacts would be less than significant.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Under existing conditions, the project site has been previously disturbed and is currently developed with a church, comprising several buildings, a concrete parking area, an asphalt basketball court, and numerous grass areas. Surface water flow from the northwestern portions of the site tends to move south toward an 18- by 18-inch catch basin situated within a sediment basin. This flow is subsequently directed eastward via an existing 3-inch HDPE drain, where it converges with runoff from the northeastern section before discharging onto Jericho Road through existing curb outlets. Surface water from the southern part of the site flows south toward a 12- by 12-inch catch basin and then to an existing curb outlet on Jericho Road. This runoff then merges with additional runoff from the southeastern part of the site and is funneled south through the Jericho Road and Amaya Drive curb and gutter systems. After

approximately 815 feet, this runoff is intercepted by an inlet situated across from Water Street on Amaya Drive. The captured flow enters an existing 39-inch reinforced concrete pipe under Amaya Drive and continues southeast under Water Street, is then discharged via an existing 3.2-foot by 5-foot box culvert into an existing channel north of Janfred Way. This runoff persists in its westward direction, entering a 10-foot by 5-foot reinforced concrete box culvert located southwest of the intersection of Amaya Drive and Severin Drive, then to dual 72-inch pipe that outlets into an existing open channel. This channel continues westerly to Alvarado Creek, eventually flowing into the lower San Diego River. The river subsequently empties into the Pacific Ocean at the mouth of the San Diego River (Appendix G).

The project would involve grading activities and construction of new buildings and impervious surfaces. Stormwater drainage in proposed conditions would be collected by on-site inlets and routed via the proposed storm drain system toward two underground storage facilities. The underground storage facilities serve to meet hydromodification and peak flow attenuation requirements releasing it at a specified flow rate to a downstream modular wetland, which addresses water quality concerns. Peak flows would be routed through their respective vault riser structure and discharged into the proposed 18-inch storm drain near the entrance of the project site. The runoff would then confluence with the off-site existing 39-inch storm drain on Amaya Drive and flow south similarly to existing conditions to eventually discharge into the San Diego River which empties into the Pacific Ocean. As determined in Appendix G, the project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. As determined in the Drainage Report prepared for the project (Appendix G), the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion on-or off-site.

With implementation of the proposed stormwater quality BMPs, the project would not generate runoff volumes that would significantly alter the overall drainage on site. Additionally, project-related runoff would be adequately treated prior to discharge into planned drainage systems via stormwater quality BMPs such that the proposed project would not provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

The proposed project is required to accommodate adequate drainage capacity on site, and connections to existing facilities, in project-specific plans that will be reviewed and approved by the City. Further, implementation of BMPs and a stormwater pollution prevention plan would ensure construction of the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site. Compliance with the stormwater pollution prevention plan and project specific SWQMP would ensure impacts related to erosion or siltation on- or -off-site would be less than significant.

ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As noted above, under existing conditions, the project site is fully developed with a church and associated amenities and paved parking areas. Through redevelopment of the site, the project would introduce new pervious areas on site through open space and landscaped areas that currently do not exist in current conditions. There are no existing streams or rivers on site that would be substantially altered as a result of project implementation. The project site is within Zone X on Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map. Zone X represents areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain (FEMA 2021). As previously described, the project site is surrounded on all sides by residential development.

As determined in Appendix G to this IS/MND, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area compared to existing conditions, nor substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The project site discharge would be conveyed to the existing storm drain system through the proposed storm drainage features discussed under Threshold 2.10(a). Underground storage with adequate outlet structure was proposed to decrease peak discharge from the site in developed conditions to be equal or less than existing values. Therefore, the project site provides adequate drainage and protection against flooding, and downstream properties would not be impacted by the project. For these reasons, impacts would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Please see the response provided under Threshold 2.10(a) and Threshold 2.10(c)(ii). As determined in Appendix G to this IS/MND, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area compared to existing conditions. The project site discharge would be conveyed to the existing storm drain system through the proposed storm drainage features discussed under Threshold 2.10(a). Underground storage with adequate outlet structure was proposed to decrease peak discharge from the site in developed conditions to be equal or less than existing values. As discussed previously, stormwater would be released to a downstream modular wetland, which would address water quality concerns. The on-site drainage system would be consistent with all applicable standards related to the collection and treatment of stormwater. Therefore, impacts associated with altering the existing drainage pattern of the project site and stormwater quality would be less than significant.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As described in response to Threshold 2.10(c)(ii), the project site is fully developed with a church and associated amenities and paved parking areas. There are no existing streams or rivers on site that would be substantially altered as a result of project implementation. The project site is within Zone X on Federal Emergency Management Agency's Flood Insurance Rate Map. Zone X represents areas determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain (FEMA 2021). As previously described, the project site is surrounded on all sides by residential development. As determined in Appendix G to this IS/MND, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area compared to existing conditions, nor substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on site or off site. As determined in Appendix G, the project would not place structures on site that would impede or redirect flood flows. For these reasons, impacts would be less than significant.

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

No Impact. The project site is approximately 13 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean and is not within a tsunami zone. The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area and is not located in a flood hazard or seiche zones. Given that the project site is not located near a large standing body of water, inundation by seiche (or standing wave) is considered negligible. The project site is generally flat with no steep slopes and does not contain slopes subject to mudflows; therefore, no impacts related to inundation would occur.

e) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City extends across the San Diego River and San Diego Bay Watershed Management Areas. Approximately 52% of the City is within the San Diego River Watershed, Hydrologic Unit (HU) 907. The remaining 48% of the City is within the San Diego Bay Watershed Management Area, which is composed of three HUs: Pueblo San Diego (HU 908), Sweetwater (HU 909), and Otay (HU 910). The City includes areas within two of the three San Diego Bay HUs: Pueblo San Diego and Sweetwater. As discussed in response to Threshold 2.10(a), the proposed project would be required to comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System State Water Resources Control Board's region-wide MS4 permit – Order No. R9-2013-0001, as amended by Orders R9-2015-0001 and R9-2015-0100, and Construction General Permit Order No. 2022-0057-DWQ for stormwater discharges and general construction activities, and would incorporate standard BMPs, such as regular cleaning or sweeping of construction areas and impervious areas, and filtration media screens. In compliance with the Construction General Permit, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, including an erosion control plan, will be prepared for the project, prior to issuance of grading permits, that would specify construction BMPs that would be implemented during construction to minimize impacts to water quality.

Furthermore, the project would be required to comply with the City's Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program, which was prepared to implement strategies that effectively prohibit non-storm water discharges to the MS4 and reduce the discharge of pollutants in storm water to the maximum extent practicable. As outlined in the City's Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program, all development within the City is required to meet minimum BMP requirements of incorporating both source control BMPs and low-impact development BMPs. The project would be required to comply with the City's local BMP Design Manual. All development projects within the City must comply with the City's BMP Design Manual, and the post-construction BMP plan approval process requires that all submitted documents meet the minimum requirements of the City and the General Construction Permit before the project commences. The Drainage Report and SWQMP prepared for the project have been reviewed by City staff including City engineers and all final project plans would be reviewed and approved prior to development (City of La Mesa 2015a). Project proposed site design BMPs, structural BMPs and source control BMPs are outlined in the SWQMP prepared for the project, included as Appendix H to this IS/MND.

The site is not located within a sustainable groundwater management plan area. As described in response to Threshold 2.10(b), the City does not lie within a groundwater basin, but it is close to three groundwater basins: the San Diego River Valley Groundwater Basin, the El Cajon Groundwater Basin to the east of La Mesa, and the Mission Valley Groundwater Basin to the west. The groundwater table within the project site was not encountered at a measured depth of 14 feet below the surface and it is not anticipated that de-watering would be required during construction. The project site is not considered an important recharge area, and development on the site would not interfere substantially with any groundwater basin. Groundwater use is not proposed for either construction or operation of the project.

For the reasons stated above, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan and impacts would be less than significant.

2.11 Land Use and Planning

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed 73-unit multi-family residential project includes a request for approval of a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Tentative Tract Map, Site Development Plan, Design Review and Special Permit for a residential development project within a 3.49-acre project site. The General Plan Amendment and Rezone would change the General Plan designation and Zoning from Urban Residential (R1) to Multiple Unit Residential (R3). The project site is located at 9407 Jericho Road in the northeastern area of the City. The project site has been previously disturbed and is currently developed with the Cavalry Chapel, a surface parking lot, turf area, a playground, ornamental plantings, and associated church facilities/structures. The project site is in an urban area of La Mesa surrounded by development, including single-family residential to the north and east, the Serena Vista Apartments to the south, and the Grossmont Village Condos to the west.

The project site is close to a range of existing infrastructure and development, including schools, parks, and shopping centers. The proposed project would not incorporate new roads or require removal of roads that currently provide access to the area. Furthermore, due to the location of the project site surrounded on all sides by existing development and roadways, no separation or disruption of surrounding uses would occur as a result of project implementation. Because the project site is surrounded on all sides by existing, similar, residential development, it is determined that the proposed project would not divide an established community, and therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project proposes a General Plan Amendment and Rezone to change the General Plan designation and zoning from Urban Residential (R1) to Multiple Unit Residential (R3) to allow for new residential uses.

Upon City approval of the General Plan Amendment/Rezone to R3, the proposed project would be required to comply with the allowable multifamily residential uses and development standards outlined in the City's

General Plan and Municipal/Zoning Code for land use R3. Although the proposed project would amend the land use designation, the proposed project would not result in a conflict with the City's General Plan Land Use Element goals, and project implementation would not impede the City's ability to achieve these goals.

The proposed project would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Therefore, with approval of the proposed General Plan Amendment/Rezone, project impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant.

2.12 Mineral Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) Would the project 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?

No Impact. The Conservation and Sustainability Element of the City's General Plan states that, La Mesa does not have many of the resources typically discussed in a Conservation Element, such as significant natural habitat areas, bodies of water, coastal zones, agriculture or mineral resources (City of La Mesa 2012c). As such, there are no known mineral resources within the City's jurisdiction that are of local, regional, or state importance. There are no recovery sites or mineral resource sites delineated in the City's General Plan, a specific plan, or other local land use plan. Implementation of the project would not result in increased loss of availability of mineral resources considering the site is currently developed. Due to the location and current state of the project site, there would be no impact to mineral resources.

b) Would the project 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?

No Impact. Please see response to Threshold 2.12(a), above.

2.13 Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE – Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The following analysis is based, in part, on the Noise Technical Report prepared for the project by Dudek in April 2024, which is included as Appendix I to this IS/MND.

The analysis herein uses the following standards to evaluate potential noise and vibration impacts:

Construction noise – A noise impact would be considered significant if construction activities were to occur outside the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., per Section 10.80.100 of the City's Municipal Code, and/or if construction noise levels exceed the Federal Transit Administration's daytime construction noise level threshold of 80 A-weighted decibels (dBA) energy equivalent sound level (L_{eq}) over an 8-hour period.

Off-site project-attributed transportation noise – For purposes of this analysis, a direct roadway noise impact would be considered significant if increases in roadway traffic noise levels attributed to the proposed project were greater than 3 dBA Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) at an existing noise-sensitive land use.

Off-site project-attributed stationary noise – For purposes of this analysis, a noise impact would be considered significant if noise from typical operation of heating, ventilation, and air conditioning and other electro-mechanical systems associated with the proposed project exceeded 60 dBA hourly L_{eq} from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., 55 dBA hourly L_{eq} from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., and 50 dBA hourly L_{eq} from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Construction vibration – Guidance from Caltrans indicates that a vibration velocity level of 0.2 inches per second (ips) peak particle velocity (PPV) received at a structure would be considered annoying by occupants (Caltrans 2020). As for the receiving structure itself, the aforementioned Caltrans guidance recommends that a vibration level of 0.3 ips PPV would represent the threshold for building damage risk.

a) Would the project result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Short-Term Construction

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Construction noise and vibration are temporary phenomena, with emission levels varying from hour to hour and day to day, depending on the equipment in use, the operations performed, and the distance between the source and receptor. Equipment that would be in use during construction would include, in part, graders, backhoes, rubber-tired dozers, loaders, cranes, forklifts, pavers, rollers, and air compressors. The typical maximum noise levels at a distance of 50 feet from various pieces of construction equipment and activities anticipated for use on the project site are presented in Table 14. Note that the equipment noise levels presented in Table 14 are maximum noise levels. Usually, construction equipment operates in alternating cycles of full power and low power, producing average noise levels over time that are less than the maximum noise level. The average sound level of construction activity also depends on the amount of time that the equipment operates and the intensity of construction activities during that time.

Table 14. Typical Construction Equipment Maximum Noise Levels

Equipment Type	Typical Equipment (Lmax, dBA at 50 Feet)
All Other Equipment greater than 5 horsepower	85
Backhoe	78
Compressor (air)	78
Crane	81
Dozer	82
Excavator	81
Flat Bed Truck	74
Front End Loader	79
Generator	72
Grader	85
Man Lift	75
Paver	77
Roller	80
Welder / Torch	73

Source: DOT 2006.
Note: L_{max} = maximum sound level; dBA = A-weighted decibels.

Aggregate noise emission from construction activities, broken down by phase, was predicted at two evaluation distances to the nearest existing noise-sensitive receptor: (1) from the nearest position of the construction site boundary, and (2) from the center of the construction site. Table 15 summarizes these two distances to the closest noise-sensitive receptor for each of the five construction phases. The closest existing noise-sensitive residential receptor is approximately 15 feet to the west of the proposed project's western boundary. At the site boundary, this analysis assumes that only the two loudest pieces of equipment for the listed phase will be involved in construction activity for the 1-hour period. In other words, at such proximity, the operating

equipment cannot "stack" or crowd the vicinity and still operate. This analysis assumes that all equipment for the indicated activity will be operating in a given hour over the 8-hour assessment period.

Table 15. Estimated Distances Between Construction Activities and the Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptors

Construction Phase (and Equipment Types Involved)	Distance from Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptor to Construction Site Boundary (Feet)	Distance from Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptor to Acoustical Centroid of Site (Feet)
Demolition (dozer, backhoe)	15	75
Grading (grader, scraper, dozer, front end loader)	15	75
Building construction (crane, man-lift, generator, backhoe, welder/torch)	30	125
Architectural finishes (air compressor)	30	125
Paving (paver, roller, other equipment)	30	125

Source: Appendix I.

A Microsoft Excel–based noise prediction model emulating and using reference data from the Federal Highway Administration Roadway Construction Noise Model (FHWA 2008) was used to estimate construction noise levels at the nearest occupied noise-sensitive land use. Modeling includes a temporary 8-foot-high construction noise barrier on the property lines that connects with the nearby single-family homes (refer to Figure 4, Temporary Noise Barrier Locations). The Roadway Construction Noise Model has default duty-cycle values for the various pieces of equipment, which were derived from an extensive study of typical construction activity patterns. Those default duty-cycle values were used for this noise analysis, which is detailed in Appendix I (see Appendix B, Construction Noise Modeling Input and Output, of Appendix I to this IS/MND).

Table 16 provides the estimated noise levels at the nearest sensitive receptor.

Table 16. Predicted Construction Noise Levels per Activity Phase

Construction Phase (and Equipment Types Involved)	8-Hour L_{eq} at Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptor to Construction Site Boundary (dBA)	8-Hour L_{eq} at Nearest Noise-Sensitive Receptor to Acoustical Centroid of Site (dBA)
Demolition (dozer, backhoe)	77.5	64.8
Grading (grader, scraper, dozer, front end loader)	80.0	71.3
Building construction (crane, man-lift, generator, backhoe, welder/torch)	74.9	59.8
Architectural finishes (air compressor)	63.8	50.1
Paving (paver, roller, other equipment)	74.8	61.8

Source: Appendix I.
Notes: L_{eq} = equivalent noise level; dBA = A-weighted decibels.

As presented in Table 16, the estimated construction noise levels are predicted to be as high as 80 dBA L_{eq} over an 8-hour period at the nearest existing residences (as close as 15 feet away) when grading activities take place

near the northern property boundaries. Note that these estimated noise levels at a source-to-receiver distance of 15 feet would occur when noted pieces of heavy equipment would each operate for a cumulative period of less than 6 hours a day. On an average construction workday, heavy equipment would be operating sporadically throughout the Project site and more frequently away from the property line edge. At more typical distances closer to the center of the Project site (approximately 75 feet from the nearest existing residence), construction noise levels are estimated to range from approximately 50 dBA L_{eq} to 71 dBA L_{eq} at the nearest existing residence. For these instances when operation of construction equipment and processes are sufficiently proximate to potentially cause activity noise levels to exceed 80 dBA L_{eq}, which the Federal Transit Administration uses as guidance for construction noise exposure at a residential receptor, MM-NOI-1 shall be implemented as indicated site conditions may warrant. Proper application of 8-foot-high temporary noise barriers or comparable sound abatement due to implementation of MM-NOI-1 has the ability to reduce noise levels by up to 16 decibels (dB), which would correspondingly reduce the estimated non-mitigated construction noise levels to 80 dBA L_{eq}, which would make the level compliant with the 80 dBA guidance.

In summary, construction noise during allowable daytime hours (between 7:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m.) has the potential for noise to equal but not exceed the 80 dBA L_{eq} 8-hour Federal Transit Administration guidance at the nearest residential receiver on occasion. Therefore, incorporation of MM-NOI-1 is recommended to reduce construction noise exposure levels. Thus, under such conditions, temporary construction-related noise would be less than significant.

The outcome of the King & Gardiner Farms versus Kern County judge's decision established a requirement for construction noise analyses to disclose the relative increase of construction noise over ambient noise levels. construction noise levels would cause a temporary increase of 0 to 24 dB L_{eq} over existing ambient noise levels; ranging from an imperceptible difference in the sound magnitude to a double-digit difference that would be perceived as being two to three times as loud to average healthy hearing.

The following mitigation measure would apply during project construction activities:

MM-NOI-1 Temporary Construction Noise Reduction. The project applicant or its contractor shall implement one or more of the following options for on-site noise control and sound abatement means that, in aggregate, would yield a minimum of 16 dB of construction noise reduction during the site preparation phase of the project:

- ***Administrative controls*** (e.g., reduce operating time of equipment and/or prohibit usage of equipment type[s] within certain distances to a nearest receiving occupied off-site property).
- ***Engineering controls*** (change equipment operating parameters [e.g., speed, capacity], or install features or elements that otherwise reduce equipment noise emission [e.g., upgrade engine exhaust mufflers]).
- ***Install noise abatement*** on the site boundary fencing (or within, as practical and appropriate) in the form of sound blankets or comparable temporary solid barriers to occlude construction noise emission between the site (or specific equipment operation as the situation may define) and the noise-sensitive receptor(s) of concern.

Long-Term Operational

Off-Site Traffic Noise Exposure

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would result in the creation of additional vehicle trips on local arterial roadways (i.e., Amaya Drive), which could result in increased traffic noise levels at adjacent noise-sensitive land uses. In particular, the proposed Project would create additional traffic along Amaya Drive, which according to the Traffic Impact Assessment prepared for the proposed project (Appendix J) would add 438 total average daily trips to the site's vicinity.

Potential noise effects from vehicular traffic were assessed using the Federal Highway Administration's Traffic Noise Model version 2.5. Information used in the model included the roadway geometry, Existing Year (2024), Existing Plus Project, Horizon Year (2050), and Horizon Year Plus Project traffic volumes and posted traffic speeds. Noise levels were modeled at representative noise-sensitive receivers ST1 through ST3, as shown in Appendix I, Figure 3. Since the prepared traffic assessment did not include future traffic volumes, Horizon Year traffic numbers were estimated using the SANDAG Transportation Forecast Information Center. The receivers were modeled to be 5 feet above the local ground elevation. The noise model results are summarized in Table 17. Based on results of the model, implementation of the proposed Project would not result in readily perceptible increases in traffic noise (Appendix I).

Table 17. Roadway Traffic Noise Modeling Results

Modeled Receiver	Existing (2024) Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Existing (2024) Plus Project Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Horizon Year (2050) without Project Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Horizon Year (2050) with Project Noise Level (dBA CNEL)	Maximum Project-Related Noise Level Increase (dB)
ST1	62.5	62.6	64.5	64.7	0.2
ST2	53.3	55.5	54.1	56.1	2.2
ST3	39.5	40	41.2	41.6	0.5
ST4	50	50.2	51.9	52.1	0.2

Source: Appendix I
Notes: dBA = A-weighted decibel; CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level; dB = decibel.

Table 17 shows that at all three listed representative receivers, the addition of project-related traffic to the roadway network would result in a CNEL increase of less than 3 dB, which is below the discernible level of change for the average healthy human ear. At all on-site exterior locations, the predicted CNEL values are less than 65 dBA, and compatible with the City's guidance for exterior noise levels. Thus, a less-than-significant impact is expected for project-related off-site traffic noise increases affecting existing residences in the vicinity.

Stationary Noise Sources

Less-than-Significant Impact. The incorporation of new multi-family homes and a mix of open space uses attributed to development of the proposed project would add a variety of noise-producing electro-mechanical equipment that include those presented and discussed in the following paragraphs. Most of these noise-producing equipment or sound sources would be considered stationary or limited in mobility to a defined area. Using a Microsoft Excel–based outdoor sound propagation prediction model, project-attributed operational noise at nearby

community receptors was predicted using several assumptions: (1) treatment of exposed at grade air-cooled condensing units as point-type sound emission sources; and (2) point-source sound propagation (i.e., 6 dB per doubling of distance) that conservatively ignores acoustical absorption from atmospheric and ground surface effects (Appendix I).

Residential Unit Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Noise

For purposes of this analysis, each of the new occupied residential units would be expected to feature a split-system type air-conditioning unit, with an air-cooled refrigeration (2-ton capacity) condenser unit. Assuming each condenser unit has a sound-pressure level of 68 dBA at 3 feet based on available data from a likely manufacturer (Carrier 2012), and the units would generally be installed at grade on or near rear porches. Therefore, the closest existing noise-sensitive residential receptor to the west of the proposed project's western unit would be as close as 30 horizontal feet to the nearest of these condenser units. The predicted sound emission level from the combination of all operating condenser units as received by this off-site single-family home would be 48 dBA L_{eq} and thus be compliant with the City's nighttime threshold of 50 dBA hourly L_{eq}. Under such conditions, the operation of residential air-conditioning units would result in a less-than-significant impact.

b) Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction activities may expose persons to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise, causing a potentially significant impact. Caltrans has collected groundborne vibration information related to construction activities. Information from Caltrans indicates that continuous vibrations with a PPV of approximately 0.2 ips is considered annoying. For context, heavier pieces of construction equipment, such as a bulldozer that may be expected on the Project site, have peak particle velocities of approximately 0.089 ips or less at a reference distance of 25 feet (Appendix I).

Groundborne vibration attenuates rapidly, even over short distances. The attenuation of groundborne vibration as it propagates from source to receptor through intervening soils and rock strata can be estimated with expressions found in Federal Transit Administration and Caltrans guidance. By way of example, for a bulldozer operating on site and as close as the northern project boundary (i.e., 40 feet from the nearest occupied property) the estimated vibration velocity level would be 0.04 ips per the equation as follows (Appendix I):

$$PPV_{rcvr} = PPV_{ref} * (25/D)^{1.5} = 0.04 = 0.089 * (25/40)^{1.5}$$

In the above equation, PPV_{rcvr} is the predicted vibration velocity at the receiver position, PPV_{ref} is the reference value at 25 feet from the vibration source (the bulldozer), and D is the actual horizontal distance to the receiver. Therefore, at this predicted PPV, the impact of vibration-induced annoyance to occupants of nearby existing homes would be less than significant.

Construction vibration, at sufficiently high levels, can also present a building damage risk. However, anticipated construction vibration associated with the proposed project would yield levels of 0.19 ips, which do not surpass the guidance limit of 0.3 ips PPV for building damage risk to older residential structures. Because the predicted vibration level at 15 feet is less than this guidance limit, the risk of vibration damage to nearby structures would be less than significant.

Once operational, the proposed project would not be expected to feature major producers of groundborne vibration. Anticipated mechanical systems like heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning units are designed and manufactured to feature rotating (fans, motors) and reciprocating (compressors) components that are well-balanced with isolated vibration within or external to the equipment casings. On this basis, potential vibration impacts due to proposed project operation would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. There are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site. The project site is located approximately 4.5 miles from Gillespie Field airport. The project site is not located within the 60 dBA CNEL noise contour of Gillespie Field (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2010). Thus, the project site is not exposed to excessive noise levels generated by airports. Impacts would be less than significant.

2.14 Population and Housing

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

a) ***Would the project induce substantial unplanned 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)?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. As previously described, the proposed project would consist of the demolition of the existing church and associated uses on-site, and redevelopment of the site with 73 three-story townhomes on a 3.49-acre site in a developed area of the city. The proposed townhomes would range in size from approximately 1,200 to 1,800 square feet.

As of 2023, the City has a persons per household ratio of 2.35 (DOF 2023). The project's 73 residential dwelling units would generate approximately 172 residents. Although not all residents of the project would be new to the City, residential development at the project site would not be considered unplanned growth,

as the project site is currently designated as Urban Residential (R1), and residential uses at the site were accounted for in the City's General Plan growth projections. Under the existing Urban Residential land use designation, the site is zoned for up to 10 dwelling units per acre, which would accommodate approximately 35 units and generate approximately 82 residents; in comparison to the proposed project's generation of 73 units and associated 172 (approximate) residents. However, the increase of approximately 172 residents as a result of project development would account for an approximately 0.2845% increase in the City's population. Therefore, residents generated by the project would not be considered a substantial increase in the City's population. Additionally, as previously discussed, the most recent Regional Housing Needs Assessment from SANDAG stated that La Mesa needs to build 3,797 units from 2021 through 2029 (SANDAG 2020). The City has projected deficit of 859 very-low and 487 low income units, and 577 moderate and 1,874 above-moderate income units (SANDAG 2020). The project is expected to bring 73 units to market in 2027, which would be within SANDAG's growth projection for housing during the 6th Cycle planning horizon (i.e., April 2021–April 2029). Therefore, the project would not conflict with SANDAG's regional growth forecast for the City.

Development of the project, however, is unlikely to directly induce substantial population growth in the city because the area surrounding the project site is already developed with a mix of Urban Residential, Local Serving Commercial, Rural Residential, and Suburban Residential developments. Additionally, because the project site is currently developed and served by City utilities, no indirect impacts associated with the extension or construction of roads or expansion of public utilities are expected to occur as a result of the proposed project.

Therefore, no direct or indirect impacts associated with a substantial unplanned increase in the City's population or the extension or construction of roads or other infrastructure that could induce new growth would occur as a result of the project. For the reasons described above, the project's impacts associated with substantial unplanned population growth would be less than significant.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact. Although an existing church and associated structures on site would be demolished as part of the proposed project in order to construct housing, no residential uses are currently located on the project site. Therefore, the project would not displace existing housing or people necessitating construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no impact associated with the displacement of people or housing would occur.

2.15 Public Services

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

Fire protection?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Fire and Emergency Medical Services in the City are provided by Heartland Fire & Rescue. Heartland Fire Station 12, located at 8844 Dallas Street (approximately 0.75 miles northwest of the project site), would provide primary response to the project site, and Heartland Fire Station 13 located at 9110 Grossmont Boulevard (approximately 0.95 miles southwest of the project site) would provide additional support as necessary.

The project would result in the development of 73 three-story townhomes, ranging in size from approximately 1,200 to 1,800 square feet and two to four bedrooms. As outlined in Section 2.14, Population and Housing, the project's residential component is expected to house approximately 172 residents. Under existing conditions, the project site is currently developed with the Cavalry Chapel, a parking lot, turf area, a playground, and associated church facilities and structures. As such, the proposed project would increase the demand for Heartland Fire & Rescue resources when compared to existing conditions, as the project would potentially result in an increase in calls for fire and emergency medical calls on the project site with the introduction of permanent residents.

As previously discussed in Section 2.14, under the existing Urban Residential (R1) land use designation, the site is zoned for up to 10 dwelling units per acre, which would accommodate approximately 35 units and generate approximately 82 residents; in comparison to the proposed project's generation of 73 units and associated 172 (approximate) residents. However, the increase of approximately 172 residents as a result of project development would account for an approximately 0.2845% increase in the City's population. Therefore, residents generated by the project would not be considered a substantial increase

in the City's population. Additionally, the project would be within SANDAG's growth projection for housing during the 6th Cycle planning horizon (i.e., April 2021–April 2029). As such, the project is not anticipated to result in the need for new facilities or physically altered facilities related to fire protection services. Additionally, the project would be designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable provisions of the state and local fire code; and Heartland Fire & Rescue would be required to review all final site plans and confirm service prior to project approval. Furthermore, the project applicant would be required to pay applicable development service fees. Therefore, the project's impacts on fire protection services would be less than significant.

Police protection?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The La Mesa Police Department provides law enforcement services for the City of La Mesa. The La Mesa Police Department's nearest station to the project site is located at 8085 University Avenue, approximately 2.13 miles southwest of the project site.

As outlined in Section 2.14, Population and Housing, the proposed project is expected to house approximately 172 residents with the development of 73 three-story townhomes. Under existing conditions, the project site is currently developed with the Cavalry Chapel, a parking lot, turf area, a playground, and associated church facilities and structures. As such, the proposed project would likely increase the demand for police services when compared to existing conditions, as the project would introduce permanent residents on site that could potentially result in an increase in police calls to the project site.

Implementation of the proposed project would be expected to increase the frequency of emergency and non-emergency calls to the Sherriff's Department. However, the La Mesa Police Department maintains three patrol shifts that provide 24-hour response assistance and traffic control. This continual presence is expected to deter criminal activity in the City. In addition to responding to complaints and incidents, the Police Department assigns personnel to programs designed to prevent crime.

As previously discussed, the proposed project's impact on population growth is determined to be nominal, thereby not necessitating the creation of new facilities or physical alterations to existing facilities related to police protection services. Service ratios and response times are anticipated to remain adequate with implementation of the proposed project, and the proposed project is not expected to affect police protection such that new or physically altered governmental facilities are needed. Furthermore, the La Mesa Police Department is currently servicing similar residential development surrounding the project site. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, the project's impacts on police protection services would be less than significant.

Schools?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Public education throughout the City is provided by the La Mesa-Spring Valley School District, Lemon Grove School District, as well as the Grossmont Union High School District. The project site is in the service area of Northmont Elementary School (approximately 0.29 miles north of the project site), Parkway Middle School (approximately 0.64 miles northwest of the project site), and Grossmont High School (approximately 0.5 miles southeast of the project site). The project proposed the construction of 73 three-story townhomes generating approximately 172 residents, which would generate new students in the area that would need to be accommodated at nearby schools that serve the project

site, including Northmont Elementary School, Parkway Middle School, and Grossmont High School. Capacity for these three schools are presented in the Table 18.

Table 18. School Capacity and Enrollment Data

School	Design Capacity	2022–2023 Enrollment	Resulting Excess/ (Deficit) Capacity
Northmont Elementary School	614	461	153
Parkway Middle School	1,034	658	376
Grossmont High School	2,585	2,326	259

Notes: Reported school design capacities in the La Mesa General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (City of La Mesa 2012d). Enrollment numbers from Educational Data Partnership (Ed Data 2024).

As shown above, the three educational institutions designated to accommodate the project are not currently operating at maximum capacity. Although the capacity of these schools to accommodate new students generated by the project may vary in the short term, the planning and provision of future school facilities fall under the jurisdiction of the school district. Relevant statutes, such as Government Code Section 65995 and Education Code Section 53080, empower school districts to levy facility mitigation fees on new developments to address potential increases in enrollment.

SB 50, enacted on August 27, 1998, introduced significant revisions to developer fee and mitigation procedures for school facilities outlined in Government Code Section 65996. This legislation stipulates that one acceptable means of offsetting a project's impact on school facility adequacy is the payment of a school impact fee before the issuance of a building permit. Once paid, these fees serve as complete mitigation for any impacts the project may have on school facilities, as outlined by the law. The La Mesa-Spring Valley School District, Lemon Grove School District, and Grossmont Union High School District collect developer fees for both residential and commercial projects. Accordingly, the project in question would be obligated to pay the requisite school facilities fees before receiving building permits. Compliance with these fees ensures full and comprehensive mitigation for any impacts on school facilities, as mandated by state law per Government Code Section 65996 and SB 50.

Thus, project development would not lead to substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the establishment of new or altered school facilities. Impacts on schools would be less than significant.

Parks?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As previously described, the proposed project would result in the addition of approximately 172 residents in the City. This increase in residents would increase demands for neighborhood and regional parks and other recreational facilities. The addition of 172 residents, however, would be a nominal contribution to the City. Therefore, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in the need for new of physical altered park facilities. Additionally, the project's developer would be required to pay a Park and Recreational Development Construction Unit Fee, specifically the Quimby Act Parkland Dedication In-Lieu Fee and Park Acquisition and Improvement Impact Fees, pursuant to Chapter 9.20 of the City's Municipal Code. These fees are designed for single and multi-family residential developments to mitigate the impact of new development on the City's existing facilities and infrastructure. The fees developed were based on population and growth projections, facility standards, amount/cost of facilities required to accommodate growth and total cost of facilities per unit of development. The proposed project

would also include a number of on-site recreational amenities to help offset the project's contribution to the demand for public parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, the project's impacts on park facilities would be less than significant. For further discussion on the project's impacts on the City's recreational services, refer to Section 2.16, Recreation.

Other public facilities?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Other public facilities provided within La Mesa include library services. Library services within La Mesa are provided by the County. A La Mesa branch is located in the Civic Center complex at 8074 University Avenue (approximately 2.16 miles southwest of the project site). The project's addition of approximately 172 residents would increase the demand for library services in the City. This increase, however, would be nominal and would not result in the need for new or physically altered library facilities. As such, the proposed project's impacts on library services would be less than significant.

2.16 Recreation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City provides nearly 136 acres of existing parkland including regional parks, community parks, neighborhood parks, and pocket parks. The City also includes approximately 5,800 acres of natural open space and over 40 miles of hiking trails (City of La Mesa 2012e). The park nearest to the project site is Harry Griffen Park, located approximately 0.3 miles east of the project site. This park is walkable from the project site and includes green space with a jogging path, picnic and play areas, an off-leash dog run, and summer concerts.

As described in Section 2.14, the project is expected to result in the generation of approximately 172 residents. The proposed project would include approximately 27,489 square feet of common open space area, including approximately 11,489 sf of private open space, and approximately 16,000 square feet of common open space area. The common open space amenities would include features such as decorative

walkways, gathering spaces, a BBQ area with shaded seating, a tot lot, and passive lawn areas for recreation. These on-site amenities would help to offset a portion of the project's demand for off-site parks and recreational facilities. Additionally, as stated it Section 2.15, Public Services, the project applicant would be required to pay a Park and Recreational Development Construction Unit Fee, specifically the Quimby Act Parkland Dedication In-Lieu Fee and Park Acquisition and Improvement Impact fees, pursuant to Section 9.20.050 of the City's Municipal Code. These fees would be used for public park improvements, to ensure the City is able to provide an adequate level of parks and recreational services to serve all city residents. The project's increase in demand for existing neighborhood and regional parks is not anticipated to be substantial leading to the physical deterioration of the facilities given the project's on-site amenities. Therefore, for the reasons described above, the project's impact on existing neighborhood and regional parks would be less than significant.

*b) **Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. As mentioned above, the proposed project would include approximately 16,000 sf of common open space area including recreational amenities such as decorative walkways, gathering spaces, a BBQ area with shaded seating, a tot lot, passive lawn areas, and other amenities spread throughout the project site. Any potential environmental impacts related to the construction and operation of these on-site recreational amenities are analyzed in this IS/MND as part of the impact assessment conducted for the entirety of the project. No adverse physical impacts beyond those already disclosed in this document would occur as a result of implementation of the project's on-site recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts associated with the construction or expansion of recreational facilities would be less than significant.

2.17 Transportation

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The section is based on the Traffic Assessment Letter (TAL) prepared by CR Associates in September 2023. The TAL is included as Appendix J of this IS/MND.

a) Would the project conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is within the northeastern area of the City. It is approximately 1 mile east of SR-125 and approximately 0.5 miles north of Interstate 8. The adjacent land uses include residential, commercial, and institutional land uses. To the north and east of the site, there are single-family homes, and to the south and west are multi-family developments. The project proposes development of 73 townhomes on a site that is currently occupied by the Calvary Church and associated structures.

The City of La Mesa has not yet adopted City of La Mesa-specific guidelines for local transportation analyses (LOS-based). Therefore, the traffic analyses prepared by CR Associates (Appendix J to this IS/MND), and the analysis included below, is based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Guidelines for Transportation Impact Studies in the San Diego Region (ITE 2019) for LOS-based analysis. This approach is consistent with other previously approved transportation impact studies prepared for developments within the City of La Mesa. Based on the City's Development Review Process for Traffic (February 2016) and Traffic Development Review Applicability Sheet, a residential development that generates more than 100 average daily traffic or 20 peak hour trips but less than 500 average daily traffic or 50 peak hour trips must prepare a TAL. The TAL includes the analysis of roadway and intersections immediately adjacent to the project site under two scenarios: Existing, and Existing with Project Conditions (Appendix J).

The project site is within a Transit Priority Area because the Amaya Trolley Station is within 0.5-mile walking distance of the project site. The closest bus stop to the project site is located at Fletcher Pkwy and Navajo Road (approximately 1.15 miles north of the project site) and the second closest bus stop to the project site is located at El Cajon Transit Center (approximately 1.2 miles east of the project site). Roadways adjacent to the project site and studied in the TAL include Jericho Road and Amaya Drive. Jericho Road is a two-way, two-lane undivided roadway that runs between Broadmoor Drive and Amaya Drive. Sidewalks are present and parking is permitted along both sides of the road but there are no bicycle facilities along Jericho Road. Amaya Drive is a two-way, two-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lane west of Jericho Road. Sidewalks are present on both sides of the road and Class II bike lanes are present on both sides of Amaya Drive, west of Jericho Road. Broadmoor Road is a two-way, two-lane roadway off Amaya Dr with sidewalks present along both sides of the road. As part of the TAL, roadway segments studied include Jericho Road, between Broadmoor Drive/Project Driveway and Amaya Drive; Amaya Drive, between Water Street and Jericho Road; and Amaya Drive, between Jericho Road and Kathy Street. Intersections included in the TAL study area included Jericho Road and Broadmoor Drive/Project Driveway; Jericho Road and Amaya Drive; and Water Street and Amaya Drive.

On-street parking is permitted along both sides of Jericho Road. It is not anticipated that implementation of the project would impact on-street parking within the study area, as the project would provide enough on-site parking to accommodate its future residents and guests. The project would apply the City Municipal Code 24.04.030 – Off-Street parking requirements to determine the number of parking spaces required by the project. Per the Municipal Code, dwelling units in apartments, condominium or community apartment projects require 2 parking spaces per unit. Based on this standard, the project is required to provide 146 parking spaces for residents (2 per each of the 73 units); therefore, the project would provide 146 parking spaces for residents. The City Municipal Code also states that guest or visitor parking be provided at a rate

of 0.4 spaces per dwelling unit. However, AB 2097 prohibits public agencies from imposing or enforcing a minimum automobile parking requirement for residential, commercial, and other developments if the parcel is located within a 0.5-mile walking distance of a major transit stop. As the project is within a 0.5-mile distance of a major transit stop, the project would provide 5 parking spaces for guests, for a total of 151 parking spaces provided by the project. The internal roadways for the project would be lined with perpendicular parking or enclosed garage spaces.

Northmont Elementary is the closest public school to the project site, located northwest of the project, along Gregory Street. The project does not include any features or elements that would change or impede the travel patterns to/from the school or change access to the school. Similarly, the project would not include any features or elements that would impede access to Amaya Trolley Station located 0.5 miles away from the site, nor any other transit stops.

As shown in Table 1 of Appendix J, the proposed project is anticipated to generate a total of 438 daily trips, including 36 (8-in/28-out) trips during the AM peak hour and 40 (28-in/12-out) trips during the PM peak hour. As shown in Table 2 of Appendix J, all study roadway segments currently operate at LOS D or better under Existing Conditions; and as shown in Table 3 of Appendix J, all study intersections currently operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours under Existing Conditions. As shown in Table 4 of Appendix J, the study roadway segments are projected to continue to operate at LOS D or better under Existing with Project Conditions; and as shown in Table 5 of Appendix J, all study intersections are projected to continue to operate at LOS B or better during the AM and PM peak hours under Existing with Project Conditions. As outlined in the TAL, implementation of the project does not require roadway segment or intersection improvements.

The proposed project would be consistent with applicable transportation plans, including City of La Mesa Vision Zero, San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan, The Smart Growth – Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Plan, and the City of La Mesa Bicycle Facilities and Alternative Transportation Plan (City of La Mesa 2012f), as discussed below.

Vision Zero

Vision Zero is a City strategy to eliminate traffic facilities and severe injuries among all road users by ensuring safe, healthy, and equitable mobility for all. Vision Zero takes a productive, preventative approach that prioritizes transportation and mobility safety as a public health issue (City of La Mesa 2024). The proposed project would be consistent with the strategy and goals of Vision Zero because it integrates principles of traffic safety and pedestrian-friendly design by promoting infill development and transit-oriented living.

San Diego Forward Regional Plan

The San Diego Forward Regional Plan (Regional Plan) sets forth the goal of developing a safe, equitable, and accessible system that improves everyone's access to basic needs, including parks (SANDAG 2021). The proposed project would be consistent with the overarching principles of the Regional Plan because it promotes infill development, encourages transit-oriented living, enhances walkability, and contributes to the revitalization of existing communities, thus aligning with the goals of sustainability, equity, accessibility, and economic vitality outlined in the plan. In addition, the proposed project would be consistent with other Regional Plan goals and strategies of increasing transportation mode choices and reducing reliance on the

single-occupancy automobile. The Amaya Trolley Station is within a 0.5-mile walking distance of the proposed project. Thus, the project is within a Transit Priority Area. The project does not include any features or elements that would impede access to the Amaya Trolley Station or other transit stops. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the Regional Plan's goals of developing a safe, equitable, and accessible system because the proposed project promotes the access to the trolley and other transit stops, fostering connectivity and encouraging sustainable transportation options.

La Mesa General Plan Circulation Element

The General Plan contains several Circulation Element alternative transportation policies that are primarily programmatic rather than implemented at the project level. However, at the project level, the proposed project would support Objective CE-3.1 to maximize the utility of La Mesa's transit services (City of La Mesa 2012g). Due to the project's proximity to the Amaya Trolley Station, project residents would likely increase the use of nearby alternative transportation facilities.

La Mesa Smart Growth – Pedestrian and Bicycles Improvement Plan

The City's Smart Growth – Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Plan was prepared to assist pedestrians and bicyclists to feel more comfortable navigating downtown La Mesa (City of La Mesa 2015b). In general, the Smart Growth – Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Plan includes a variety of strategies that improve safety and accessibility for pedestrians and bicyclists. The project site is located 2.30 miles from downtown La Mesa and it is anticipated project residents may bike to downtown. Currently, the closest Class II bike lanes to the project site are along Amaya Drive. Contiguous sidewalks are also provided on both sides of Amaya Drive and Jericho Road. The project does not include any plans to add or alter existing bicycle facilities and sidewalks. The project would not conflict with the goals of the Smart Growth – Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Plan.

La Mesa Bicycle Facilities and Alternative Transportation Plan

The La Mesa Bicycle Facilities and Alternative Transportation Plan is a conceptual plan that addresses opportunities to connect and integrate existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the city (City of La Mesa 2012f). As outlined above, the closest Class II bike lanes to the project site are along Amaya Drive. Contiguous sidewalks are also provided on both sides of Amaya Drive and Jericho Road. The project does not include any plans to add or alter existing bicycle facilities and sidewalks. Furthermore, the project site is located within a Transit Priority Area because the Amaya Trolley Station is within a 0.5-mile walking distance of the project. The closest bus stop to the project site is located at Fletcher Pkwy and Navajo Rd (approximately 1.15 miles north of the project site) and the second closest bus stop to the project site is located at El Cajon Transit Center (approximately 1.2 miles east of the project site).

Therefore, since the proposed project does not conflict with any applicable plans or policies related to the circulation system, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City of La Mesa has not yet adopted City-specific guidelines for VMT-based or LOS-based analyses. Therefore, consistent with other approved developments within the City of La Mesa, the scope for the VMT analysis is based on the Governor's Office of Planning and Research

Technical Advisory. The Technical Advisory provides recommendations and screening thresholds, VMT analysis methodologies, project VMT thresholds, and mitigation strategies (OPR 2018).

Per the Technical Advisory, certain projects (including residential, retail, and office projects) proposed within 0.5 miles of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high-quality transit corridor is presumed to have a less-than-significant VMT impact (OPR 2018). The proposed project is located within a 0.5-mile walking distance from the Amaya Trolley Station, and the walking route to the station is without discontinuity of sidewalk or obstructions. Therefore, in accordance with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research Technical Advisory, the would have a less-than-significant VMT impact and is exempt from further VMT analysis.

c) Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Access to the proposed project would be via two project driveways on Jericho Road and Broadmoor Drive. As part of the project design process, a corner sight distance and stopping sight distance analysis was performed on the project's driveways. Based on the sight distance criteria outlined in the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (AASHTC 2018), an intersection where the minor roadway is stop controlled, allows left-turn movements, and has a design speed of 30 mph (design speed = 25 mph speed limit on Jericho Road +5 mph) would require a clear stopping sight distance of 200 feet and/or a clear corner sight distance of 335 feet (Table 6 and 7 of Appendix J display the standards for stopping sight distance and corner sight distance). As shown in the TAL, the project driveways do not currently meet the required stopping sight distances. Project Driveway #1 would need an additional 85 feet of clear stopping sight distance from the south approach; and Project Driveway #2 needs an additional 87 feet of clear stopping sight distance from the south approach. This is due to the vertical curve along Jericho Road, as the approximately 15% slope along Jericho limits the line of sight for vehicles traveling toward the project driveways. Furthermore, as shown in Table 9 of the TAL, the project driveways do not currently meet the required corner sight distances. Project Driveway #1 (the driveway aligned with Jericho Road) needs an additional 234 feet of clear corner sight distance to the east along Broadmoor Drive and 226 feet to the south along Jericho Road. Project Driveway #2 (the driveway aligned with Broadmoor Drive) meets the required corner sight distance to the east but needs an additional 219 feet of clear corner sight distance to the south along Jericho Road. Similar to the stopping sight distance analysis, the corner sight distances at the project driveways are limited along Jericho Road due to the approximately 15% vertical curve. Additionally, Project Driveway #1 also has a limited corner sight distance looking east toward Broadmoor due to the wide curve at the intersection of Broadmoor Drive and Jericho Road.

Because the project driveways would not meet the minimum stopping sight and corner sight distance requirements, and therefore could result in potential hazards, the project would be required to mitigation this potential impact. Implementation of MM-TRA-1 would ensure that sight distance requirements are met and would reduce safety risks associated with limited sight distances. By coordinating with the City staff and meeting engineering standards, compliance with these measures ensures that impacts are minimized, resulting in overall safer conditioners for road users and pedestrians.

The proposed project does not propose any new roadways or alterations to existing roadways. No unique roadway features, traffic patterns, or incompatible vehicles would be introduced as part of the development. With implementation of MM-TRA-1, impacts would be less than significant.

MM-TRA-1 Sight Distance. The project applicant/developer shall be required to maintain trimmed bushes and shrubs, as well as limit/clear any objects in the line of sight at the project driveways in order to increase and meet sight distance requirements. Furthermore, the applicant/developer shall install W2-1 signs (Cross Road Signs) along the northbound approach of Jericho Road to indicate the presence of driveways and the possibility of turning or entering traffic. Installation of these W2-1 signs shall be in accordance with the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) (version 2014 revision 7) and be coordinated with City of La Mesa staff and satisfaction of the City Traffic Engineer.

d) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As described in response to Threshold 2.17(a), the project would be served by two primary driveways located off Jericho Road and Jericho Road/Broadmoor Drive. Both driveways would provide full turning movements and would be designed to meet the design requirements codified in the California Fire Code. Additionally, adequate corner and stopping site distances would be maintained at all driveway locations with implementation of MM-TRA-1. As outlined in Section 2.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of this IS/MND, the proposed project would be required to abide by the standards set forth in the La Mesa Emergency Operations Plan. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to impact any roadway or staging areas that are identified in any emergency planning documents and would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. As required under the California Fire Code, the proposed project would be required to present development plans which afford fire and emergency responders suitable fire access roads dimensions and surfaces (Chapter 5, Section 503.1 through Section 503.4 of the California Fire Code), an adequate number of emergency rated entrances to the community (Appendix D, Section D106 of the California Fire Code), and entryway gate access for first responders (Chapter 5 of the California Fire Code, Section 503.6). The proposed points of entry and site plans will be reviewed by Heartland Fire & Rescue and the City Traffic Engineer(s) and would be required to meet the qualifications for emergency access to and from the project site. Proposed internal driveways would be designed in accordance with the City's roadway design standards to ensure proper safety requirements are met. Therefore, impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant.

2.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES				
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☒	☐	☐

The evaluation of potential impacts to tribal cultural resources (TCRs) is based on the findings resulting from tribal consultation conducted by the City, as the lead agency, as well as the findings of the Cultural Resources Inventory Report conducted by Dudek in April 2024 (Appendix D).

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)?

Less-than-Significant Impact. As described under Section 2.5, Cultural Resources, of this IS/MND, the Built Environment Inventory and Evaluation Report prepared for the site evaluated built environment resources consistent with the requirements of CEQA. These efforts included a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System, the development of a study area or API, an intensive-level survey of the API for built resources of historic age (45 years of age or older); building development and archival research, the creation of appropriate historic contexts, and recordation and evaluation of 14 historic-era properties located in the API under the NRHP, CRHR, and City of La Mesa listing criteria. Dudek's archival research and field survey found 14 historic-era properties in the API. None of the properties were previously recorded. Dudek concludes that none of the subject properties are eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, or La Mesa's local register due to a lack of significant associations and architectural merit. The recommended California Historical Resource Status Code for these properties is 6Z, indicating that they were found ineligible for the NRHP, CRHR, and local designation through a survey evaluation.

Additionally, a records search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) at the SCIC was conducted for the project area and a 1-mile search buffer. The SCIC records search indicated that no

cultural resources intersect the project area. However, 34 previous cultural resources have been recorded within the 1-mile search buffer of the project area. In addition to the records search, a search of the Sacred Lands Files from the NAHC was conducted in January 2024. A response letter was received via email from the NAHC on February 15, 2024, stating that the results were positive. As a result, Dudek mailed outreach letters on February 19, 2024 to all Native American group representatives included on the NAHC contact list. These letters attempted to solicit additional information relating to Native American resources that may be impacted by the project. No responses have been received to date.

For the reasons stated above and detailed in Appendix C, the project would result in less-than-significant impacts to historical resources. However, implementation of MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-6, outlined in Section 2.5, would further ensure potential unforeseen impacts as a result of project construction would be less than significant.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. The project is subject to compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 (PRC Section 21074), which requires consideration of impacts to TCRs as part of the CEQA process and requires lead agencies to provide notification of proposed projects to California Native American Tribal representatives that have requested such notifications. Considering the developed nature of the existing site, the discovery of TCRs on-site are not anticipated. To date, no TCRs have been identified on the project site that would be impacted by project implementation. However, the City initiated consultation with interested Tribes under SB 18 on March 5, 2024 and AB 52 on May 29, 2024. To date, one letter was received from the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians as part of SB 18, on March 7, 2024. The San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians have requested to engage in formal government-to-government consultation under AB 52 and have requested access to any cultural resource reports. City staff met with San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians representatives to discuss interests and tribal requests. Based on consultation with the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-6 are proposed as part of the project. San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians confirmed closure of consultation via email on August 23, 2024.

As described in Threshold 2.18(a) above, a search of the Sacred Lands Files from the NAHC was conducted in January 2024. A response letter was received via email from the NAHC on February 15, 2024, stating that the results were positive. As a result, Dudek mailed outreach letters on February 19, 2024 to all Native American group representatives included on the NAHC contact list. These letters attempted to solicit additional information relating to Native American resources that may be impacted by the project. No responses have been received to date.

Although considered unlikely based on the current developed state of the project site and other information received by the City to date, there remains the potential for the project to encounter previously unknown and unanticipated TCRs during construction of the proposed project. As outlined in Section 2.5 of this IS/MND, project implementation of MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-6 would reduce potential unanticipated project impacts to cultural resources (including TCRs) and human remains to less than significant.

2.19 Utilities and Service Systems

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, waste water treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a determination by the waste water 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The following analysis is based, in part, on the Preliminary Drainage Study (Appendix G) and SWQMP (Appendix H) prepared for the project by Hunsaker & Associates in July 2023, and on the Water Study (Appendix K) and Sewer Study (Appendix L) prepared by Dexter Wilson Engineering Inc. in August 2023.

a) Would the project require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities that would cause significant environmental effects for the reasons discussed in the following subsections.

Water Facilities

The project involves the construction of a 73-unit townhome development with associated landscaping and amenities, which would increase demand for water supply in comparison to the existing Calvary Church facilities on site. Water service would be provided by the Helix Water District (HWD), which provides water service to the City. There are existing water facilities in the vicinity of the project site which serve the existing on-site and surrounding uses. Existing water facilities in the project vicinity include 6-inch-diameter water lines in Jericho Road and Broadmoor Drive. The project site would make two connections for an on-site public loop that would supply proposed fire hydrants as well as domestic water meters. According to the HWD 2020 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), the anticipated demand for water supply within HWD's service area is anticipated to be greater than the demand for water in the future, which indicates that HWD has available capacity to serve the proposed project. The HWD UWMP includes a forecast of future water supply needed to serve the district's customers through 2035. Wet year, single dry year, and multiple dry year projections are considered in the forecast (HWD 2020). Based on the Water Study prepared for the project (Appendix K), the project would result in an average water demand of approximately 33,721 gallons per day. When compared to the projected water demand of the project, the projected HWD supply is determined to be adequate to serve the project.

As outlined in Appendix K, from a service pressure standpoint, HWD connection to the project would provide adequate service. The proposed public water system for the project consists of making two connections for an on-site public 8-inch loop that would directly supply proposed fire hydrants and domestic meters. A domestic water meter connection would be made at five locations. The project's proposed on-site domestic water systems would be formally designed in accordance with the California Plumbing Code and/or water agency standards.

Wastewater Treatment Facilities

The City of La Mesa is a member of the Metro Wastewater Joint Powers Authority, a coalition of agencies that utilize the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant (WTP) operated by the City of San Diego. Wastewater generated within the City is collected by the City's sewer service and then conveyed to the Point Loma WTP located at the south end of the Point Loma peninsula. The Point Loma WTP treats approximately 175 million gallons per day of wastewater generated in a 450-square-mile area by more than 2.2 million residents. Located on a 40-acre site on the bluffs of Point Loma, the WTP has a treatment capacity of 240 million gallons per day (City of San Diego 2024). The Point Loma WTP is owned and operated by the City of San Diego and allows 15 other municipalities, including La Mesa, to purchase allocations of wastewater treatment capacity at the plant.

Wastewater collection at the project site would be provided by the City's wastewater infrastructure. The existing gravity sewer line that is adjacent to the project site is an 8-inch-diameter gravity in Jericho Road; this sewer line flows southeast to another existing 8-inch-diameter gravity sewer line in Anaya Drive (Appendix L). The project would install a new gravity wastewater collection system that would all flow to two manholes in Jericho Road. The project is projected to result in an average sewage flow of approximately 13,140 gallons per day. According to the sewer system capacity analysis conducted, all existing downstream sewer lines have adequate capacity to convey peak flows from existing development plus the proposed project while maintaining City requirements. The project's sewer system would be designed according to the California Plumbing Code and/or City design standards to comply with all design criteria.

Thus, the project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new wastewater treatment facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts.

Stormwater Drainage Facilities

As described in Section 2.10, Hydrology and Water Quality, and as outlined in the Drainage Report (Appendix G to the IS/MND), the existing site consists of area that is currently developed and disturbed. Under existing conditions, surface water flows from the northwestern portions of the site south toward a catch basin situated within a sediment basin on site. Surface water from the southern part of the site flows south toward a catch basin and then to an existing curb outlet in Jericho Road. This runoff then merges with additional runoff from the southeastern part of the site and is funneled south through the Jericho Road and Amaya Drive curb and gutter systems. Flows are subsequently directed eastward via an existing drain, where it converges with runoff from the northeastern section before discharging onto Jericho Road through existing curb outlets.

Stormwater runoff from the project site would be collected by on-site inlets and routed via the proposed storm drain system toward two underground storage facilities. The underground storage facilities serve to meet hydromodification and peak flow attenuation requirements releasing it at a specified flow rate to a downstream modular wetland, which addresses water quality concerns. Peak flows would be routed through their respective vault riser structure and discharged into the proposed 18-inch storm drain near the entrance of the project site. The runoff would then confluence with the off-site existing 39-inch storm drain on Amaya Drive and flow south similarly to existing conditions to eventually discharge into the San Diego River, which empties into the Pacific Ocean. As determined in Appendix G, the project would not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems. With project implementation of the underground storage facility, proposed peak flows would be equal to or less than the capacity of the existing storm drain the project is connecting to.

Electric Power Facilities

Electric power service is currently provided to the project site by San Diego Gas & Electric. Any proposed above-ground transformers and electrical facilities that solely service the project site would be placed on-site. The project would require electricity for building operations (e.g., appliances, lighting). In addition, the project would be required to comply with the 2022 Title 24 standards or the most recent standards at the time of building permit issuance. The project would comply with CALGreen and install energy-efficient fixtures to reduce overall electrical demand. Therefore, impacts associated with electrical power facilities would be less than significant.

Natural Gas Facilities

Natural gas is currently provided to the site by San Diego Gas & Electric. The project would comply with 2022 Title 24 building energy efficiency standards, reducing energy used in the state. Based on compliance with Title 24, the project would generate a need for natural gas that is consistent with multifamily homes. Therefore, impacts associated with natural gas facilities would be less than significant.

Telecommunications Facilities

The City is served by multiple telephone service providers. Because the project site is in an urbanized area and is nearby other residential uses, there are existing telecommunication facilities that would be able to serve the site, including Cox Communications, AT&T, Spectrum, and Frontier Communications. Once the project is completed, residents would be able to connect to existing telecommunications services without the need for expansion or construction of new facilities. Therefore, impacts associated with telecommunications facilities would be less than significant.

b) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City is served by HWD for potable water, including the project site. According to the City's General Plan, HWD's primary water collection and storage facilities are at Lake Cuyamaca, Lake Jennings and El Capitan Reservoir. In 2010 less than 20% of HWD's supply was runoff from winter rain and snow stored in Lake Cuyamaca and natural runoff into El Capitan Reservoir. The District also receives water from the Colorado River and the San Diego County Water Authority, which purchases its water from the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California (City of La Mesa 2012g).

In general, water demand tends to increase in dry years, primarily due to increased water activities such as landscape irrigation. Thus, to assess the reliability of water supply, every urban water purveyor is required to assess its water service under normal, dry, and multiple-dry water years. The UWMP assesses the District's water supply and forecasts its reliability over a 25-year planning period, including a single year and five consecutive dry years from 2025 onwards. District projections suggest that even in the event of a six-year drought, there would still be sufficient supply to meet demand within the service area. Through this planning process, the District has determined that with continued development of water supplies and ongoing conservation efforts, there are no anticipated shortages during normal years, single dry years, or even in the event of a consecutive five-year drought up to 2045.

As described in response to Threshold 2.19(a) above, based on the Water Study prepared for the project (Appendix K), the project would result in an average water demand of approximately 33,721 gallons per day. When compared to the projected water demand of the project, the projected HWD supply is determined to be adequate to serve the project.

Further, the project site would be developed in compliance with the California Green Building Code, which implements water efficiency standards for appliances and fixtures. Compliance with the California Green Building Code would further reduce project water usage in combination with HWD's ongoing water conservation practices. In 2018, California signed AB 1668 and SB 606 into law. These new regulations, outlined in a primer entitled "Making Water Conservation a California Way of Life," lay out a new long-term water conservation framework for California to use water more wisely, eliminate water waste, strengthen local drought resilience, and improve agricultural water-wise efficiency and drought planning (HWD 2020). Compliance with these regulations and conservation measures would ensure sufficient water supplies are available to service the proposed project. Therefore, as all water demands for the project have been considered in the UWMP, no shortages are expected. With ongoing compliance with regulations and conservation measures, the overall impact would be less than significant.

c) Would the project 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?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The City is part of the Metro Wastewater Joint Powers Authority, a coalition of agencies using the Point Loma WTP operated by the City of San Diego. Wastewater generated within the City is collected by its sewer service and conveyed to the Point Loma WTP at the south end of the Point Loma peninsula. The Point Loma WTP treats about 175 million gallons per day of wastewater from a 450-square-mile area inhabited by over 2.2 million residents. With a treatment capacity of 240 million gallons per day, the Point Loma WTP enables 15 other municipalities, including La Mesa, to purchase allocations of wastewater treatment capacity at the plant (City of San Diego 2024). In 2008, the City completed a Wastewater Collection System Master Plan, as required by State Water Resources Control Board. The Master Plan determined that the City is expected to have sufficient wastewater treatment capacity at the Point Loma plant to accommodate anticipated development as projected by SANDAG. In 2030, treatment capacity totaling approximately 6.61 million gallons per day will be required to meet La Mesa's wastewater treatment needs, well within the City's contracted capacity right of 6.993 million gallons per day. Subsequent to the 2008 Wastewater Collection System Master Plan, SANDAG updated the growth forecast with a 2050 horizon year. Based on the updated forecast, the City's contracted capacity at the Point Loma Treatment Plant adequately covers the wastewater generated by the population and employment expected through 2035 (City of La Mesa 2012g).

As outlined in Appendix L to this IS/MND, the proposed project is estimated to result in an average sewage flow of 13,140 gallons per day. The project would receive sewer service by making two connections to the existing public 8-inch diameter gravity sewer line that currently serves the existing development on-site. The project would involve construction of a private sewer collection system on site that would convey flows via gravity to the existing sewer infrastructure in Jericho Road. A sewer system capacity analysis was conducted as part of Appendix L, which indicates that all existing downstream sewer lines in the study area have adequate capacity to convey peak flows from the existing development plus the proposed project while maintaining the City required depth-to-diameter ratio of less than 0.50 d/D. It was also determined that off-site sewer capacity improvements are not required for the proposed project. Although the proposed project requests a zone change from Urban Residential (R1) to Multiple Unit Residential (R3), the project would retain the designated residential use for the site and would not result in substantial population growth at the site than what has been planned for. Project compliance with all Metro Wastewater Joint Powers Authority requirements would ensure sufficient sewer service would be available to serve the project as proposed, and impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Demolition of the existing site and construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of solid waste such as scrap lumber, concrete, residual wastes, packing materials, and plastics. Operation of the proposed project would represent an increase in intensity of uses and generation of solid waste on the project site compared to existing conditions. Solid waste generated by the project would be serviced by EDCO Waste and Recycling (EDCO). EDCO handles solid waste disposal in the City of La Mesa as detailed in the Will Serve Letter included in Appendix M of this IS/MND. EDCO operates as a private waste collection and recycling company under a current contract with the City (City of La Mesa 2012d). All waste is disposed of at the Sycamore Landfill. According to the California Department

of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), the facility has a daily permitted capacity of 5,000 tons per day for solid waste. As of December 2016, the remaining capacity of Sycamore Sanitary Landfill is 147,908,000 cubic yards, or approximately 40 million tons, with an anticipated closure date of 2042. Further, four other landfills in San Diego County accept municipal solid waste, including Borrego Landfill, Miramar Landfill, Otay Landfill, and Ramona Landfill (CalRecycle 2019). According to the 2022 Five-Year Review Report of the Countywide Integrated Solid Waste Management Plan, the County possesses sufficient landfill capacity to handle disposal needs for at least the next 15 years, meeting the state's requirement of maintaining a minimum 15 years of future disposal capacity (County of San Diego 2022).

The anticipated operational solid waste generation from the project was estimated using CalRecycle's Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates (CalRecycle 2019). Based on this estimation, it is anticipated that the project, consisting of 73 units, would generate approximately 892.88 pounds of solid waste per day, using an estimated rate of 12.23 pounds per household. Note that this calculation does not incorporate any waste diversion practices such as recycling. According to CalRecycle, the City has set a disposal rate target of 8.9 pounds per person per day. Meeting this target ensures compliance with the 50% diversion requirement of AB 939. However, recent data from CalRecycle (CalRecycle 2020) indicate that the annual per-capita disposal rate is significantly lower, at 4.9 pounds per person per day. This suggests that the City is surpassing its diversion target, demonstrating effective waste management practices. Once operational, the project would result in waste typically associated with multifamily residences.

The project would be required to comply with applicable state and local regulations related to solid waste, waste diversion, and recycling at the time of development. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals, and impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant.

e) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations governing solid waste, diversion of waste, and recycling. All solid waste facilities, including landfills, require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, PRC Sections 44001–44018 and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440 et seq.) authorize the County Department of Environmental Health and Quality, Local Enforcement Agency to issue solid waste facility permits. The project would be required to adhere to the requirements outlined in Title 14 of the La Mesa Building Code, Chapter 14.27, mandating the recycling and reuse of 75% of designated recyclables, such as asphalt, concrete, and dirt. Additionally, the project is committed to diverting a minimum of 75% of operational waste from landfills through recycling and reuse practices, as specified by the 2019 Title 24 Part 11 CALGreen Standards. Furthermore, the project's design incorporates provisions for the storage and collection of recyclables and yard waste in accordance with the latest standards, ensuring compliance with La Mesa Municipal Code Title 7.22 on Mandatory Recycling and AB 939 requirements. AB 939 specifically mandates a 50% diversion of solid waste from landfill disposal through various means, including source reduction, recycling, and composting. Moreover, to address the regulations set forth by SB 1383, which aims to reduce methane emissions from organic waste, the proposed project must comply with the requirements for organics recycling. SB 1383 mandates a reduction of organic waste disposal to 50% below 2014 levels by 2020 and to 75% of 2014 levels by 2025, with additional measures to recover 20% of edible food for human consumption currently sent to landfills by

2025. Effective January 1, 2022, all single-family residential dwellings, commercial businesses, and multi-family residential dwellings are mandated to subscribe to recycling and organics recycling service (CalRecycle 2024). Project development and operation would be required to comply with all applicable regulations related to solid waste. Given the measures in place and alignment with regulatory mandates, alongside the considerations outlined in Section 2.19(d), impacts related to solid waste as a result of project implementation would be less than significant.

2.20 Wildfire

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE – If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	☐	☐	☒	☐

a) Would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is not located within or adjacent to a state responsibility area or local responsibility area Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (CAL FIRE 2007). The nearest Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone is a local responsibility area located approximately 0.58 miles northeast of the project site (CAL FIRE 2007). The project site is within a developed area of the City classified as within a local responsibility area. Additionally, the project site is currently developed land and does not include flammable vegetation. As discussed in Section 2.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, the project would be required to comply with all applicable state and local fire codes, including compliance with the California Fire Code and the City of La Mesa Fire Department requirements. All preliminary and final site plans would be reviewed and require approval from the Fire Department and City engineers. As discussed for Threshold

2.20(d), the proposed project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan and, therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is in a developed area of the City and is not located within or adjacent to a fire hazard severity zone. Additionally, the project site is relatively flat with a descending slope along the southern and eastern project boundaries and an ascending slope at the northern project boundary. Due to the project topography and location in an urbanized area, the project site does not include any factors that could exacerbate the risk of wildfire. Project site plans and emergency access for the proposed project would be reviewed by the City's Fire Department to ensure it does not propose any uses or project elements that could exacerbate the risk of wildfire. Because the potential for the project to exacerbate wildfire risks is low due the type of project and its location impacts associated with wildfire risk and exposing occupants to pollutants would be less than significant.

c) Would the project require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines, or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Although the proposed project would require installation of water sources and other underground utilities to connect to the City's existing infrastructure (refer to Section 2.19, Utilities and Service Systems), these would not exacerbate fire risks, as the proposed project is not located within or adjacent to a fire hazard severity zone, and these improvements would be constructed within an existing right-of-way or within the project site boundary. The project does not include any new overhead utility lines or construction of roads to serve the project site. The proposed project would not require the installation or maintenance of such infrastructure that would exacerbate fire risk, and therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The project site is located in a developed area of the city and is not located in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The risk of wildfire is considered low due to the type of project and its location within a relatively flat and highly urbanized area of the City. As outlined in Section 2.7, Geology and Soils, the Geotechnical Evaluation prepared for the project site determined that the potential for landslides, liquefaction, or slope instabilities to occur is negligible (Appendix E). The proposed project would be required to comply with the recommendations of the Geotechnical Evaluation regarding earthwork activities. Additionally, the project would not disrupt existing drainage patters or increase surface runoff rates, as outlined in Section 2.10. Therefore, impacts related to flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes would be less than significant.

2.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☒	☐	☐

a) ***Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?***

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As outlined in the Biological Resources Memorandum prepared for the proposed project (Appendix B), the project site consists entirely of disturbed habitat and developed land cover type, consisting of a church, and paved parking lots, with associated minor ornamental landscaping and structures. No natural land covers or potential habitat is located on or adjacent to the site, and the site does not contain any natural vegetation communities or land cover types that are known to provide habitat to any special-status wildlife species. Similarly, the site does not contain any natural vegetation communities of land cover types that are known to provide habitat to any special-status plant species. However, MM-BIO-1 is proposed in order to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and pre-construction nesting bird survey(s) will be conducted if demolition or construction occurs within the nesting season (January 15 through August 31).

As described throughout this IS/MND, the project would not degrade the quality of the environment; would not substantially reduce the habitats of fish or wildlife species, would not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, would not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal, and would not eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory. The project would require the demolition of the existing church and associated structures on site. As outlined in Appendix C, the project is not anticipated to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory, and therefore, impacts would be less than significant. As part of MM-CUL-2 outlined in Section 2.5, the project would be subject to compliance with Section 7050.5 of the California Health and Safety Code, should any unanticipated human remains be discovered during construction. Additionally, construction monitoring by a qualified archaeologist, including a Native American monitor, would be incorporated as part of MM-CUL-1 outlined in Section 2.5 of this IS/MND.

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. Implementation of the proposed project, when combined with other approved and proposed projects in the City and outlying areas, could potentially contribute to cumulative degradation of the environment as a result of potential impacts related to air quality, cultural resources, GHG emissions, hydrology and water quality, noise, public services, transportation, TCRs, and utilities and services systems. As analyzed throughout Chapter 2 of this IS/MND, all potential impacts would be less than significant, with the exception of impacts related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, noise and transportation, which would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated (MM-AQ-1, MM-BIO-1, MM-CUL-1 through MM-CUL-6, MM-NOI-1, and MM-TRA-1). All cumulative projects would be required to complete a similar environmental analysis and incorporate mitigation as necessary to reduce the potential for cumulative impacts.

Although cumulative impacts are always possible, the proposed project, by incorporating all mitigation measures outlined herein, would reduce its contribution to any such cumulative impacts to less than cumulatively considerable; therefore, the project would result in individually limited, but not cumulatively considerable, less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporated.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated. As evaluated throughout this IS/MND, with incorporation of mitigation identified herein, all environmental impacts associated with the project would be reduced to less-than-significant levels. Thus, the project would not directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects on human beings. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

3 References and Preparers

3.1 References

AASHTC (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials). 2018. *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, 7th Edition.

CAL FIRE (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection). 2007. "Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ)." Accessed April 10, 2024. https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/.

CAL FIRE. 2023. State Responsibility Area Fire Hazard Severity Zones Map. Accessed April 2024. https://34c031f8-c9fd-4018-8c5a-4159cdff6b0d-cdn-endpoint.azureedge.net/-/media/osfm-website/what-we-do/community-wildfire-preparedness-and-mitigation/fire-hazard-severity-zones/fire-hazard-severity-zones-map-2022/fire-hazard-severity-zones-maps-2022-files/fhsz_county_sra_11x17_2022_sandiego_2.pdf.

CalEPA (California Environmental Protection Agency). 2024. Cortese List: Section 65962.5(a). https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/section-65962-5a/.

CalRecycle (California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery). 2019. "Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates." Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastecharacterization/general/rates.

CalRecycle. 2020. Disposal Rate Calculator. https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/LGCentral/AnnualReporting/DisposalRateCalculator.

CalRecycle. 2024. "New Statewide Mandatory Organic Waste Collection." Accessed June 2024. https://calrecycle.ca.gov/Organics/SLCP/collection/.

Caltrans (California Department of Transportation). 2020. *Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual*. Division of Environmental Analysis, Environmental Engineering, Hazardous Waste, Air, Noise, Paleontology Office. Sacramento, California. Accessed April 2024. https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/programs/environmental-analysis/documents/env/tcvgm-apr2020-a11y.pdf.

Caltrans. 2024. "California State Scenic Highways." https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways.

CARB (California Air Resources Board). 2017. *California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan.* November. https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf.

Carrier. 2012. CA16NA 018-061 Single-Stage Air Conditioner w/ Puron Refrigerant. Catalog No: CA16NA-06PD. https://resource.carrierenterprise.com/is/content/Watscocom/carrier_ca16na04200g_article_1404816230343_en_ss

CDC (California Department of Conservation). 2022. California Important Farmland Finder. Accessed, March 2024. https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/documents/publications/special-reports/SR_240-MLC-WesternSanDiegoPCR-2017-Plate01-MRZs.pdf.

CDC. 2023. "Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation." Accessed March 2023. https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/.

City of La Mesa. 1998. *City of La Mesa Subarea Habitat Conservation Plan/Natural Community Conservation Plan*. Adopted February 1998. https://nrm.dfg.ca.gov/FileHandler.ashx?DocumentID=35090&inline.

City of La Mesa. 2012a. *La Mesa General Plan: Land Use and Urban Design Element.* https://cityoflamesa.us/DocumentCenter/View/6197/03LaMesaGPLandUseUrbanDesign-CD?bidId=.

City of La Mesa. 2012b. *La Mesa General Plan: Safety Element.* https://cityoflamesa.us/DocumentCenter/View/6203/09LaMesaGPSafety-CD?bidId=.

City of La Mesa. 2012c. *La Mesa General Plan: Conservation and Sustainability Element*. Accessed March 2024. https://www.cityoflamesa.us/DocumentCenter/View/6199/05LaMesaGPConservSustain-CD?bidId=.

City of La Mesa. 2012d. *City of La Mesa General Plan Environmental Impact Report. Public Services, Utilities, and Energy*. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.cityoflamesa.us/DocumentCenter/View/5889/Chpt-4-12-Public-Services-OPT?bidId=.

City of La Mesa. 2012e. *La Mesa General Plan: Recreation and Open Space Element*. Accessed March 2024. https://www.cityoflamesa.us/DocumentCenter/View/6200/06LaMesaGPRecreationOpenSpace-CD?bidId=.

City of La Mesa. 2012f. *Bicycle Facilities and Alternative Transportation Plan*. Accessed February 2012.https://www.cityoflamesa.us/DocumentCenter/View/2477/Bicycle-Facilities-Final-Report-LaMesa_OPT_LowRes?bidId=.

City of La Mesa. 2012g. *Public Services and Facilities*. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.cityoflamesa.us/DocumentCenter/View/6204/10LaMesaGPPublicServicesFacilities-CD?bidId=.

City of La Mesa. 2013a. *City of La Mesa General Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. SCH no. 2012061053. Certified July 9, 2013. http://www.cityoflamesa.com/1077/2012-General-Plan-EIR.

City of La Mesa. 2013b. *City of La Mesa 2012 Centennial General Plan*. Adopted July 9, 2013. http://www.cityoflamesa.com/953/General-Plan.

City of La Mesa. 2015a. *City of La Mesa Jurisdictional Runoff Management Program*. June 2015. https://www.cityoflamesa.us/DocumentCenter/View/7138/2015-JRMP?bidId=.

City of La Mesa. 2015b. *Smart Growth – Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvement Plan*.

City of La Mesa. 2018. *City of La Mesa Climate Action Plan*. Adopted March 13, 2018.

City of La Mesa. 2024. "Vision Zero." Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.cityoflamesa.us/1756/Vision-Zero.

City of San Diego. 2024. "Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant." Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.sandiego.gov/public-utilities/customer-service/water-wastewater-facilities/point-loma#:%7E:text=Point%20Loma%20Wastewater%20Treatment%20Plant%20treats%20approximately%20175%20million%20gallons,gallons%20per%20day%20(mgd).

Cohen, K.M., Finney, S.C., P.L. Gibbard, and J.-X. Fan. 2023. "International Chronostratigraphic Chart." V 2023/06. June 2023. https://stratigraphy.org/ICSchart/ChronostratChart2023-06.pdf.

County of San Diego. 2022. *County of San Diego Five-Year Review Report of the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan*. Approved September 20, 2022. https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dpw/SOLID_WASTE_PLANNING_and_RECYCLING/Files/2022%20Five-Year%20Review.pdf.

Demeré, T.A., and S.L. Walsh. 1993. *Paleontological Resources, County of San Diego*. Prepared for the San Diego Planning Commission, pp. 1–68.

DOF (Department of Finance). 2023. "E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2023." Accessed April 10, 2024. https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fdof.ca.gov%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2Fsites%2F352%2FForecasting%2FDemographics%2FDocuments%2FE-5_2023_InternetVersion.xlsx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK.

DOT (U.S. Department of Transportation). 2006. *FHWA Roadway Construction Noise Model: User's Guide*. Final Report. FHWA-HEP-06-015. DOT-VNTSC-FHWA-06-02. Cambridge, Massachusetts: DOT, Research and Innovative Technology Administration. August 2006.

DTSC (Department of Toxic Substances Control). 2024. EnviroStor. https://envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/.

Ed Data (Education Data Partnership). 2024. "Grossmont Hight." Accessed April 11, 2024. https://www.ed-data.org/school/San-Diego/Grossmont-Union-High/Grossmont-High.

EIA. 2024. California State Energy Profile. Updated May 16, 2024. https://www.eia.gov/state/print.php?sid=CA.

EPA (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency). 2022. "Household Hazardous Waste (HHW)". Updated May 14, 2022. Accessed April 2024. https://www.epa.gov/hw/household-hazardous-waste-hhw.

FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency). 2021. FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL Viewer). Accessed April 2024. https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd&extent=-117.01038155790032,32.78899167548926,-116.96883950467769,32.80702868159625.

FHWA (Federal Highway Administration). 2008. *Roadway Construction Noise Model (RCNM)*, Software Version 1.1. U.S. Department of Transportation, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, John A. Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Environmental Measurement and Modeling Division. Washington, D.C. December 8, 2008.

HWD (Helix Water District). 2020. *2020 Urban Water Management Plan*. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.hwd.com/DocumentCenter/View/317/2020-Urban-Water-Management-Plan-PDF.

ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers). 2019. *Guidelines for Transportation Impact Studies in the San Diego Region*. January 22, 2019. https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/pds/ceqa/JVR/AdminRecord/IncorporatedByReference/Section-3-1-8---Utilities-and-Service-Systems/Draft+Guidelines+for+TIS+in+the+San+Diego+Region+1-22-19.pdf.

Kennedy, M.P. 1975. "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California." *California Division of Mines and Geology*, pp. 19–20.

Kennedy, M.P., and G.W. Moore. 1971. "Stratigraphic Relations of Upper Cretaceous and Eocene Formations, San Diego Coastal Area, California." *American Association of Petroleum Geologists Bulletin* 55: 719–721.

OEHHA (Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment). 2015. *Air Toxics Hot Spots Program Risk Assessment Guidelines Guidance Manual for Preparation of Health Risk Assessments 2015*. February 2015. http://oehha.ca.gov/air/hot_spots/2015/2015GuidanceManual.pdf.

OPR (Governor's Office of Planning and Research). 2018. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*. December 2018. https://opr.ca.gov/ceqa/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf.

OSHA (Occupational Safety and Health Administration). 2012. "Hazard Communication Standard: Safety Data Sheets." Accessed December 6, 2022. https://www.osha.gov/sites/default/files/publications/OSHA3514.pdf.

Peterson, G.L., and M.P. Kennedy. 1974. "Lithostratigraphic Variations in the Poway Group near San Diego, California." *San Diego Society of Natural History Transactions* 17: 251–258.

SANDAG (San Diego Association of Governments). 2020. *6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Assessment Plan.* July 10. Accessed April 2022. https://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_189_27782.pdf.

SANDAG. 2021. *San Diego Forward: The 2021 Regional Plan*. Accessed April 10, 2024. https://www.sandag.org/regional-plan/2021-regional-plan/final-2021-regional-plan.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority. 2010. *Gillespie Field Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.* Adopted January 25, 201; amended December 20, 2010. https://www.cityofsanteeca.gov/documents/planning-building/plans/gillespie-field-airport-land-use-compatibility-plan.pdf.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority. 2024. ALCUP Mapping Tool. Accessed April 2024. https://www.san.org/Airport-Projects/Land-Use-Compatibility/ALUC-Mapping-Tool.

SCAQMD (South Coast Air Quality Management District). 2008. *Final Localized Significance Threshold Methodology*. July. http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/localized-significance-thresholds/final-lst-methodology-document.pdf?sfvrsn=2.

SDAPCD (San Diego Air Pollution Control District). 2016. "SDAPCD Regulation II: Permits; Rule 20.2: New Source Review—Non-Major Sources." January 29, 2016. Accessed May 2022. https://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdapcd/documents/rules/current-rules/Rule-20.2.pdf.

SDAPCD. 2022. *Supplemental Guidelines for Submission of Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Program Health Risk Assessments (HRAs)*. July 2022. Accessed October 2023. https://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdapcd/documents/permits/air-toxics/Hot-Spots-Guidelines.pdf.

SDNHM (San Diego Natural History Museum). 2024. "Vertebrate Paleontology Records Check for Paleontological Resources for the Jericho Road Project, Dudek Project #15823, in La Mesa, San Diego County, Project Area." Unpublished Records Search Results Letter from the San Diego Natural History Museum, San Diego, California.

SVP (Society of Vertebrate Paleontology). 2010. *Standard Procedures for the Assessment and Mitigation of Adverse Impacts to Paleontological Resources*, p. 11. https://vertpaleo.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/SVP_Impact_Mitigation_Guidelines-1.pdf.

SWRCB (State Water Resources Control Board). 2024. GeoTracker. https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/.

Tan, S.S. 2002. Geologic map of the El Cajon 7.5-minute quadrangle, San Diego County, California: A digital database. California Geological Survey, Preliminary Geologic Maps PGM-02-06, 1:24,000.

The Climate Registry. 2021. "2021 Default Emission Factors." https://theclimateregistry.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/2024-Emission-Factor-Document_FINAL.pdf.

Todd, V.R. 2004. Preliminary Geologic Map of the El Cajon 30' x 60' Quadrangle, Southern California. U.S. Geological Survey, Open-File Report 2004-1361.

3.2 List of Preparers

Dudek

Vanessa Scheidel, Project Manager
Keegan Kingsbury, Environmental Analyst
Shane Russett, Air Quality Specialist
Olivia Koziel, Biologist
Angela Pham, Archaeologist
Claire Cancilla, Architectural Historian
Michael Williams, PhD, Paleontologist
Connor Burke, Noise Specialist

LGC Geotechnical Inc.

Dennis Boratynec, GE
Branden Petersen, Senior Staff Engineer

CR Associates

Jonathan Sanchez, Traffic Engineer

City of La Mesa

Laura Traffenstedt, Associate Planner

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SOURCE: SanGIS 2023, Open Street Map 2019

DUDEK

0 1,000 2,000 Feet

FIGURE 1

Project Location

Jericho Road Residential Project

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SOURCE: SanGIS 2023, Open Street Map 2019

DUDEK

0 50 100 Feet

FIGURE 2

Project Site

Jericho Road Residential Project

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SOURCE: SanGIS 2023, Open Street Map 2019

DUDEK

0 50 100 Feet

FIGURE 3

Site Plan

Jericho Road Residential Project

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

SOURCE: SanGIS 2023, Open Street Map 2019

DUDEK

0 50 100 Feet

FIGURE 4

Temporary Noise Barrier Locations

Jericho Road Residential Project

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK