



County of San Diego

APRIL F. HEINZE, P.E.

Director

(858) 694-2527
FAX (858) 467-9283

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

5560 OVERLAND AVE., STE. 410, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123-1204

FACILITIES OPERATIONS
FLEET MANAGEMENT
MAIL SERVICES
PROJECT MANAGEMENT
REAL ESTATE SERVICES

May 2014

CEQA Initial Study – Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G)

1. **Title:** Imperial Beach Branch Library Project; Project Number 1014143
2. **Lead agency name and address:**
County of San Diego, Department of General Services
5560 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, California 92123
3. **a. Contact:** Marc Cass, Project Manager
b. Phone number: 858.694.2047
c. E-mail: Marc.Cass@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. **Project location:**

The project site largely consists of a single parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number (APN) (626-400-54-00), but would connect with a community center (APN 760-107-25-00) located in the City of Imperial Beach in southern San Diego County, California, (Figure 2-1, Regional Map). Regional access is provided to the project site via Interstate 5 (I-5), and the site is located at 810 Imperial Beach Boulevard, Imperial Beach, California 91932 (Figure 2-2, Vicinity Map). The nearest intersection to the project site is Imperial Beach Boulevard and 8th Street.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1349, Grid G/1

5. **Project Applicant name and address:**

County of San Diego, Department of General Services
5560 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, California 92123

6. **General Plan:** City of Imperial Beach
Community Plan: N/A
Land Use Designation: PF - Public Facilities
Density: N/A du/N/A acre(s)
Floor Area Ratio (FAR): N/A
7. **Zoning:** City of Imperial Beach
Use Regulation: PF – Public Facilities
Minimum Lot Size: N/A
Special Area Regulation: N/A
8. **Description of project:**

The project is the demolition of the existing 5,000-square-foot Imperial Beach Branch Library due to the age and condition of the building, and consists of the construction of a larger approximately 12,000-square-foot library facility. The future library would provide separate areas for children, family, teens, adults, staff, book store, and a great room (Figure 2-4 Conceptual Site Plan and Figure 2-5 Conceptual Floor Plan). The additional building area would result in the library expanding into the existing 11-space parking lot. In addition, the project proposes to renovate or rebuild the existing 2,000-square-foot community room (the Marina Vista Center) located north of the existing parking lot. The new library building would be connected to the renovated community room via a new entry way (Figure 2-4, Conceptual Site Plan). The total building area for the new library and renovated community room would amount to 14,000 square feet.

The proposed architectural features of the new library facility would include a lifeguard tower façade consisting of a standing seam metal roof, metal wall panels with a reflective coating. In addition, the following building features are proposed: wave roof [incorporates standing seam metal roof and clerestory windows (above eye level windows to bring in outside light and fresh air into the proposed inner space of the building)], a wetland roof (which shades the clerestory), Brazilian hardwood siding, a poet's patio, children's splash patio, surfboard sidewalk, and a bookdrop window display (Figure 2-6 Conceptual Design). The highest point of the structure would be 31'-6". The following architectural and landscape elements are LEED certified silver: the cool roof (standing steam metal roof with a reflective coating), the green roof (water filtration system along the edge of the roof), photovoltaic glazing windows, and xeriscape landscaping.

The proposed library expansion from 5,000 square feet to 12,000 square feet would require an increase of parking spaces from 16 spaces to 38 parking spaces. To accommodate the parking needs of the project, a shared parking agreement with St. James Lutheran Church would be obtained that would allow at least 21-stall parking spots to be reserved for the library. The remaining demand of 17 parking spaces will utilize the on-street parking spaces along 8th Street. The City plans to increase the number of parking spaces along the east side of 8th Street from 33 to 50 spaces, resulting in an additional 17 on-street parking spaces (refer to Figure 2-4).

The Asbestos/Lead Survey conducted for the proposed project by the County of San Diego's Department of Environmental Health - Community Health Division, confirmed the presence of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing building materials; therefore, the project would involve the abatement of lead-based paint and asbestos-containing building materials prior to the demolition of the existing facility. The project would include removing all structures on the project site. Prior to the commencement of demolition activities, all asbestos and lead-based paint materials would be remediated per the requirements identified by the County of San Diego (County's) Department of Environmental Health. Demolition materials would then be hauled off site and transported to the Sycamore Landfill and/or the closest landfill that accepts hazardous materials.

9. **Surrounding land uses and setting (briefly describe the project's surroundings):**

Lands surrounding the project site are used for residential uses, Veterans Park, a church, schools, commercial uses, and public facilities. The topography of the project site is relatively flat. The site is currently developed with a 5,000 square-foot library.

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

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Coastal Development Permit	City of Imperial Beach
Right-of-Way Permits: Encroachment Permit	City of Imperial Beach

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of General Services finds that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of General Services finds 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.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of General Services finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.



Signature

5/1/14

Date

April F. Heinze

Printed Name

Director

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
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 Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
- The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

Less Than Significant Impact: A site visit was conducted July 17, 2013. The proposed project is not located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista. The visual composition consists of public facilities, a park, a church, a school, and residential uses surrounded by mature landscaping within existing development.

The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing 5,000-square-foot library that was originally constructed in 1967. The project is compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality because no viewshed would be impacted and the project would be consistent with the urban nature and mass of the surrounding area. Additionally, the proposed project would be consistent with the site's existing land use. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present, and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII, Mandatory Findings of Significance, for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVIII are not located within the project viewshed and would not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project proposes to remove the existing structures on the site and the construction of a new library facility on a site that is not located near or within the viewshed of a scenic vista. Therefore, the project would not result in adverse project or cumulative impacts 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic per the Caltrans California Scenic Highway Program. Generally, the area defined within a state scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist’s line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

No Impact: State Route (SR) 75, an officially designated state scenic highway (Caltrans California Scenic Highway Program, Caltrans 2013), is located approximately 0.92 miles northwest of the project site. SR 75 starts from Imperial Beach city limit to Avenida Del Sol in the City of Coronado, and Coronado Bridge. However, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of SR 75 and would not damage or remove visual resources within SR 75. The site is developed with an existing 5,000-square-foot library, surface parking, and associated landscape and hardscape. The project site consists of the demolition and reconstruction of the Imperial Beach Branch Library. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a state scenic highway.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present, and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XVIII, Mandatory Findings of Significance, for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVIII are not located within the scenic vista’s viewshed and would not contribute to a cumulative impact because the project site is not located within the vicinity of an officially designated scenic highway. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project- or cumulative-level effect on a scenic resource within a state scenic highway.

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity, and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surroundings can be characterized as an established, developed community. The established community consists of the following land uses: residential uses, Veterans Park, church, schools, commercial uses, and public facilities.

The site is developed with an existing 5,000-square-foot library, surface parking, and associated landscape and hardscape. The project site consists of the demolition and reconstruction of the Imperial Beach Branch Library. The existing character of the site would slightly change from a small, old library with surface parking to a new, larger library facility with associated hardscape and landscape. The new library facility would be one story tall with an architectural façade of a lifeguard tower at the main building entrance. The highest point of the structure would be 31'- 6". The lifeguard tower façade contains standing seam metal roof, metal wall panels with a reflective coating. In addition, the following building features are proposed: wave roof [incorporates standing seam metal roof and clerestory windows (above eye level windows to bring in outside light and fresh air into the proposed inner space of the building)], a wetland roof (which shades the clerestory), woody siding (Brazilian hardwood siding which are renewable, durable and low maintenance), a poet's patio, children's splash patio, surfboard sidewalk, and a bookdrop window display (see Figure 2-6 Conceptual Design). The following architectural and landscape elements are LEED certified silver: the cool roof (standing steam metal roof with a reflective coating), the green roof (water filtration system along the edge of the roof), photovoltaic glazing windows, and xeriscape landscaping. The proposed building features are representative of the existing visual community character.

Construction activities would cause short-term visual quality impacts to nearby residences, park users, church goers, civic center staff and visitors, and passing motorists along Imperial Beach Boulevard and 8th Street. Construction equipment would be screened as far away as possible from residential uses. Due to the temporary nature of changes in visual character and quality resulting from construction, the proposed project would not significantly degrade the existing visual character of the project site.

The project would not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present, and future projects

within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XVIII, Mandatory Findings of Significance, for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XVIII are not located within the viewshed surrounding the project. Furthermore, the cumulative projects would contribute to the urban environment in the viewshed and they would not result in additional disturbed vacant/undeveloped sites. Therefore, the project would not result in any adverse project- or cumulative-level effects on visual character or quality on site or in the surrounding area.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is already an illuminated area. Currently there are sources of nighttime light and glare from the existing library facility and surface parking lot. The proposed project would result in the addition of lighting for the proposed Imperial Beach Branch Library and landscaped areas. The overall appearance of the new library and intensification of the urban uses in the project area would be consistent with the existing setting. Introduction of some amount of nighttime lighting is needed due to safety requirements. The additional nighttime lighting could be considered an annoyance to the residences across from the project site on 8th Street and Imperial Beach Boulevard. The County’s zoning code Section 59.105 provides the requirements for lamp source and shielding. In addition, Section 59.106 requires that the lighting plans indicate the location and type of outdoor lighting, and a description of the type of lighting to be installed (including but not limited to manufacturer’s catalog cuts, photometric study, and drawings). The plans are required to be submitted and reviewed prior to the issuance of a permit. Therefore, compliance with the County Codes 59.105 and 59.106 would ensure that lighting impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any agricultural resources, lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local

Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency (SANGIS 2007a). Therefore, no agricultural resources including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is zoned PF – Public Facilities (City of Imperial Beach October 2010), which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Additionally, the project site’s land is not under a Williamson Act Contract (SANGIS 2007b). Therefore, the project does not 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)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain forest lands or timberland. The City of Imperial Beach does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. In addition, the project is consistent with existing zoning as the same use is proposed and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland production zones.

d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site does not contain any forest lands as defined in California Public Resources Code section 12220(g), therefore project implementation would not

result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of off-site forest resources.

- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site and the surrounding area within a radius of 1 mile does not contain any active agricultural operations or lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency (California Department of Conservation 2013). Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations would be converted to a non-agricultural use.

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

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Regional planning efforts to improve air quality include a variety of strategies to reduce emissions from motor vehicles and minimize emissions from stationary sources. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) is the agency principally responsible for comprehensive air pollution control in San Diego County. The SDAPCD develops rules and regulations, establishes permitting requirements for stationary sources, inspects sources, and enforces measures through educational programs or fines, when necessary. The applicable air quality plan for San Diego County is the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS). The RAQS is based on San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth forecasts for the region and incorporates measures to meet state and federal requirements. Under this threshold, the significance of air quality impacts is based on the degree to which the project is consistent with SANDAG's growth forecasts. If a project is consistent with growth forecasts, its resulting impacts were anticipated in the RAQS and are considered to be

less than significant. Growth forecast in the RAQS are based on approved general plans, community plans, and redevelopment plans.

The project site consists of the demolition and reconstruction of the Imperial Beach Branch Library. Additionally, as discussed below, emissions during project demolition would be less than the County's thresholds of significance. The types and quantities of construction equipment that would be used for the proposed project would be typical of demolition and construction activities and would not be of sufficient magnitude or quantity to exceed the assumptions used in the preparation of construction equipment emissions in the RAQS. Because the RAQS has accounted for construction-related emissions of ozone precursors, construction emissions generated by the proposed project would be consistent with those included in the emissions inventory of the RAQS; therefore, they would be consistent with construction-related emissions projected in the RAQS. Hence, the threshold of significance (i.e., conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan) would not be exceeded and no impact would result.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Emissions resulting from demolition and construction activities would be short term and temporary and would be generated by heavy equipment, construction-related trips by workers, material-hauling trucks, and associated fugitive dust generation. The principal pollutants of concern would be particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀) and ozone precursors, reactive organic gases (ROG) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x). Emissions from demolition and construction were estimated using the URBEMIS 2007, Version 9.2.4, land use and air emissions model, available online at <http://www.urbemis.com>. For the purposes of estimating the construction emissions, it was assumed that the demolition of the proposed project would commence in the fourth quarter of 2014. Construction would occur over an approximately two year period. Construction equipment and emissions estimates are provided in Appendix A of this document.

Table 4-1 provides estimated project emissions during demolition and construction activities. The emissions are compared to the County's air quality thresholds of significance (County of San Diego 2007).

**Table 4-1
Estimated Maximum Daily Construction Emissions (pounds/day)**

	VOCs	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
<i>2014</i>						
	0.87	5.99	5.14	0.00	0.40	0.36
<i>2015</i>						
	2.29	17.65	11.18	0.00	2.63	1.13
<i>2016</i>						
	6.98	8.40	7.86	0.00	0.65	0.59
<i>Maximum daily emissions</i>	6.98	17.65	11.18	0.00	2.63	1.13
<i>Emission threshold</i>	75	250	550	250	100	55
Threshold exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: URBEMIS 2007. See Appendix A for complete results.

VOCs = volatile organic compounds; NO_x = nitrogen oxides; CO = carbon monoxide; SO_x = sulfur oxides; PM₁₀ = particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns; PM_{2.5} = particulate matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns

As shown, daily construction emissions would not exceed the County’s significance thresholds for VOCs, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. Impacts during construction would be less than significant.

Following the completion of construction activities, the proposed project would generate VOC, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, and PM_{2.5} emissions from mobile and stationary sources including vehicular traffic and area sources (space heating and landscaping).

Vehicular Traffic

The proposed project would impact air quality through the vehicular traffic generated by the proposed project. According to the proposed project’s traffic report (RBF 2014), the baseline traffic scenario consists of 400 trips. The expansion of the library by 7,000 square feet would result in approximately 420 additional daily trips. See Appendix D for detailed trip generation information.

The URBEMIS 2007 model was utilized to estimate daily emissions from proposed vehicular sources (refer to Appendix A). URBEMIS 2007 default data, including temperature, trip characteristics, variable start information, emissions factors, and trip distances, were conservatively used for the model inputs.

Project-related traffic was assumed to be comprised of a mixture of vehicles in accordance with the model outputs for traffic. Emission factors representing the vehicle mix and emissions for 2016 were used to estimate emissions associated with the proposed project.

Area Sources

In addition to estimating mobile source emissions, the URBEMIS 2007 model was also used to estimate emissions from the project’s area sources, which include other natural gas combustion, landscaping (which would not produce winter emissions), and architectural coatings for maintenance. Refer to Appendix A for additional information.

Table 4-2, Estimated Daily Maximum Operational Emissions, presents the maximum daily emissions associated with the operation of the proposed project after all phases of construction have been completed. The values shown for motor vehicles and area sources are the maximum summer or winter daily emissions results from URBEMIS 2007. Complete details of the emissions calculations are provided in Appendices B and C of this document.

**Table 4-2
Estimated Daily Maximum Operational Emissions (pounds/day)**

Emission Source	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_x	PM₁₀	PM_{2.5}
<i>Summer</i>						
Motor Vehicles	2.30	3.14	28.97	0.04	6.94	1.34
Area Sources	0.21	0.16	1.66	0.00	0.01	0.01
Total	2.51	3.30	30.63	0.04	6.95	1.35
<i>Winter</i>						
Motor Vehicles	2.69	4.57	31.26	0.03	6.94	1.34
Area Sources	0.09	0.14	0.11	0.00	0.00	0.00
Total	2.78	4.71	31.37	0.03	6.94	1.34
<i>Emission Threshold</i>	137	250	550	250	100	55
Threshold Exceeded?	No	No	No	No	No	No

Source: See Appendices A and C for complete results.

Note: The emissions were calculated based on the 2011 RBF Traffic Study which reported 540 vehicle trips. Based on the updated 2014 RBF Traffic Study the vehicle trips were reduced to 420. The emission estimates in the table are considered conservative because they utilized the higher trip generation. Emissions represent maximum of summer and winter. "Summer" emissions are representative of the conditions that may occur during the ozone season (May 1 to October 31) and "winter" emissions are representative of the conditions that may occur during the balance of the year (November 1 to April 30).

As shown, daily operational emissions would not exceed the County's significance thresholds for VOCs, NO_x, CO, SO_x, PM₁₀, or PM_{2.5}. Impacts during operation would be less than significant.

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

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project's cumulative impacts are primarily based on an analysis of the consistency of the project with the local general plan and the applicable air quality plan. As discussed previously, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of any federal, state, or local air quality attainment plans and the project would be consistent with the existing land use of the site. As a result, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable

net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.

In addition, the improved library building would operate at a higher energy efficiency than the existing building as it would incorporate sustainable design and energy reduction measures. Therefore, it is anticipated that implementation of the proposed LEED Silver certified project and constructing the library as a zero net energy facility would not substantially increase operational criteria air pollutant emissions resulting from energy use relative to that associated with the existing structure. Moreover, as the project would be consistent with the existing land use as anticipated in the current local air quality plans, the increase in motor vehicle emissions resulting from the project coupled with the increase of 7,000 square feet would be offset by the increase in energy efficiency of the new building, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in criteria air pollutant emissions. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (preschool–12th grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, daycare centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly. The nearest sensitive receptors to the proposed project include single family residential development to the west, northwest, south, southwest, and southeast, and multi-family residential development to the northeast.

Fugitive Dust

The building demolition and subsequent cleanup activities would result in generation of fugitive dust (i.e., PM₁₀). The project must comply with SDAPCD Rule 55, which applies to “any commercial construction or demolition activity capable of generating fugitive dust emissions.” Accordingly, compliance with Rule 55 would minimize visible fugitive dust emissions beyond the property line. Appropriate measures, including use of water sprays during demolition and wetting of disturbed soil, would be applied during the project. Due to the presence of nearby sensitive receptors, the project would also notify residences prior to the start of demolition. With these measures, the potential for fugitive dust impacts during demolition activities would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

M-AIR-1: Prior to commencement of demolition activities, all residences located within 1,000 feet of the project site shall be notified of the anticipated demolition schedule and daily hours of demolition activities.

Air Toxics

Diesel exhaust particulate matter would be emitted from heavy equipment and trucks used in the demolition process. Because diesel exhaust particulate matter is considered to be carcinogenic, long-term exposure to diesel exhaust emissions could result in adverse health impacts. Demolition of the proposed project would result in short-term, temporary emissions of diesel exhaust from construction equipment. The emissions would not occur 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, but would be more likely to occur during daytime working hours with varying uses over that time of equipment and vehicles dependent on diesel fuel. Because of the temporary, short-term nature and frequency of demolition emissions, diesel exhaust particulate matter would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; therefore, exposure to sensitive receptors due to emissions of air toxics would be a less-than-significant impact. With respect to operations, impacts would be less than significant as the project would consist of the expansion of the existing library, and would not introduce new sources of operational emissions from those under existing conditions.

With regard to demolition activities and the potential release of asbestos, the SDAPCD's Regulation XI, Subpart M, Rule 361.145 requires that the SDAPCD be notified in writing at least 10 days prior to the start of any demolition or renovation activities involving the presence of asbestos-containing material. The existing on-site building is 47 years old, originally built in 1967. The Asbestos/Lead Survey conducted by the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health - Community Health Division, Occupational Health Program, confirmed the presence of regulated asbestos-containing material within the existing building. According to the asbestos and lead-based paint survey, following materials tested positive for asbestos: acoustic spray ceiling, 1'x1' floor tile & mastic, plaster, and roof mastic. All of the remaining sampled materials tested negative for asbestos. Several components within the structure were identified to contain lead at "high" concentrations (i.e. >1.0 milligrams per square centimeter (mg/cm²)) (County of San Diego 2013). Subpart M of SDAPCD's Regulation XI requires that all regulated asbestos-containing material be removed prior to demolition activities. The proposed project would comply with this regulation. In addition, the County would comply with Rule 631.145 by providing notification of the SDAPCD in writing at least 10 days before the start of the demolition of any buildings. Compliance with Rule 361.145 would reduce asbestos-related impacts to a level that is less than significant. Due to the presence of nearby sensitive receptors, the project would also notify residences prior to the start of demolition, as described in M-AIR-1. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Demolition activities could generate airborne odors associated with the operation of construction vehicles (e.g., diesel exhaust). Total demolition

would take up to 8 weeks. Demolition emissions would be isolated to the immediate vicinity of the project site and would be limited to a finite period of time that would be relatively short. As noted previously, operational emissions would resemble those under existing conditions and the project would not introduce new odor-generating uses to the site; thus, the project would not create objectionable odors in the long term. As such, impacts related to creation of odors during demolition of the project would be less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant: The proposed project site is not known to contain habitat for 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 (CDFW)¹ or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), due to the disturbed and urban nature of the project site. The majority of on-site vegetation is composed of ornamental landscaping. Additionally, wildlife on site is limited to common species typically found in urban environments. The site has already been scraped and paved for surface parking, the existing 5,000-square-foot library, and urban parkland (see Figure 2-3, Aerial Photo). The area around the site has been primarily developed for residential, park, church, and public facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact associated candidate, sensitive, or special-status species as identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFW or the USFWS.

¹ As of September 2012, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) has changed its name to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). In quoted material and when citing documents published before the official name change, the original name is retained; in original text and for documents published after the official name change, CDFW is used.

- 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is the demolition and reconstruction of a library facility. The proposed project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by any local or regional plans, policies, or regulations. In addition, the project does not propose any off-site improvements, and hence would not contribute to off-site impacts related to riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is currently developed with 5,000-square-foot library, a surface parking lot, and associated landscape and hardscape areas. The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river, or water of the United States, that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion, or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts would occur to wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project site is currently developed with 5,000-square-foot library, a surface parking lot, and associated landscape and hardscape areas. Due to the developed nature of the project site, there is limited biological value and no impedance of the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, the use of an established native resident or migratory wildlife corridor, or the use of native wildlife nursery sites expected as a result of the proposed project. Some bird species present or potentially present in the project area may nest within the assortment of ornamental trees and shrubs along Imperial Beach Boulevard and 8th Street and on the grounds of the library facility. Migratory birds may utilize ornamental trees and shrubs with good vegetative structure for nest construction and foraging while raptor species may nest in larger, taller trees within the project area. If nesting bird species are present at the time of demolition or construction, indirect impacts to these species could occur due to demolition/construction related noise and the removal of the existing on-site ornamental landscaping. Implementation of mitigation measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 would reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

M-BIO-1: Trees, shrubs, and the bare ground in and surrounding the project area may provide nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MTBA). If project construction (including demolition) cannot be conducted outside of the nesting season (typically February 1 to August 30), then preconstruction surveys for nesting raptors and migratory birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist 30 days in advance of any earth disturbing activities, and continued weekly with a final survey no more than 3 days prior to the start of construction activities, including vegetation clearing. The qualified biologist shall survey the construction zone and a 500-foot radius surrounding the proposed construction zone in suitable habitat to determine whether the proposed demolition/construction has the potential to disturb or otherwise harm nesting birds.

M-BIO-2: If an active raptor nest is located within a 500-foot radius around the proposed construction zone, including demolition and staging areas, or if an active migratory bird nest is located within a 300-foot radius and construction must take place during the breeding season, a buffer zone (300-feet for non-raptors, 500-feet for raptors) shall be established by a qualified biologist and confirmed by the appropriate resource agency. A qualified wildlife biologist shall monitor the nest to determine when the young have fledged and submit monthly monitoring reports to the County Department of General Services throughout the nesting season on the status of the nest. The biological monitor shall have the authority to cease demolition and/or construction if there is any sign of

distress to the raptor or migratory bird. Reference to this requirement and the MBTA shall be included in the construction specifications.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the City’s General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element, most of the open space in the City consists of public lands as well as other open spaces including the San Diego-Eastern Arizona Railroad right-of-way, Ream Field (U.S. Navy Outlying Landing Field), Salt Evaporation Ponds, and the San Diego Bay. Due to the urbanized nature and the developed area of the project site, existing significant wildlife habitats within such areas are nonexistent. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Nature Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, or any other local policies or ordinances that project biological resources.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on the Due Diligence Report for Imperial Beach Branch Library Project (ASM Affiliates 2010), it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources (Appendix B). Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to historical resources.

The Historic Resources Evaluation Report for the Imperial Beach Library prepared by ASM Affiliates in November 2013 (ASM Affiliates 2013) conducted a standard assessment approach in order to determine the historical significance of the building, utilizing guidelines set forth by the California Office of Historic Preservation’s *Technical Assistance Series #6: California Register and National Register: A Comparison (for purposes of determining eligibility for the California Register)*, the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board’s *Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria*, and the County of San Diego’s *Guidelines for Determining*

Significance. ASM Affiliates also consulted guidelines from the National Register of Historic Places' (NRHP) *How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation*.

Based on this resource report, the Imperial Beach Branch Library was found to be ineligible for the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and the San Diego County Local Register of Historical Resources (Local Register) for the following reasons:

- The Imperial Beach Branch Library is less than 50 years of age;
- The Imperial Beach Branch Library is not representative of the theme of community development;
- No specific, important, or significant individuals were found to be closely associated with the property;
- The Imperial Beach Branch Library is not representative of distinctive characteristics of type, period, or method of construction that would distinguish it architecturally;
- Delmar Mitchell, the architect of the Imperial Beach Branch Library, is not listed as with Modern architects considered to have significantly contributed to San Diego Modernism;
- The Imperial Beach Branch Library is a common property type that would not have potential to provide information about history or prehistory.

The Imperial Beach Branch Library fails to meet any definitions of a significant historic resource under the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). It is not considered a locally or regionally unique resource.

Due to the Imperial Beach Branch Library being ineligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in the Local Register, and is not otherwise identified as a significant historical resource of California, the property was determined not to be historically significant. Therefore, the project would have no impact on a historical resource.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: See response a) above. The project would not impact archaeological resources since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to buried archaeological resources.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes that generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County.

No Impact: The site is currently developed and does not support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not impact paleontological resources since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for impacts to buried paleontological resources.

e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would not disturb any human remains since prior grading of the project site has eliminated any potential for the presence of interred human remains.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not located within a fault-rupture hazard zone as identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42 (SP 42), Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California or within an area with substantial evidence of a known fault. As the site is not within a fault hazard zone, the potential for fault rupture is low. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: While the project site is located in San Diego County, which is susceptible to strong seismic ground shaking, the project would be designed to resist seismic forces in accordance with the criteria contained in the California Building Code guidelines. Therefore, the project would not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located outside of liquefaction zones as identified in the San Diego County "Potential Liquefaction Areas" Map (San Diego County 2011). This indicates that the liquefaction potential at the site is low. In addition,

the site is not located within a floodplain. Therefore, there would be a less-than-significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The City of Imperial Beach is generally flat. The project site is not within a liquefaction zone as identified in the San Diego County “Liquefaction Susceptibility Areas” Map (San Diego County 2011). Therefore, the project would not result in significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as urban land. Urban land consists of “closely built-up areas in cities. Buildings, streets, and sidewalks cover almost all of the surface. The soil has been so altered by urban works that identification is not feasible” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The project site has been previously graded and supports urban development, including the existing Imperial Beach Branch Library, surface parking, hardscape, and landscape areas. Short-term construction activities could have the potential to result in erosion of soils. However, the proposed project would include erosion and siltation control features pursuant to National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements, as well as adhering to all applicable local, state, and federal regulations. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-GE-1 would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure

M-GE-1: The County shall prepare an erosion control plan for the project site. The erosion control plan shall provide site-specific best management practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion both during demolition and construction activities, including but not limited to sediment control, wind erosion control, and stormwater management.

In addition, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present, and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow City of Imperial Beach requirements for erosion protection; Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; and City of Imperial Beach stormwater standards. Refer to XVIII, Mandatory Findings of Significance, for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

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 an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site currently consists of a previously graded lot with a 5,000 square feet of existing building space, surface parking lot, and associated hardscape and landscape areas. The project proposes to demolish the existing 5,000-square-foot library and reconstruct a 12,000 square-foot library facility on the site. The proposed project would not result in a significant impact from on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI, Geology and Soils, Question a, iii and iv.

e) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on site are identified as urban land; due to the urban environment, further identification of the soils is not feasible. The project site is not located within a potential expansive soil area as identified in the San Diego County "Potential Expansive Soil Areas" Map (San Diego County 2011). Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or property to a potential risk to life or property as a result of expansive soils.

f) 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No septic tanks exist on the project site. The site and surrounding area are served by an extensive, existing infrastructure system, including sewer collection. The proposed project would connect to the existing sewer systems and would not involve other, alternative wastewater disposal methods.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be associated with the demolition and construction of the proposed project through use of construction equipment and vehicle trips. Emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) were estimated using URBEMIS 2007. For the purposes of estimating the construction emissions, it was assumed that construction of the proposed project would commence in the fourth quarter of 2014. Construction would occur over an approximately twoyear period. Construction equipment and emissions estimates are provided in Appendix C of this document.

For the purposes of this analysis, it was generally assumed that heavy construction equipment would be operating at the site for approximately 8 hours per day, 5 days per week (22 days per month), during demolition and construction activities. Additionally, URBEMIS model assumptions were used for worker trips and vendor (delivery truck) trips during building demolition.

The URBEMIS 2007 results were adjusted to estimate methane (CH₄) and nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions in addition to CO₂. The CO₂ emissions from off-road equipment and vehicles and delivery trucks, which are assumed by URBEMIS 2007 to be diesel fueled, were adjusted by a factor derived from the relative CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O for diesel fuel as reported in the California Climate Action Registry's *General Reporting Protocol* (CCAR 2009) for transportation fuels and the global warming potential (GWP) for each GHG to

estimate the emissions in units of CO₂ equivalent (CO₂E).² The CO₂ emissions associated with construction worker trips were multiplied by a factor based on the assumption that CO₂ represents 95% of the CO₂E emissions associated with passenger vehicles (EPA 2005). The results were then converted from tons per year to metric tons per year (MT CO₂E/yr). Table 4-3, Estimated Construction GHG Emissions, shows the estimated annual GHG construction emissions associated with the proposed project.

**Table 4-3
Estimated Construction GHG Emissions (MT CO₂E/yr)**

	GHG Emission MT CO ₂ E/yr
2014	16
2015	158
2016	94
Total	268

Source: URBEMIS 2007. See Appendix C for complete results.

Note: The emissions were calculated based on the 2011 RBF Traffic Study which reported 540 vehicle trips. Based on the updated 2014 RBF Traffic Study the vehicle trips were reduced to 420. The emission estimates in the table are considered conservative because they utilized the higher trip generation.

The total proposed project’s construction emissions would equal approximately 268 MT CO₂E.

For the purposes of analyzing GHG impacts as a result of the proposed project, the project was analyzed under the updated County of San Diego *Guidelines for Determining Significance – Climate Change* which includes a 2,500 metric ton CO₂E per year “bright line” screening threshold (County of San Diego 2013). The County developed screening criteria for a range of project types and sizes to identify smaller projects that would have less-than-cumulatively considerable GHG emissions effects (Table 4-4). If a proposed project is the same type and equal to, or smaller than the project size listed, it is presumed that the operational GHG emissions for that project would not exceed 2,500 MT CO₂E per year, and there would be a less-than-cumulatively considerable impact (County of San Diego 2013). Use of the 2,500 metric ton “bright line” threshold only applies to a project’s operational emissions and does not require construction emissions be annualized and added to the operational emissions. Therefore, the construction emissions presented in Table 4-3 above are provided for informational purposes only.

**Table 4-4
Screening Criteria**

Project/Plan Type	Screening Threshold
Single-Family Housing	86 dwelling units
Low-Rise Apartment Housing	121 dwelling units

² The CO₂ equivalent for a gas is derived by multiplying the mass of the gas by the associated GWP, such that MT CO₂E = (metric tons of a GHG) × (GWP of the GHG). For example, the GWP for CH₄ is 21. This means that emissions of 1 metric ton of methane are equivalent to emissions of 21 metric tons of CO₂.

**Table 4-4
Screening Criteria**

Project/Plan Type	Screening Threshold
Mid-Rise Apartment Housing	136 dwelling units
High-Rise Apartment Housing	144 dwelling units
Condominium or Townhouse Housing	120 dwelling units
Congregate Care (Assisted Living) Facility	239 dwelling units
Elementary or Middle School	91,000 square feet
High School	103,000 square feet
University/College (four years)	336 students
Library	81,000 square feet
Restaurant	12,000 square feet
Hotel	106 rooms
Free-Standing Retail Store	31,000 square feet
Shopping Center	33,000 square feet
Convenience Market (24-hour)	2,000 square feet
Office Building	61,000 square feet
Office Park	56,000 square feet
Hospital	47,000 square feet
Warehouse	141,000 square feet
Light Industrial Facility	74,000 square feet

Source: County of San Diego 2013

Notes: Land use types outlined in the table above are intended to correlate with those presented in the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual (8th Edition). Proposed project land use types will be compared with the land use types included in the screening table above to determine applicability. Low-rise apartments have one or two stories, such as garden apartments. Mid-rise apartments have between 3 and 10 stories. High-rise apartments are normally rental units in buildings with more than 10 stories. A shopping center includes a group of commercial establishments that is developed as a unit. A free-standing retail store (also known as "free-standing discount store") is a free-standing store with off-street parking that offers a wide range of customer services and would typically be open 7 days per week with relatively long hours. Office parks are normally in a suburban context and contain office buildings and support services arranged in a campus-type setting, whereas an office building would accommodate multiple tenants in a single structure. Light industrial facilities would typically involve assembly of processed or partially processed materials into products and would have an energy demand that is not substantially higher than office buildings of the same size and scale. Light industrial facilities would not typically generate dust, other air pollutants, light, or noise that is perceptible beyond the boundary of the subject property.

Operation of the proposed project would result in GHG emissions from vehicular traffic, area sources (natural gas combustion, landscaping), electrical generation, water supply, and solid waste.

To effectively analyze operational GHG emissions associated with the proposed project, two scenarios were modeled. The first scenario represents project emissions under a "business as usual" approach, which estimates project emissions absent federal, state and local measures and without project features intended to reduce GHG emissions. The second scenario represents project emissions with implementation of applicable federal, state and local GHG reduction measures and project features. Statewide emission reduction measures proposed in CARB's *Scoping Plan* (CARB 2008) that are applicable to the proposed project as well as the percent reduction from "business as usual" are indicated in Table 4-5 below. Detailed calculations can be found in Appendix C.

**Table 4-5
State Measures Addressing Reduction of GHG Emissions**

Measure	Sector	Percent Reduction from Business as Usual
AB 1493 – Pavley Standards	Transportation	19.71%
Energy Efficiency	Energy Consumption (Electricity)	10.92%
Renewable Portfolio Standard (33% by 2020)	Energy Consumption (Electricity)	15.30%
Natural Gas Efficiency	Energy Consumption (Natural Gas)	9.54%
Renewable Portfolio Standard (33% by 2020)	Energy Consumption (Water Supply)	15.30%

Source: CARB 2008. See Appendix C for complete results.

Vehicular Traffic

The proposed project would impact air quality through the vehicular traffic generated by the proposed project. According to the proposed project’s traffic report (RBF2014), the proposed project would result in a net increase in 420 trips per day. See Appendix D for detailed trip generation information.

Annual CO₂ emissions from motor vehicle trips for full project buildout were quantified using URBEMIS 2007 (refer to Appendix C for additional details and model assumptions). As described earlier, CH₄ and N₂O emissions were accounted for by multiplying the URBEMIS 2007 CO₂ emissions by a factor based on the assumption that CO₂ represents 95% of the CO₂E emissions associated with passenger vehicles (EPA 2005).

GHG emission reduction measures identified above in Table 4-5 would reduce emissions associated with vehicular traffic by approximately 20%.

Area Sources

In addition to estimating mobile source emissions, URBEMIS 2007 was also used to estimate emissions from the project’s area sources, which include natural gas combustion and landscape maintenance (which would not produce winter emissions). Refer to Appendix C for additional information. The CO₂ emissions from natural gas combustion were adjusted by a factor derived from the relative CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O for natural gas as reported in the CCAR’s *General Reporting Protocol* (CCAR 2009) for stationary combustion fuels and their GWPs.

GHG emission reduction measures identified above in Table 4-5 would reduce emissions associated with natural gas combustion by approximately 10%.

Electrical Generation

Electric usage rates were provided by the City of Imperial Beach (City of Imperial Beach 2013). Electricity consumption would be approximately 58,605 kilowatt-hours per year (see Appendix C for calculations) without accounting for the electricity generated by the existing library structure.

The generation of electricity through combustion of fossil fuels typically results in emissions of CO₂ and to a smaller extent CH₄ and N₂O. Annual electricity emissions were estimated using the reported CO₂ emissions per kilowatt-hour for San Diego Gas & Electric, which would provide electricity for the project. The contributions of CH₄ and N₂O for power plants in California were obtained from the CCAR's *General Reporting Protocol* (CCAR 2009), which were adjusted for their GWPs.

GHG emission reduction measures identified above in Table 4-5 would reduce emissions associated with electrical generation by approximately 26%.

Water Supply

Water supplied to the proposed project requires the use of electricity. Accordingly, the supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water would indirectly result in GHG emissions through use of electricity. Water usage rates were provided by the City of Imperial Beach (City of Imperial Beach 2013). The estimated electrical usage associated with supply, conveyance, treatment, and distribution of water was obtained from a CEC report on electricity associated with water supply in California (CEC 2006).

GHG emission reduction measures identified above in Table 4-5 would reduce emissions associated with electricity used for water supply by approximately 15%.

Solid Waste

The proposed project would generate solid waste, and would therefore result in CO₂E emissions associated with landfill off-gassing. Solid waste generation rates for the proposed project were obtained from the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery waste generation data (CalRecycle 2013), and CO₂E conversion factors were obtained from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's Greenhouse Gas Model, Version 1.1.9 Beta (BAAQMD 2010).

**Table 4-6
Estimated GHG Emissions Compared to Business as Usual
(metric tons CO₂E/year)**

Source	GHG Emissions Proposed Project with GHG Reduction Measures
Motor Vehicles	404
Area Sources	
Natural Gas Combustion	24
Landscaping	0
Electrical Generation	15
Water Supply	0
Solid Waste	11
Total	455

Source: See Appendix C for complete results.

As shown in Table 4-6, the proposed project, after accounting for statewide GHG reduction measures and project features, would result in a net change of 455 metric tons CO₂E per year. This would be less than the County’s 2,500 MT CO₂E “bright line” screening threshold. Therefore, impacts during operation would be less than significant.

As shown in Table 4-7, the project has incorporated the following sustainable features into the project design in order to reduce its overall emissions. Sustainable goals are set to ensure that the library would achieve LEED Silver certification and be a zero net energy building:

**Table 4-7
Project Design Features**

Feature	Specifications
Energy	Cool Roof – standing seam metal roof with reflective coating
	Green Roof – Edge of roof water filter system
	Day Lighting – Clerestory – Photovoltaic glazing at windows
Water Conservation	Green Roof – Edge of roof water filter system
	Low-flow fixtures, xeriscape landscaping (drought-tolerant landscaping)
Indoor Air Quality	Materials with low VOC content
Waste Reduction	Recycled/Renewable Material – Carpets, Brazilian hardwood
Material Sourcing	Recycled/Renewable Material – Carpets, Brazilian hardwood
Other	Building Commissioning – monitoring of water use, mechanical, and electrical consumption

The identified project design features reflect the types of emissions reduction measures recommended by public agencies to contribute to reducing the intensity of GHG emissions and helping California achieve its state-wide goals. Additionally, the project would achieve LEED Silver certification, would be built as a zero net building and would incorporate additional design features including energy and water conservation measures, designed to further reduce GHG emissions once operational. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The County of San Diego adopted the *County of San Diego Climate Action Plan (CAP)* in June 2012, which documents the County’s long-term strategy for addressing the adverse effects of climate change (County of San Diego 2012). The CAP outlines various mechanisms and measures for reducing GHG emissions at the County level, including those specific to water conservation, waste reduction, land use, and adaptation strategies to fulfill the obligations delineated in

Assembly Bill 32. The CAP includes County goals previously established under the County General Plan and County Strategic Energy Plan, and establishes reduction targets at 15% below 2005 levels by 2020 and 49% below 2005 levels by 2035. The proposed project does not involve any new uses that would be subject to the CAP. Therefore, there would be no conflict and impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project proposes to demolish the existing library structure that was constructed prior to 1980 and that has been confirmed to contain lead-based paint (LBP) and asbestos-containing materials (ACMs) (County of San Diego 2013). Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used up until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows, and doors. LBP shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, hazardous waste disposal requirements (22 CCR, Division 4.5), worker health and safety requirements (8 CCR 1532.1), and state lead accreditation, certification, and work practice requirements (17 CCR, Division 1, Chapter 8). Asbestos was used extensively from the 1940s until the late 1970s in the construction industry for fireproofing, thermal and acoustic insulation, condensation control, and decoration. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has determined that there is no “safe” exposure level to asbestos. It is therefore highly regulated by the federal EPA, the California EPA, and the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA). Demolition operations that involve asbestos-containing materials must conform to SDAPCD Rules 361.140–361.156. Prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of on-site structures and prior to commencement of demolition activities lead and ACM abatement is required. As discussed previously in Section III, Air Quality, Subpart M of SDAPCD’s Regulation XI requires that all regulated asbestos-containing material be removed prior to demolition activities. The proposed project would comply with this regulation. In addition, the County would comply with Rule 631.145 by providing notification of the SDAPCD in writing at least 10 days before the start of the demolition of any buildings. Compliance with Rule 361.145 would reduce asbestos-related impacts to a level that is less than significant. Due to the presence of nearby sensitive receptors, the project would also notify residences prior to the start of demolition. As such, impacts would be less than significant.

Additionally, neither the County of San Diego nor the City of Imperial Beach currently have lead-based paint safe work practices in place; therefore, the Cal/OSHA lead safe

work practices shall be used for procedural guidance for disturbing lead as described in M-HAZ-2, M-HZ-3, M-HZ-6, M-HZ 7, M-HZ 8, and M-HZ-9.

Moreover, the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the Certified Unified Program Agency, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The hazardous materials business plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity, and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of on site. The plan also contains an emergency response plan that describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the DEH HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local fire agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations, to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release, and to suggest preventive measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures M-HZ-1 through M-HZ-9, the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above, and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections would occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations would reduce potentially significant impacts from the project related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances or related to the accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

Mitigation Measures

M-HZ-1: Prior to demolition, when the building is vacant, the County's Department of Environmental Health (DEH) shall conduct a follow-up inspection to explore inaccessible areas (during the asbestos/lead survey conducted in December 2013) such as wall cavities and ceiling spaces; and collect core samples of the roof.

M-HZ-2: The County shall notify California Department of Industrial Regulations Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) prior to the commencement of disturbing asbestos containing material (ACM) and asbestos-containing construction material (ACCM). Since the amount of friable ACM is greater than 160 square feet, a minimum 10 working day notification shall also be provided to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD).

M-HZ-3: Prior to demolition, ACM and ACCM shall be removed by a licensed contractor with an asbestos certification that is registered with Cal/OSHA. The licensed asbestos abatement contractor shall perform all disturbance and/or removal of ACM or

ACCM, in accordance with all California Department of Industrial Regulations Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) requirements.

M-HZ-4: The contractor shall submit an Asbestos Workplan indicating the proposed work practices and controls they will use to remove the asbestos materials. The plan shall also include the asbestos disposal plan. Prior to the commencement of work, the County shall review and approve the Asbestos Work Plan.

M-HZ-5: The contractor and contractor's employees shall take appropriate precautions (e.g. training, personal protective equipment, exposure monitoring, etc.) to protect the workers from hazards. For paint-disturbing activities on lower-lead-concentration components, general precautions shall be taken to minimize the release of chips, dust, and debris to the ground surface, vegetation, and inside the buildings.

M-HZ-6: The lead based paint (LBP) contractor shall submit a lead work plan indicating the proposed demolition methods and measures they will use to address the lead-containing components. The contractor shall have, at a minimum, completed and satisfied the Cal/OSHA lead training requirements. The contractor is responsible for complying with all Cal/OSHA requirements for lead in construction standards, California Environmental Protection Agency (CEPA) requirements regarding waste disposal. Prior to commencement of the project, the County shall review and approve the lead work plan.

M-HZ-7: If the project will disturb 100 square feet or more of lead-containing material, the County shall notify Cal/OSHA.

M-HZ-8: Disposal and recycling issues regarding the identified ACMs and lead containing building materials will need to be addressed based on the final destination of the material. OHP and the contractor need to decide on a disposal/recycling plan for the ACMs and lead materials based on the best available environmental and cost-effective disposal option. The contractor's approach shall be consistent with the County's Construction and Recycling Ordinance, all Cal/OSHA requirements, and California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) requirements regarding solid waste and hazardous solid waste disposal.

M-HZ-9: If suspect ACM or LBP building materials, not addressed in the pre-demolition survey or the follow-up inspection required in mitigation measure M-HZ-1, are identified during the course of the demolition activities, all work must cease. In addition, the contractor shall contact OHP in order that the suspect materials can be identified prior to proceeding with project activities.

M-HZ-10: The contractor shall comply with the General, Asbestos, Lead and Other Considerations of the asbestos/lead pre-demolition survey prepared for the proposed project.

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

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project is located adjacent to the St. James Lutheran Church and School as well as within one-quarter mile of Imperial Beach Elementary, which is also adjacent to Mar Vista High and Sweetwater Community Day School. Due to the age of the building and the identification of asbestos and lead substances in the structure as noted in the asbestos and lead pre-demolition survey, demolition of the structure would require compliance with Subpart M of SDAPCD's Regulation XI requires that all regulated asbestos-containing material be removed prior to demolition activities. In addition, the County would comply with Rule 631.145 by providing notification of the SDAPCD in writing at least 10 days before the start of the demolition of any buildings. Compliance with Rule 361.145 would reduce asbestos-related impacts to a level that is less than significant. Moreover, neither the County of San Diego nor the City of Imperial Beach currently have lead-based paint safe work practices in place; therefore, the Cal/OSHA lead safe work practices shall be used for procedural guidance for disturbing lead as described in mitigation measures M-HZ-2, M-HZ-3, M-HZ-6, M-HZ-7, M-HZ-8, and M-HZ-9.

The project would not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances would be in full compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. California Government Code Section 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Sections 25500–25520.

The DEH HMD is the Certified Unified Program Agency for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the Certified Unified Program Agency, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The hazardous materials business plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity, and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of on site. The plan also contains an emergency response plan that describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the DEH HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local fire agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations, to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental

spill or release, and to suggest preventive measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above, implementation of Mitigation Measures M-HZ-1 through M-HZ-10, and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, state, and federal regulation, potential impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school would be less than significant.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances (DTSC 2013). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill; is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash); is not on or within 1,000 feet of a formerly used defense site; does not contain a leaking underground storage tank; and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historical uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station, or a vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the site is not known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances, and the project is not expected to create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The project site is located within 2 miles of the Naval Outlying Landing Field (NOLF) Imperial Beach (approximately 0.75 miles); however, the proposed project is not located within the Airport Influence Area. Also, the project does not propose construction

of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located within 1 mile of a private airstrip, the NOLF Military Airport. However, the proposed project is not located within the air traffic patterns at the NOLF Military Airport. As a result, the project would not constitute a safety hazard 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following sections summarize the project’s consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process and identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives, and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project would not interfere with this plan because it would not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan would not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, the location of the plant, and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. The project site is not located within 10 miles of the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. Therefore, no impacts to the plan would result.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: Although the proposed project site is located within the coastal zone, the San Diego County Operational Area Oil Spill Contingency Element of the Area Hazardous Materials Plan would not be interfered with because the proposed project would not introduce a new use to the site that would subject the project to great risk than the existing library structure. Additionally, the proposed project would not create a risk to existing onshore pipelines or fuel farms that may result in an oil spill event. No impact would occur.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan would not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: The Dam Evacuation Plan would not be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is located within a developed area, largely surrounded by an urbanized environment, and is not adjacent to any Wildlands. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. Moreover, the project would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present, and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the City of Imperial Beach Fire Code, Chapter 15.20.

h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats, or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g., artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that would produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies, etc.), solid waste facilities, or other similar uses. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase current or future residents' exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats, or flies.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). In addition, the project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff or land use activities that would require special site-design considerations, source-control BMPs, or treatment-control BMPs under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (RWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001). Prior to demolition and construction, collaboration with the RWQCB would ensure all waste discharge requirements would be met by the project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project lies in the Otay Valley hydrologic subarea, within the Otay hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, pollutants at the Tijuana River Estuary consist of eutrophic, indicator bacteria (proposed TMDL completion was in 2010), lead, low dissolved oxygen, Nickel, pesticides, thallium, and trash (RWQCB 2007). However, the project does not propose any known sources of pollutants or land use activities that might contribute these pollutants.

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: All hazardous materials identified in the existing facility would be remediated prior to demolition activities. The project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new stormwater drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff off site.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes to establish a 12,000 square foot facility which is larger than the existing 5,000 square foot facility. The removal of the impervious parking lot surface for the proposed library expansion would not

increase the amount of impervious surfaces. Therefore the project would not result in an increase in impermeable surfaces and would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies. While the project would have the potential to consume a greater amount of water due to the increase in facility size, a library facility is generally not considered an intensive water user. Therefore, the project would have less than significant impact to groundwater supplies.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would establish a library facility beyond the footprint of the current facility, expanding into the existing parking lot and connecting to the Marina Vista Center to the north. The removal of the impervious parking lot surface could potentially alter the existing drainage pattern on the property. However, the area would remain impervious with the proposed development of the expanded library facility. In addition, the project would utilize existing storm drainage facilities and not alter the course of any stream or river. The project site is completely developed, and the proposed demolition of the existing facility and construction of the proposed facility would not substantially alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on or off site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would establish a library facility beyond the footprint of the current facility, expanding into the existing parking lot and connecting to the Marina Vista Center to the north. The removal of the impervious parking lot surface could potentially alter the existing drainage pattern on the property. In addition, the project would utilize existing storm drainage facilities and not alter the course of any stream or river. The project site is completely developed, and the proposed demolition of the existing facility and construction of the proposed facility would not substantially alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on or off site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact
 Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The expansion of the existing library facility would occur over land that already exists as an impervious surface parking lot. The project would also not convert any pervious surfaces to impervious surfaces, altering the amount of potential runoff from the site. While the immediate drainage pattern could potentially alter, the project would utilize existing storm drainage facilities and would not be expected to exceed their capacities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would demolish the existing structure at the project site. All demolition activities would follow strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined under Section VIII, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial sources of polluted runoff. No known sources of polluted runoff would be generated during the operational phase of the project. Impacts would be less than significant.

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact
 Incorporated

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)-mapped floodplains or City-mapped floodplains or drainages were identified on the project site. The majority of the area within the 100-year flood plain lies south of the project site in the open space related to the Tijuana River and north of the project site near the San Diego Bay (County of San Diego 2009a). In addition, the project does not propose the placement of housing on site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site; therefore, no impact would occur.

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area. Therefore, the project would not expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding.

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: According to Dam Failure Map drafted as part of San Diego County's *Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan* (San Diego County 2009b), a large portion of the City of Imperial Beach would be inundated by a dam failure. However, the project site lies outside the inundation zone. Therefore, impacts related to dam failure would be less than significant.

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, it would not be inundated by a seiche and impacts would be less than significant.

ii. TSUNAMI

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located approximately one mile from the coast. However, according to State of California Department of Conservation's *Tsunami Inundation Map For Emergency Planning, Imperial Beach Quadrangle* (Department of Conservation 2009) the project site lies outside the tsunami inundation zone. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

iii. MUDFLOW

Less Than Significant Impact: Mudflow is a type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. Landslides are not considered a significant hazard within the City of Imperial Beach due to the generally flat topography. Though the project does propose land disturbance that would expose unprotected soils during demolition and construction, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project would expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow and impact would be less than significant.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project entails the demolition and reconstruction of the Imperial Beach Branch Library. The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure, such as major roadways or water supply systems or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project would not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project entails the demolition and reconstruction of the Imperial Beach Branch Library. The project proposes to expand the library into the existing parking lot, and would enter into a joint parking agreement with the adjacent church facility (see Figures 2-4 and 2-5). The City of Imperial Beach General Plan land use designation and zoning designation for the project site is public facility. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production–Consumption Region, 1996) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site is currently developed and is surrounded by developed land uses, including residential development, a church, a park, schools, and public facilities which are incompatible with future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, and traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since availability of the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Demolition of the existing Imperial Beach Branch Library and removal of associated surface parking, hardscape, and landscape areas would not result in the loss of availability of mineral resources. Furthermore, the project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s).

Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: The existing land use (library) and proposed land use after demolition of the existing structure would remain the same. Surrounding land uses consist of single family residential development to the west, northwest, south, southwest, and southeast; multi-family residential development to the northeast; church to the east; and park to the northeast. The proposed hours of operation for the proposed library would remain the same. The project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons.

i. GENERAL PLAN – NOISE ELEMENT

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 address noise-sensitive areas and require an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise-sensitive areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 A-weighted decibels (dBA) for single residences (including senior housing, convalescent homes), and 65 dBA CNEL for multifamily residences (including

mixed-use commercial/residential). Moreover, if the project is in excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to the project to reduce noise levels. Noise-sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries, or similar facilities. Project implementation is not expected to expose existing or planned noise-sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial, or other noise in excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL. This is based on a review of projected County noise contour maps (CNEL 60 dBA contours). Therefore, the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

ii. NOISE ORDINANCE – SECTION 36.404

Non-transportation operational noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The site is zoned PF – Public Facilities. This zone does not have a specific 1-hour average sound level limit. The adjacent properties are zoned R-1-3800 (single family residential), R-1-6000 (single family residential), and PF (public facilities) which have 1-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA between the hours of 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. for low-density residential uses under the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance. The project's noise levels are not anticipated to impact adjoining properties or exceed County Noise Standards of 50 dBA because the project does not involve any noise-producing uses or activities that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

iii. NOISE ORDINANCE – SECTION 36.409

Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. The project could potentially exceed the 75 dB standard between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. as delineated in Section 36.409 of the County's noise ordinance.

Construction equipment anticipated for project development includes only standard equipment that would be employed for any routine demolition and construction project of this scale. Construction equipment with substantially higher noise and vibration generation characteristics (such as pile drivers, rock drills, blasting equipment, etc.) are not anticipated for development of the project. Construction noise is difficult to quantify because of the many variables involved including the size of equipment used, percentage of time and number of pieces of equipment which will actually operate on the site. However, maximum construction noise levels at 50 feet would typically range from approximately 75 to 85 dB for the type of equipment anticipated to be used for construction of the project. The range of maximum noise levels associated with various pieces of construction equipment is depicted in Table 4-8.

Noise-sensitive land uses exist along the northwest, west, southwest, south, and east sides of the project site. The closest noise-sensitive receivers consist of single family residences to the west approximately 68 feet from the project site. The residences have windows that face the project site and were therefore used to analyze potential noise effects during demolition and construction.

Based on the types of equipment that would be operating as close as 68 feet to the nearest residences, the construction noise is anticipated to generate maximum noise levels of up to

approximately 82 dB at the nearest residences. This noise level could intermittently occur throughout the demolition and construction period. When the construction equipment is operating, the existing residences could be disturbed by the activities.

**Table 4-8
Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels**

Equipment	Typical Sound Level (dB) 50 feet from Source
Air Compressor	81
Backhoe	80
Compactor	82
Concrete Mixer	85
Concrete Pump	82
Concrete Vibrator	76
Crane, Derrick	88
Crane, Mobile	83
Dozer	85
Generator	81
Grader	85
Impact Wrench	85
Jack Hammer	88
Loader	85
Paver	89
Pile-driver (Impact)	101
Pile-driver (Sonic)	96
Pneumatic Tool	85
Pump	76
Rail Saw	90
Rock Drill	98
Roller	74
Saw	76
Scraper	89
Truck	88

Source: Federal Transit Administration, May 2006, *Traffic Noise and Vibration Assessment*.

Temporary construction activities associated with development of the project have the potential to adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses. As such, these noise levels are considered to represent a potentially significant impact. The project would be required to limit construction hours, place mufflers on equipment engines, construct temporary noise barriers, and, to the extent possible, orient stationary sources to direct noise away from sensitive uses. These measures are included as a part of the noise mitigation.

M-NOI-1: Prior to grading permit issuance, the applicant shall ensure that:

- All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers.

- Construction noise reduction methods such as shutting off idling equipment, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools, rather than diesel equipment, shall be used where feasible. Unattended construction vehicles shall not idle for more than 5 minutes when located within 200 feet from residential properties.
- Noise attenuation measures, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources, are implemented where feasible.
- During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from or shielded from sensitive noise receivers where feasible.
- During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practical from noise sensitive receptors.
- The project shall be in compliance with the County's Municipal Code such that construction and grading activities are limited to the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- Construction hours, allowable workdays, and the phone number of the job superintendent shall be clearly posted at all construction entrances to allow surrounding property owners and residents to contact the job superintendent if necessary. In the event the City receives a complaint, appropriate corrective actions shall be implemented.
- Two weeks prior to the commencement of construction, notification must be provided to surrounding land uses within a 500 feet of the project site disclosing the construction schedule, including the various types of activities that would be occurring throughout the duration of the construction period. This notification shall give a contact phone number for any questions or complaints. All complaints shall be responded to in a method deemed satisfactory by the City of Imperial Beach.

Following implementation of mitigation measure M-NOI-1, noise impacts during construction would be reduced to a level that is less than significant.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project proposes the following land uses that can be impacted by ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels:

1. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet offices where low ambient vibration is preferred

However, construction activities are not anticipated to result in continuous vibration levels that typically annoy people. Construction activities do not involve blasting or pile driving events that would generate perceptible groundborne vibration. Also, the project does not propose any major, new, or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways, or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels on site or in the surrounding area. Vibration impact would be **less than significant**.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would establish a larger library facility compared to the existing facility. A larger facility would be expected to increase overall human presence in the area through increase patronage of the proposed library facility. However, libraries are generally not considered sources for substantial operational noise and a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise would not be expected from normal operations of a library facility. As discussed below in Section XVI, Transportation and Traffic, the project would generate permanent additional traffic to the area, increasing the ambient traffic related noise. Increased traffic would also generate permanent additional noise from parking areas including door slams, car alarms, car horns, etc. However, such increases in traffic and parking facilities would not be expected to generate a substantial permanent increase in the ambient noises levels in the area. No other substantial permanent increases due to ongoing operations of the proposed library facility are expected. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: General demolition and construction noise is not expected to exceed the construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), which are derived from state regulations to address human health and quality of life concerns. Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels in the project vicinity during demolition and construction phases.

As previously stated, library and other similar community center facilities are not generally considered substantial sources of noise. The conceptual floor plan indicates that the majority of the proposed facility would be indoors. Two outdoor patios are conceptually planned to be built on the southern and northeastern portions of the proposed facility. These patios have potential for temporary increases of ambient noise from activities including future community events that would likely temporarily increase overall human presence. Such activities would be expected to align and be conducted with respect to general operations of the proposed library facility. Therefore, substantial temporary increases in ambient noise would not be expected from the project and impacts 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located within 2 miles of the Naval Outlying Landing Field (NOLF) Imperial Beach (approximately 0.75 miles); however, the proposed project is not located within the Airport Influence Area. Since the project proposes to demolish and rebuild the existing library use, it is not expected to expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels in excess of the CNEL 60 dBA. Furthermore, the location of the project is outside of the CNEL 60 dBA contours for the airport (County of San Diego 2009).

In addition, based on the list of past, present, and future projects, there are no new or expanded public airport projects in the vicinity that may extend the boundaries of the CNEL 60 dBA noise contour. Refer to XVIII, Mandatory Findings of Significance, for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise on a project or cumulative level.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is located approximately 0.75 mile of a private airstrip, the NOLF Military Airport. However, the proposed project is not located within the air traffic patterns at the NOLF Military Airport. As a result, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project entails the demolition of the existing 5,000-square-foot library and the reconstruction of an approximately 12,000-square-foot library with associated hardscape and landscape improvements. Although there would be a larger library facility, the increase in square footage would not induce substantial growth in an area. Furthermore, the proposed project would not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area, including but not limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure, new commercial or industrial facilities, large-scale residential development, accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multifamily use, or regulatory changes including general plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) annexation actions.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The property is currently developed with an existing library and surface parking lot. The proposed project consists of the construction of a new library, and associated landscape, hardscape, and infrastructure improvements. Since the existing facility does not include housing, the proposed project would not displace existing housing.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The property is currently developed with an existing library and surface parking lot. The project site currently does not support any housing; therefore, the proposed project would not displace a substantial number of people.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes the demolition and reconstruction of the existing library facility. The new library facility would be expanded from 5,000 square feet to 12,000 square feet. The project proposes to expand the library into the existing parking lot, and would obtain a shared parking agreement with adjacent church facility (see Figure 2-4). The environmental impacts associated with the demolition and reconstruction/expansion of the existing public library facility is discussed in this environmental document. The expanded library facility would not result in an increase in fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

XV. RECREATION

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any residential use, including but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile-home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose the development of recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, the construction of the project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC – Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and Mobility Element, the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program, and the Congestion Management Program.

Less Than Significant Impact: During the demolition and construction phase of the project, traffic would be generated by construction crews and construction equipment traveling to and from the project site. In addition, trucks would travel from the site to Sycamore Landfill or another appropriate disposal facility to dispose of the demolition debris from the site. Due to the size of the project, a relatively small number of vehicles would be required to implement the demolition and construction phase. Therefore, increased traffic from the demolition and construction phase of the project would be short term and less than significant.

Demolition of the existing 5,000-square-foot library and reconstruction of a 12,000-square-foot library would result in a slight increase of long-term vehicle trips that would be generated by the proposed project. Based on the Parking and Trip Generation Study prepared by RBF (Appendix D), the proposed project is forecasted to result in an increase of 420 daily trips. RBF concluded that the library expansion would not result in any significant impacts along the study roadway segments or intersections. As identified in the County Guidelines, the project trips would not result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, the volume-to-capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with any policies establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system and no mitigation is required.

b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The designated Congestion Management Agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan, of which the Congestion Management Program is an element, to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The Congestion Management Program includes a requirement for enhanced California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on Congestion Management Program system roadways, their associated costs, and appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System, and the North County Transit District is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on Congestion Management Program transit performance measures are identified.

Levels of Service (LOS) are determined based on the ratio of volume to capacity. The City of Imperial Beach goal for acceptable level of service is LOS C or better on arterial streets, local streets, and signalized intersections.

Less Than Significant Impact: As shown in Table 1 of the Parking and Trip Study prepared by RBF (Appendix D), all roadway segments surrounding the library site currently operate at LOS A. As shown in Table 2 of the Parking and Trip Study (Appendix D), existing P.M. Peak Hour Intersection at Imperial Beach Boulevard/8th Street and Imperial Beach Boulevard/9th Street operate at LOS C. Short-term limited demolition and construction traffic would not create a substantial impact on traffic volumes or change traffic patterns in such a way as to affect the level of service or vehicle-to-congestion ratios in study area roadways. Long-term traffic would be generated by the proposed project, but level of service from existing plus project conditions would remain at LOS A and Existing Plus Project level of service would operate at LOS B or C. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any congestion management program.

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Demolition of the existing 5,000-square-foot library and reconstruction of the library to 12,000 square feet would not result in a change in air traffic patterns as the project site is not located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would not alter traffic patterns or roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes, or walls that would impede adequate sight distance on a road.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. During demolition and construction activities, short-term traffic may result from construction equipment traveling to and from the site and trucks transporting demolition debris off site. The project site is located on the northwestern corner of Imperial Beach Boulevard and 8th Street, and is located within proximity to 9th Street. Imperial Beach Boulevard and 9th Street are classified as a four-lane Class I Collectors in the City of Imperial Beach Circulation Element. 8th Street is a non-circulation element roadway operating as a two-lane Residential Collector. No vehicle trips or constraints on access to the project site would result after demolition and construction activities has ceased. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-TR-1 would reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Mitigation Measure

M-TR-1: A traffic control plan shall be prepared to notify emergency personnel of possible delays in the project area during demolition activities.

This mitigation measure would be made a condition of project approval.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing 5,000-square-foot library and reconstruction of the library to 12,000 square feet. Based on the Parking and Trip Study prepared by RBF (Appendix D), the proposed project is forecasted to result in an increase of 420 daily trips. RBF concluded that the library expansion would not result in any significant impacts along the study roadway segments or intersections. Project implementation would not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project would not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian, or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project would not conflict with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would be provided wastewater treatment services by the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant (PLWTP) located in the City of San Diego. PLWTP operates under RWQCB Order No. R9-2009-0001 which adopted the NPDES Permit No. CA010749, defining discharge requirements for the facility. The plant complies with all state and federal requirements governing the treatment and discharge of wastewater through a combination of industrial source controls, advanced primary treatment, and comprehensive environmental monitoring. The proposed project would result in overall increase of 7,000 square feet of building space; however, the

project would serve the same population and patrons as under existing conditions, and hours of operation would not change from existing operations. Consequently, the quantity of effluent from the project is expected to be similar to what is generated under existing conditions. Wastewater generated by the proposed project would not exceed the treatment capacity of the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant and would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: A larger library facility would not directly or indirectly introduce a large increase in water or wastewater treatment demand (i.e. increase the population of the City) that would require the construction of new facilities. In addition, a library is considered to be neither a large consumer of water nor a large producer of wastewater under normal operational conditions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would not require the construction of additional storm water facilities as the project would utilize existing facilities. Before demolition and construction begins, coordination with RWQCB would occur to ensure that the project would be in proper compliance as it relates to storm water management. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would require water supplies during the demolition, construction, and operation phases. Demolition and construction would last approximately one year, only temporarily requiring water usage. As stated previously, a library is not considered an intensive water user under normal operational conditions. As such, the project would not be expected to require substantial amounts of water such that current water supplies would be insufficient. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would generate wastewater as part of normal operations. As stated previously, a library facility would not normally be considered to be an intensive wastewater generator under normal operating conditions. Additionally, the project would serve the same population and patrons as under existing conditions, and hours of operation would not change from existing operations. Consequently, the quantity of effluent from the project is expected to be similar to what is generated under existing conditions. Wastewater generated by the proposed project would not exceed the treatment capacity of the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant and would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the RWQCB; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project would generate solid waste during demolition and construction activities as well as during operation of the project. Solid waste generated during operation of the project would not substantially increase from that of existing operations. All solid waste facilities, including landfills, require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency, issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board under the authority of the California Public Resources Code (Sections 44001–44018) and California Code of Regulations (27 CCR 21440 et seq.). There are five permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project would generate solid waste during demolition and construction activities as well as during operation of the project. All solid waste facilities, including landfills, require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board under the authority of the California Public Resources Code (Sections 44001–44018) and California Code of Regulations (27 CCR 21440 et seq.). The project would deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and therefore would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, 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?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory was considered in the response to each question in Sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project’s potential for significant cumulative effects. Mitigation measure have been incorporated into the project to reduce potential direct and indirect impacts to biological resources during the demolition/construction phase of the project. No cultural resources would be impacted by the project; as such, significant effects associated with cultural resources would not result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

The following list of past, present and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

Project Name	Project Status
Breakwater	Project Approved in 2011, not constructed
Bikeway Village	Project Approved in 2012, not constructed
Commercial Zoning Amendments	Project Approved in 2013, not constructed
Bernardo Shores	Environmental review in progress

Less Than Significant. Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects was considered in the response to each question in Sections I through XVIII of this form. In addition to project-specific impacts, this evaluation considered the project's potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

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

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings was considered in the response to certain questions in Sections III, Air Quality; VI, Geology and Soils; VIII, Hazards and Hazardous Materials; IX, Hydrology and Water Quality; XII, Noise; and XVI, Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following: Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, Air Quality, and Transportation and Traffic. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XIX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to federal, state, and local regulations are available on the Internet. For federal regulations refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For state regulations refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For county regulations refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

- California Department of Transportation. 2013. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/)
- County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

- SANGIS 2007a, "Agricultural Preserve," GIS layer, County of San Diego Assessor and Department of Planning and Land Use, April 2007.
- SANGIS 2007b, "Agricultural Preserve Contracts," GIS layer, County of San Diego Assessor and Department of Planning and Land Use, April 2007.
- California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," 2013. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- City of Imperial Beach. 1994. City of Imperial Beach General Plan/Local Coastal Plan and Zoning Ordinance Land Use Map

AIR QUALITY

- County of San Diego. Asbestos/Lead Survey: Imperial Beach Community Center, 1075 8th Street, Imperial Beach. December 27, 2013.
- County of San Diego, County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements – Air Quality. 2007.
- County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.sandiego.ca.us)
- Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- RBF. 2014. Imperial Beach Library Parking and Traffic Study. April 24, 2014.
- Jones and Stokes. 2007. Software User's Guide: URBEMIS2007 for Windows; Emissions Estimation for Land Use Development Projects. Version 9.2.4 Prepared for the South Coast Air Quality Management District. November 2007. (<http://www.urbemis.com/support/manual.html>)

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- City of Imperial Beach. 1994. Imperial Beach General Plan. Conservation and Open Space Element.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- ASM Affiliates. 2013. Historic Resources Evaluation Report for the Imperial Beach Library.
- ASM Affiliates. 2010. Due Diligence Report for the Renovation of the Imperial Beach Library.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation. 2013. California Geological Survey. Point Loma Quadrangle Fault Zone Map.
- County of San Diego. 2011. County of San Diego General Plan Environmental Impact Report.

GREENHOUSE GASES

- BAAQMD (Bay Area Air Quality Management District). 2010. Greenhouse Gas Model (BGM). Version 1.1.9 Beta.
- California Climate Action Registry, General Reporting Protocol, Reporting Entity-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Version 3.1. 2009.
- CalRecycle (California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery). 2013. Public Sector and Institutions: Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/wastechar/wastegenrates/Institution.htm>.
- CARB. 2008. *Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change*. October, approved December 12, 2008. <http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/document/psp.pdf>
- CEC (California Energy Commission). 2006. Refining Estimates of Water Related Energy Use in California. <http://www.energy.ca.gov/2006publications/CEC-500-2006-118/CEC-500-2006-118.PDF>
- City of Imperial Beach. 2013. Utility Manager Pro Data Estimates. Monthly Electricity Use for Imperial Beach Library. November.
- County of San Diego. 2012. Climate Action Plan. Adopted June 2012. http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/advance/Climate_Action_Plan.pdf
- County of San Diego. 2013. County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report and Format and Content Requirements. Climate Change. Land Use and Environment Group. November 7, 2013.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Emission Facts: Greenhouse Gas Emissions from a Typical Passenger Vehicle." EPA420-F-05-004. EPA Office of Transportation and Air Quality.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

California Department of Toxic Substance Control. (DTSC) EnviroStore database. 2013. (<http://www.dtsc.ca.gov/database/Calsites/>)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)

City of Imperial Beach. Fire Code, Chapter 15.20.

County of San Diego. Department of Environmental Health, Community Health Division. Asbestos/Lead Survey: Imperial Beach Community Center, 1075 8th Street, Imperial Beach. 2013.

County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)

Federal Transit Administration. 2006. Traffic Noise and Vibration Assessment.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation. 2009. State of California Department of Conservation's Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, Imperial Beach Quad.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. 2010. San Diego County Multi-Jurisdiction Hazard Mitigation Plan

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. 2009a. County of San Diego Hazard Mitigation Planning. Flood Map.

County of San Diego. 2009b. County of San Diego Hazard Mitigation Planning. Draft – Dam Failure Map.

County of San Diego. Asbestos/Lead Survey: Imperial Beach Community Center, 1075 8th Street, Imperial Beach. December 27, 2013.

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water. San Diego's Watersheds. Accessed on March 3, 2014. (<http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/watersheds.html>)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water. Otay Watershed. Accessed on March 3, 2014. (http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/ws_otay.html)

RWQCB. 2007. San Diego Region. 2006 CWA Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments Requiring TMDLS.

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2010. 2010 Integrated Report (Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List/305(b) Report). (<http://maps.waterboards.ca.gov>)

LAND USE AND PLANNING

City of Imperial Beach. 2010. City of Imperial Beach General Plan and Local Coastal Plan.

City of Imperial Beach. 1994. City of Imperial Beach General Plan/Local Coastal Plan and Zoning Ordinance Land Use Map.

City of Imperial Beach. 1994. Imperial Beach Municipal Code. Chapter 19.24 PF Public Facilities Zone.

MINERAL RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation. 1996. Division of Mines and Geology. Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. 2009. General Plan Noise Element. Existing Noise Contours.

County of San Diego. 2005. San Diego County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan – Military Airports Background Data.

Federal Transit Administration. 2006. Traffic Noise and Vibration Assessment.

RECREATION

City of Imperial Beach. 2010. City of Imperial Beach General Plan.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

RBF. 2014. Imperial Beach Library Parking and Traffic Study. April 24, 2014.

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

County of San Diego. County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines)

RBF. 2014. Imperial Beach Library Parking and Traffic Study.

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Regional Water Quality Control Board. 2009. San Diego Region, Waste Discharge Requirements and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit - Point Loma Metropolitan Wastewater Treatment Plan Discharge to the Pacific Ocean Through the Point Loma Ocean Outfall. San Diego County.

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

**Imperial Beach Branch Library Project
Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration**

5.0 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measure	Time Frame of Mitigation					Monitoring Reporting Agency	Time Frame for Verification Frequency To		Date of Completion	Date of Verification	
	Planning	Pre-Demo	During Demo	Pre-Construction	During Construction		Monitor	Report			
<p>PDF 1: During construction, the County or its designee would take steps necessary to ensure that temporary, construction-related security lighting is arranged in such a manner that direct rays would not shine on or produce glare for adjacent street traffic and residential uses.</p> <p>PDF 2: During the preparation of final site design plans, the County or its designee would ensure that (1) all light fixtures are shielded away from sensitive viewers so that no light spill leaves the site; (2) motion sensor/detector lights are used whenever feasible to reduce the amount of constant light, especially during the late evening/early morning hours; and (3) lighting fixtures provide illumination appropriate for the level of activity.</p>	X			X	X	County of San Diego					
<p>M-AIR-1: Prior to commencement of demolition activities, all residences located within 1,000 feet of the project site shall be notified of the anticipated demolition schedule and daily hours of demolition activities.</p>	X	X				County of San Diego					
<p>M-BIO-1 Trees, shrubs, and the bare ground in and surrounding the project area may provide nesting habitat for raptors and migratory birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MTBA). If project construction (including demolition) cannot be conducted outside of the nesting season (typically February 1 to August 30),</p>	X	X		X		County of San Diego					

Imperial Beach Branch Library Project Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Mitigation Measure	Time Frame of Mitigation				Monitoring Reporting Agency	Time Frame for Verification Frequency To		Date of Completion	Date of Verification
	Planning	Pre-Demo	During Demo	Pre-Construction		During Construction	Monitor		
<p>then preconstruction surveys for nesting raptors and migratory birds shall be conducted by a qualified biologist 30 days in advance of any earth disturbing activities, and continued weekly with a final survey no more than 3 days prior to the start of construction activities, including vegetation clearing. The qualified biologist shall survey the construction zone and a 500-foot radius surrounding the proposed construction zone in suitable habitat to determine whether the proposed demolition/construction has the potential to disturb or otherwise harm nesting birds.</p> <p>M-BIO-2: If an active raptor nest is located within a 500-foot radius around the proposed construction zone, including demolition and staging areas, or if an active migratory bird nest is located within a 300-foot radius and construction must take place during the breeding season, a buffer zone (300-feet for non-raptors, 500-feet for raptors) shall be established by a qualified biologist and confirmed by the appropriate resource agency. A qualified wildlife biologist shall monitor the nest to determine when the young have fledged and submit monthly monitoring reports to the County Department of General Services throughout the nesting season on the status of the nest. The biological monitor shall have the authority to cease construction if there is any sign of distress to the raptor or migratory bird. Reference to this requirement and the MBTA shall be included in the construction specifications.</p>		X		X					

Imperial Beach Branch Library Project Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Mitigation Measure	Time Frame of Mitigation					Monitoring Reporting Agency	Time Frame for Verification Frequency To		Date of Completion	Date of Verification
	Planning	Pre-Demo	During Demo	Pre-Construction	During Construction		Monitor	Report		
M-GE-1: The County shall prepare an erosion control plan for the project site. The erosion control plan shall provide site-specific best management practices (BMPs) to reduce erosion both during demolition and construction activities, including but not limited to sediment control, wind erosion control, and stormwater management.	X	X				County of San Diego				
M-HZ-1: Prior to demolition, when the building is vacant, the County's Department of Environmental Health (DEH) shall conduct a follow-up inspection to explore inaccessible areas (during the asbestos/lead survey conducted in December 2013) such as wall cavities and ceiling spaces; and collect core samples of the roof.	X	X				County of San Diego				
M-HZ-2: The County shall notify California Department of Industrial Regulations Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) prior to the commencement of disturbing asbestos containing material (ACM) and asbestos-containing construction material (ACCM). Since the amount of friable ACM is greater than 160 square feet, a minimum 10 working day notification shall also be provided to the Air Pollution Control District (APCD).	X	X				County of San Diego				
M-HZ-3: Prior to demolition, ACM and ACCM shall be removed by a licensed contractor with an asbestos certification that is registered with Cal/OSHA. The licensed asbestos abatement contractor shall perform all disturbance and/or removal of ACM or ACCM, in accordance with all California Department of Industrial	X	X				County of San Diego				

Imperial Beach Branch Library Project Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Mitigation Measure	Time Frame of Mitigation				Monitoring Reporting Agency	Time Frame for Verification Frequency To		Date of Completion	Date of Verification
	Pre-Demo	During Demo	Pre-Construction	During Construction		Monitor	Report		
<p>Regulations Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal/OSHA) requirements.</p> <p>M-HZ-4: The contractor shall submit an Asbestos Workplan indicating the proposed work practices and controls they will use to remove the asbestos materials. The plan shall also include the asbestos disposal plan. Prior to the commencement of work, the County shall review and approve the Asbestos Work Plan.</p>	X				County of San Diego				
<p>M-HZ-5: The contractor and contractor's employees shall take appropriate precautions (e.g. training, personal protective equipment, exposure monitoring, etc.) to protect the workers from hazards. For paint-disturbing activities on lower-lead-concentration components, general precautions shall be taken to minimize the release of chips, dust, and debris to the ground surface, vegetation, and inside the buildings.</p>	X				County of San Diego				
<p>M-HZ-6: The lead based paint (LBP) contractor shall submit a lead work plan indicating the proposed demolition methods and measures they will use to address the lead-containing components. The contractor shall have, at a minimum, completed and satisfied the Cal/OSHA lead training requirements. The contractor is responsible for complying with all Cal/OSHA requirements for lead in construction standards, California Environmental Protection Agency requirements regards waste disposal. Prior to commencement of the project, the County shall review and approve the lead work plan.</p>	X				County of San Diego				

Imperial Beach Branch Library Project Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Mitigation Measure	Time Frame of Mitigation					Monitoring Reporting Agency	Time Frame for Verification Frequency To		Date of Completion	Date of Verification
	Planning	Pre-Demo	During Demo	Pre-Construction	During Construction		Monitor	Report		
M-HZ-7: If the project will disturb 100 square feet or more of lead-containing material, the County shall notify Cal/OSHA.	X	X				County of San Diego				
M-HZ-8: Disposal and recycling issues regarding the identified ACMs and lead containing building materials will need to be addressed based on the final destination of the material. OHP and the contractor need to decide on a disposal/recycling plan for the ACMs and lead materials based on the best available environmental and cost-effective disposal option. The contractor's approach shall be consistent with the County's Construction and Recycling Ordinance, all Cal/OSHA requirements, and California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) requirements regarding solid waste and hazardous solid waste disposal.	X	X				County of San Diego				
M-HZ-9: If suspect ACM or LBP building materials not addressed in the pre-demolition survey are identified during the course of the demolition activities, all work must cease. In addition, the contractor shall contact OHP in order that the suspect materials can be identified prior to proceeding with project activities.	X	X				County of San Diego				
M-HZ-10: The contractor shall comply with the general, asbestos, lead and other considerations of the asbestos/lead pre-demolition survey prepared for the proposed project.	X	X				County of San Diego				

Imperial Beach Branch Library Project Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

Mitigation Measure	Time Frame of Mitigation				Monitoring Reporting Agency	Time Frame for Verification Frequency To		Date of Completion	Date of Verification
	Planning	Pre-Demo	During Demo	Pre-Construction		During Construction	Monitor		
<p>M-NOI-1: Prior to grading permit issuance, the applicant shall ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All construction equipment, fixed or mobile, shall be equipped with properly operating and maintained mufflers. • Construction noise reduction methods such as shutting off idling equipment, maximizing the distance between construction equipment staging areas and occupied residential areas, and use of electric air compressors and similar power tools, rather than diesel equipment, shall be used where feasible. Unattended construction vehicles shall not idle for more than 5 minutes when located within 200 feet from residential properties. • Noise attenuation measures, which may include, but are not limited to, temporary noise barriers or noise blankets around stationary construction noise sources, are implemented where feasible. • During construction, stationary construction equipment shall be placed such that emitted noise is directed away from or shielded from sensitive noise receivers where feasible. • During construction, stockpiling and vehicle staging areas shall be located as far as practical from noise sensitive receptors. • The project shall be in compliance with the County's Municipal Code such that 	X	X							

**Imperial Beach Branch Library Project
Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration**

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Imperial Beach Branch Library Project Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration

6.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

6.1 Lead Agency – County of San Diego

Department of General Services

Suzanne Evans, Project Manager
Marc Cass, Project Manager

Department of Environmental Health

Rebecca Lafreniere, Chief

Resource Management Division

Dahvia Lynch, Chief

6.2 Project Consultants

Dudek

Carey Fernandes, Senior Environmental Project Manager
Elizabeth Doalson, Environmental Planner
Stephanie Tang, Environmental Planner
Brian Grover, Environmental Planner
Mike Greene, Environmental Specialist/Acoustician
David Deckman, Air Quality Specialist
Jenifer Longabaugh, Environmental Planner
Stephanie Tang, Environmental Planner
Randy Deodat, GIS Analyst
Lesley Terry, Graphics
Amna Javed, GIS Analyst
Laurel Porter, Technical Editor
Devin Brookhart, Publications Assistant

6.3 Technical Report Preparation

Historical Resources Evaluation Report, ASM Affiliates Inc.

Shannon Davis, MA, RPH, Senior Architectural Historian
Sarah Stringer-Browsher, MA, RPH, Senior Historian

**Imperial Beach Branch Library Project
Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration**

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK