

5 Cumulative Impacts

Section 15130(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that “An EIR shall discuss cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, as defined in Section 15065(c). The discussion of cumulative impacts “shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide greater detail than is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone.” Section 15355(b) describes cumulative impacts from several projects as “...the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects.” Past, present and reasonably anticipated future projects are addressed in this cumulative analysis, which includes projects under construction, approved projects and proposed projects at the time of this Draft EIR preparation. The list of cumulative projects provided below was based upon consultation with lead agencies including the City of San Diego Planning and Development Review staff, the Community College District and the San Diego Unified School District.

5.1 CUMULATIVE PROJECTS

The following analysis is based on a comprehensive review of potential and planned additional development that, when considered with the proposed Central Area Elementary School, could result in environmental impacts that are cumulatively considerable. The inventory for cumulative projects for the proposed project includes 14 past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects within the Mid-City area. The location and a brief description of the cumulative projects considered in this analysis are shown on Figure 5.1-1; including the recommended locations for the proposed Proposition MM Schools. A more detailed description on the type and intensity of development and the status of each cumulative project follows.

5.1.1 Proposition MM Elementary Schools in Mid-City

In addition to the proposed Central Area Elementary School, the District is proposing to construct four more new elementary schools in the Mid-City Communities Planning Area. These four additional schools are: Winona Avenue Area Elementary School (aka Euclid Area Elementary School), 52nd Street Area Elementary School (aka Jackson/Marshall Area Elementary School), Parks/Edison/Hamilton Area Elementary School and Adams/Franklin Area Elementary School. Figure 5.1-1 identifies the approximate locations for these four additional preferred elementary school sites proposed by the District, as well as the proposed Central Area Elementary School. Similar to the proposed project, each of the four Preferred Sites is located within the neighborhoods recommended for additional elementary schools in the updated *Mid-City Communities Plan*. The District worked closely with the local community

Figure 5.1-1 Location of Cumulative Project

in identifying Preferred Sites for the new schools during preparation of the updated *Mid-City Communities Plan*, and subsequently with the citizen-based Mid-City Site Selection Task Force.

Each of the proposed elementary schools would accommodate a planned enrollment of approximately 700-900 students, kindergarten through grade five. The sites for each of the proposed schools would take up approximately two city blocks (between 7 and 12 acres) and would have permanent facilities built for 500 students, with additional portable classrooms for 200 students (total capacity of 700 students). To account for future enrollment fluctuations due to changes in demographics, the School District has master-planned the new school facilities to accommodate up to 900 students. The additional capacity of 200 students would be accommodated with one- or two-story portable classrooms. The elementary schools would operate as a “neighborhood school” in that enrollment would be drawn from surrounding neighborhoods within walking distance to each respective school site. The faculty would consist of approximately 52 full-time employees for each school. Approximately 70 on-site parking spaces would be provided at each school. The projects would also include joint-use turf fields and playground facilities that would be open to the public after school hours.

Development of each new school site would involve the demolition of existing residences, soon after the District has acquired the necessary properties. The proposed school sites are occupied by existing single- and multi-family residential units that vary in number by school site, but would be similar to the composition of the preferred Central Area Elementary school, which includes 163 structures. Demolition activities would include, but would not be limited to, the removal of existing structures and vegetation, removal of portions of existing sidewalks, and the removal of existing asphaltic concrete (AC) within closed portions of existing city streets within the selected site. Preparation of environmental documents are currently underway for two of the four additional school sites; Winona Avenue Area Elementary School and 52nd Street Area Elementary School. The District anticipates the opening of the four schools between the Fall of 2005 and the Fall of 2006.

5.1.2 City Heights Urban Village

City Heights Urban Village (Urban Village) is a proposed project located near the intersection of Fairmount Avenue and University Avenue. A portion of the proposed project has already been completed, as explained below. The proposed project consists of two main components: 1) the redevelopment of six and one-half City blocks into an “Urban Village,” and 2) an amendment to the City Heights Redevelopment Plan to delete 211 non-contiguous and 34 contiguous parcels from the Redevelopment Project Area. The Urban Village component is envisioned as a mixed-use, town-center project proposed by CityLink Investment Corporation (CIC) for the City Heights community through public and private ownership. The proposed project includes approximately 65,750-square feet of commercial/office/multi-family dwelling unit space and a 140,400-square-foot community commercial center. The portion of the proposed project that has already been completed includes a 25,000-square-foot public library and community center; a 3,500-square-foot “black box” theater; a 2,500-square-foot swim center building; and Wightman Street improvements. Construction of the Urban Village required

the demolition of existing single- and multi-family dwelling units, commercial uses and conversion of open space.

The commercial/office/multi-family housing component of the Urban Village is currently in the planning stage through a development partnership between Transwest Development Company and Price Charities. This project component is formally called the Transwest Project and would acquire and clear the block bound by 43rd Street, Wightman Street, Fairmount Avenue and University Avenue. Existing land uses within the Transwest project site that would be demolished include 34 single- and multi-family dwelling units, commercial and office space and some vacant land. The new development would include a six-story building fronting University Avenue that would have retail on the ground floor and offices above. Behind the office building would be a four-story parking structure, which would also have some retail space on the ground floor. On the south half of the block would be four-story town house buildings arranged around a large open courtyard. A total of 116 housing units are proposed, 93 of which will be made available at affordable cost to local low income residents.

5.1.3 Auto Dealership and Repair Shop

An auto dealership and repair shop is an approved project located on the east side of Fairmount Avenue between El Cajon Boulevard and Orange Avenue in the Mid-City Communities Planning Area. The project includes the construction of a two-story, 3,633-square-foot commercial building on an existing vacant lot. The proposed building would house an automobile sales and repair facility with a total of nine parking spaces. Two small offices totaling 468-square feet would be situated on the second floor of the building. A negative declaration was certified by the City for this project in September 1998; construction has not begun.

5.1.4 Orange Avenue at 54th Place Condominiums

The Orange Avenue at 54th Place Condominiums is an approved project located along Orange Avenue, between 54th Place and Colts Way in the Mid-City Communities Planning Area. The project is the construction of 51 condominium units on an undeveloped 3.45-acre site covered with non-native grasses. The two- and three-bedroom units range in size from 1,400 to 2,100 square feet within 12 two-story buildings. Five of the proposed buildings would each contain six units; seven would contain three units. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was certified by the City for this project in August 1999; construction has not begun.

5.1.5 Teen Challenge

Teen Challenge is an approved drug/alcohol rehabilitation center located at 5450 Lea Street, within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area. The project includes converting a vacant, 26.55-square-foot, two-story medical building into a 50-bed residential drug/alcohol rehabilitation facility for men 18 and over.

A Negative Declaration was certified by the City for this project in July 1996. Construction is complete and the facility is currently in use.

5.1.5 University Terrace

The University Terrace project is an approved project located at 5556-5592 University Avenue in the Mid-City Communities Planning Area. The project includes construction of an approximately 74,400-square-foot, 60-room, two-story residential care facility with a basement on a 1.51-acre parcel. The facility would accommodate 120 residents, and provide a 30-space surface parking lot. A dining room, kitchen, lobby, offices and a 14-space underground parking lot would be located in the basement, while living quarters would be located on the first and second floors. Construction would require the demolition of existing structures on the project site. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was certified by the City in May 1997; construction has not begun.

5.1.7 Stepping Stone

The Stepping Stone project is an approved project located at 3767 Central Avenue, between Wightman Street and Landis Street in the City Heights area of the *Mid-City Communities Plan*. The project would reconstruct and continue the operation of a residential alcohol treatment facility. The project would demolish five residential bungalows and a garage, and construct a new 9,204-square-foot residential recovery facility consisting of six, one- and two-story buildings with 31 beds, administration, dining room, meeting room, kitchen and laundry, with accompanying grading and landscaping. Eight parking spaces would also be provided. A negative declaration was certified by the City for this project in September 1998. Construction is complete for this project.

5.1.8 Asia Business Center

The Asia Business Center is an approved project located at 4660 El Cajon Boulevard, within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area. The project would demolish an existing motel and construct a 31,770-square-foot, three-story, mixed use development on a 0.8-acre site. The proposed uses would consist of 11,890 square feet of retail commercial space on the ground floor, 13,310 square feet of professional office space on the second floor, and six 1,040-square-foot apartments on the third floor. A Negative Declaration was certified by the City for this project in July 1997. Construction has been completed for this project, but the building is currently uninhabited.

5.1.9 Regional Transportation Center Project

The Regional Transportation Center (RTC) is a proposed project located on the southeast corner of El Cajon Boulevard and Central Avenue. Existing land uses on the project site that would be demolished to implement the project include 19 multi-family dwelling units and some commercial uses. The proposed project is a new transit center facility with two main components: 1) a for-profit center to display, sell and service alternative fuel and conventional vehicles, and 2) a non-profit education center to teach junior

high, high school and adult vocational education students about alternative fuel technologies and their relationship to the environment. A Mitigated Negative Declaration was completed for this project.

5.1.10 City Heights Service Plaza

The City Heights Service Plaza is a proposed project located at the southeast corner of University Avenue and Central Avenue. This proposed project includes a 2,000-square-foot mini mart/food store; between 5,300 to 7,000 square feet for a service station, car wash and retail space, and a maximum of 28 off-site parking spaces. The anticipated construction date is August 2000, with a completion date of February 2001.

5.1.11 Mid-City Continuing Education Center

The Mid-City Continuing Education Center is an approved project located at the corner of Fairmount Avenue and Wightman Street. The facility includes approximately 58,400 square feet of classroom and administrative office space, and 18,700 square feet of underground parking (45 parking spaces). Construction is currently underway and is scheduled for completion August 2000.

5.1.12 Oak Park Drainage Channel

The City of San Diego is currently designing a capital improvement project called the Oak Park Drainage Channel (CIP Project No. 11-274.1), located south of University Avenue between 50th Street and 52nd Street. The proposed project runs southwesterly from the juncture of University Avenue and follows the natural drainage course until 51st Street towards the intersection of Wightman Avenue and 50th Street. The proposed drainage improvement consists of an open channel lined with concrete flooring and walls which run between residential units within the project area. No residential units would be demolished as a result of the proposed project. The earliest time that development could begin would be the year 2002. No development is occurring as funding is not yet available (Pers. Comm. Danny Schrotberger, City of San Diego, July 2000).

5.1.13 Home Avenue Trunk Sewer

The Home Avenue Trunk Sewer is an approved sewer replacement and rehabilitation project located in the City Heights area. The proposed project begins at the intersection of El Cajon Boulevard and Euclid Avenue, and bends east then south towards the intersection of Altadena Avenue and Euclid Avenue. Improvements include the rehabilitation and extension of a 15-inch trunk sewer line along the southern half of the project, and the replacement of the existing sewer line with an 18-inch pipe along the northern half of the project. A mitigated negative declaration was prepared for the proposed project in 1999. Construction is expected to begin in October or November of 2000, and should last for approximately one year until fall of 2001 (Pers. Comm. Jihad Sleiman, City of San Diego, July 2000).

5.1.14 Mid-City Water Transmission Pipeline Project

The Mid-City Water Transmission Pipeline Project consists of the replacement and repair of existing water pipelines in the Mid-City area. Project alignment begins at approximately 70th Street and El Cajon Boulevard and heads west toward Marlborough Avenue. It continues south on Marlborough Avenue to Orange Avenue, extends west on Orange Avenue to Cherokee Avenue and continues north on Cherokee Avenue to El Cajon Boulevard. In order to connect with existing distribution pipelines, the project will extend south from El Cajon Boulevard to Highland and Polk Avenue. Construction for this project began in the winter of 2000 and is expected to be completed in the winter of 2002 (City of San Diego Mid-City Water Transmission Pipeline Project Fact Sheet, July 2000).

5.1.15 Mid-City Parks

The Mid-City Parks is a development of park amenities in three areas within the Mid-City area as mitigation for construction of State Route 15 (SR-15). The three new park areas would be located at the existing Park de la Cruz (Park de la Cruz), over the new freeway between Orange Avenue (Teralta Park) and Polk Street, and southwest of 40th Street and Adams Avenue (Normal Heights/Kensington Park). Additionally, the project proposes a child care center at one of two locations: either north of the existing Central Elementary School, or at the 38th Street canyon site. A more detailed project description of park amenities are provided below:

Park de la Cruz is a proposed park development and expansion of uses into 38th Street Canyon, located between Landis, 38th and 40th Streets. The proposed project is approximately 6.9 acres, inclusive of existing development at the Copley YMCA, totaling approximately 1.0 acre. Primary development components include basketball and volleyball courts, a lighted softball field, open turf area, restrooms, and 125 parking spaces.

The 38th Street Canyon potential park site encompasses approximately 2.5 acres. The site is located contiguous to Park de la Cruz between Wightman and Landis Streets. Within the project boundaries, there are six residential structures, including three duplexes and three single-family residences. If the park alternative is implemented then the 38th Street Canyon area would include, but would not be limited to, a playground, open turf area, basketball court, walkways, security lighting and seating areas. A child center facility is also considered for this location which is described further in this section.

The Normal Heights/Kensington Park site encompasses approximately 5.2 acres and is bound by the 40th Street off-ramp at Adams Avenue. This site currently serves as a stormwater detention basin with capacity to accommodate a 100-year storm event. The general development plan for Normal Heights/Kensington Park site would include, but would not be limited to, basketball courts, an exercise course and walkway, open turf area, small and large child play structures and a 19-space parking lot

The proposed Teralta Park would encompass approximately 5.1 acres that is currently vacant. Teralta Park would be developed on top of the freeway cover structure between Orange and Polk Avenue, over SR-15. Development plans for Teralta Park would include, but would not be limited to, basketball courts, picnic areas, open turf areas, walkways and seating areas, restrooms and a 42-space parking area.

The proposed child care center facility would consist of the same development, regardless of site location whether it is the 38th Street Canyon or Teralta Park site. It is anticipated that the child care facility would include the following primary components: 1) a two-story, 17,119 square-foot building to accommodate 200 children, 2) a play area, play structures, mini-stage and seating, and 3) a 23-space parking area.

5.2 CUMULATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

5.2.1 Land Use

The proposed Central Area Elementary School, in combination with other cumulative projects (i.e., the proposed four Proposition MM elementary schools, City Heights Urban Village, Stepping Stone and Regional Transportation Project) would involve the loss of existing low to moderate income single- and multi-family homes. Loss of single-family residences would not be consistent with the *Mid-City Communities Plan* goal to maintain the single-family character of the neighborhood, and would also decrease the amount of affordable housing available to low income persons and families.

The *Mid-City Communities Plan* identified Mid-City as an area with a high concentration of lower income households, providing an abundance of lower cost housing opportunities. The proposed Central Area Elementary School, in combination with the appropriate cumulative projects, would result in the loss of more than 800 single- and multi-family homes in the Mid-City Communities. This is considered a significant cumulative impact on housing in the community at large, as well as on affordable housing in particular. Mitigation for this significant impact would require replacement of the lost housing units. The District does not propose to mitigate the cumulatively significant loss of housing. Project approval would require the District to adopt Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

5.2.2 Traffic and Circulation

The cumulative traffic analysis for the project was based on the local street network immediately surrounding the proposed Central Area Elementary School. The near-term cumulative impact analysis described in Chapter 4.4 determined that all critical movements at the unsignalized intersections are calculated to continue to operate at LOS C or better in the year 2020 with the addition of cumulative project traffic, except the 39th Street/University Avenue intersection. Although University Avenue currently operates at LOS F on a daily basis, the project would not be expected to add any traffic on a daily basis to University Avenue.

Long-term traffic volumes for the circulation element roadway of University Avenue were taken from the SANDAG Series 9 traffic model. Table 5.2-1 shows that University Avenue is calculated to operate at LOS C west of 40th Street and at LOS E east of 40th Street in the year 2020.

With the addition of the cumulative projects described above, the proposed Central Area Elementary School would not contribute to a significant near- or long-term cumulative traffic and transportation impact. The proposed project would actually generate 160 less ADT.

5.2.3 Noise

Noise from the proposed Central Area Elementary School would be generated from project traffic and from school yard noise when students are in the outdoor playground areas. As described in Section 4.4.3, Traffic and Transportation, the proposed project would generate 160 fewer ADTs than the existing residential units on-site. Consequently, less noise from traffic would be generated on an average daily level from the proposed project. Although noise generated from outdoor usable areas when students are outside would exceed the City's Noise Ordinance, the CNEL levels remain below the City's Noise Compatibility Standard of 65 dBA CNEL. This is because students would only be outside in the mornings, during recess and lunch breaks, and after school, and noise after school hours would be minimal. Section 4.5, Noise, provides a more detailed discussion of noise from the proposed project. The proposed Central Area Elementary School, in combination with the other cumulative projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative noise impact.

5.2.4 Air Quality

Based on the traffic report, the proposed project would generate approximately 160 less ADT than the existing residential uses. The proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in a criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. This is because air pollutants associated with project-related traffic would be minimal. As a result, the proposed project, in combination with the cumulative projects, would not contribute to a significant cumulative air quality impact.

Table 5.2-1

Buildout Street Segments Operations

Street Segment	Capacity (LOS E)	Long-Term	
		VOL	LOS
University Avenue			
west of 37 th Street	40,000	21,500	C
east of 40 th Street	40,000	39,300	E

Notes: VOL = Volumes
LOS = Level of Service

Source: SANDAG Series 9 2020 Model (October 1999).

6 Other Required Considerations

6.1 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

According to Section 15126 (g) of the State CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must “discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.” Furthermore, this section also states that “it must not be assumed that growth in any area is not necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.”

As discussed in Chapter 2 of this EIR, the District identified the need for the proposed Central Area Elementary School to provide relief for enrollment pressures for the existing Central Elementary School. The acquisition of land for the construction of the proposed Central Area Elementary School would provide additional operating capacity to accommodate existing enrollments within the District, as well as future enrollments that are projected to be generated by existing/planned land uses within the District. The proposed Central Area Elementary School would not foster economic or population growth. Instead, this school would accommodate the existing and anticipated future needs of the population within the Central School enrollment/attendance area. Therefore, development of the proposed Central Area Elementary School would not be growth inducing.

6.2 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The following lists the environmental effects that were considered during the Initial Study, but found not to be significant:

6.2.1 Agriculture Resource

The project site is located in an urbanized area where there are no farmlands. There would be no farmland impacts. Therefore, no significant impacts to agriculture resources would occur.

6.2.2 Biological Resources

The preferred school site and the four alternative sites are located in a fully urbanized area. Demolition and/or removal of existing development on the site, including landscaping, would change the number and diversity of various species of decorative and exotic plants. However, removal, reuse or relocation of these plants would not be considered a significant biological impact because none of these plants is a listed sensitive species (i.e., unique, rare or endangered), and decorative urban landscaping does not provide significant biological habitat.

There are no agricultural crops on the project site.

Landscaping for the proposed project could possibly introduce new species of plants into the area. However, it is not anticipated that these plants would act as a barrier to the normal replenishment of existing species. Urbanization of the site altered the vegetation of the project area long ago; therefore, impacts would not be considered significant.

Because the project site is already urbanized and would be converted to another urbanized land use, no new species of animals would be introduced and no barrier to animal migration or movement would be created. The project site and its surrounding urban neighborhood do not provide any natural habitat for wildlife or wildlife corridors. Therefore, the proposed project would cause no significant impacts to unique, rare, threatened or endangered animal species.

6.2.3 Mineral Resources

The project is located on an urbanized site surrounded by an urbanized environment. There are no identified mineral resources that would be affected or “lost” as a result of this project; therefore, there would be no impact.

7 Alternatives

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require the evaluation of a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, which could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project (Section 15126.6(c)). Under these guidelines, the discussion of alternatives should focus on alternatives capable of eliminating any significant adverse impacts or reducing them to below a level of significance, even if these alternatives could impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. Section 15126.6(d) directs that “...the significant effects of an alternative shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed.” The proposed project consists of the acquisition of land for the construction and operation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School. The significant impacts of developing the proposed elementary school at the Preferred Site are described in Chapter 4 of this Environmental Impact Report.

There are two primary objectives of the proposed project. The first part of the project objective is to provide additional capacity for elementary students within the existing Central Elementary School attendance area and adjacent overflow transportation areas; and the second part of the objective is to assist the District in achieving the enrollment standards contained in the District’s *Long-Range Facilities Master Plan* (LRFMP).

This chapter evaluates the alternatives that could lessen or avoid the significant impacts associated with developing the proposed school at the Preferred Site, while trying to achieve the project objectives. This includes impacts to housing, population and displacement; cultural resources; noise; hazards and hazardous materials; hydrology and water quality; geology and soils; visual quality and community character; and public services.

A number of sites other than the alternative and Preferred Sites were considered by the Task Force and rejected for various reasons. Most of these sites were discussed during the Proposition MM New School Site Selection process (Section 2.3 and 2.4 of this EIR) and dismissed as not meeting basic locational criteria. The alternatives analysis presented below includes a comparative analysis of four alternative sites identified by the Site Selection Task Force. In addition, this chapter addresses the No Project Alternative, Non-Construction Alternative, and a Smaller Site Alternative.

7.1 ALTERNATIVE SITES ANALYSIS

There are no vacant sites within the proposed Central Area Elementary School project area that are large enough to accommodate the proposed elementary school. Therefore, the District must select a site that currently supports existing uses. The District considered a number of criteria in selecting sites for the proposed school. Sections 2.3 and 2.4 of this EIR describe the District’s site selection process.

In compliance with Section 15126.6(c) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, this discussion focuses on alternative sites capable of eliminating any significant adverse impacts or reducing them to below a level of significance. An environmentally Preferred Site would be one that would avoid or reduce the significant impacts associated with the Preferred Site. The following comparative analysis of the four alternative sites for the proposed Central Area Elementary School notes whether each alternative site would reduce or avoid impacts associated with the Preferred Site, or whether impacts would be greater.

The Alternatives Sites analysis assumes that only the location of the proposed Central Area Elementary School would be changed. The remaining characteristics of the proposed Central Area Elementary School (i.e., number of students, grade level configuration, school program, etc.) are assumed to be the same for any site. The District and the Site Selection Task Force have identified four alternative sites. The locations of the preferred and alternative sites are shown on Figure 3.1-3. These alternative sites were reviewed to determine their potential to avoid or reduce the significant impacts associated with the preferred project. The site characteristics for the alternative sites and the Preferred Site are presented in Table 7.1-1.

7.1.1 Alternative Site One

The Alternative Site One encompasses 7.4 gross acres (6.4 net acres) on 1.5 blocks bound by Wightman Street on the north, the alley between 37th and 38th Street on the east, Landis Street on the south, and Cherokee Avenue on the west. Development of the site would require the closure of a portion of 37th Street, between Landis Street and Wightman Street. The alley encompassed in this area would also be closed. The majority of the site is generally flat, ranging in elevation from approximately 331 to 346 feet (ft) above mean sea level (AMSL). The site is zoned MR-1500B and R1-40000/HR; its Community Plan land use designation is mixed single- and multi-family residential. Existing land uses on the site consist of 34 single- and 52 multi-family residential, as well as open space. An estimated total of 86 DUs are located on Alternative Site One with approximately 258 persons residing on the site (Table 7.1-1).

Surrounding land uses include residential to the north, west and south, a church and the construction of a new public park lies immediately to the east. A pedestrian bridge connects the project site to the residential areas east of SR-15 (See Figure 4.1-2). Surrounding zoning is R1-5000 and OS-P to the south of the site; its Community Plan land use designation is mixed single- and multi-family residential, and open space.

7.1.1.1 Land Use/Recreational Uses

Impacts to existing land uses on Alternative Site One would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.1, and would not be significant. The District is not bound by local land use regulations because they operate as a separate lead agency. Similar to the Preferred Site, the loss of existing residential units is considered a de minimus impact when compared to the amount of housing in the San Diego Region. This would result in a less than significant impact. Additionally, the

Table 7.1-1

Comparison of Preferred and Alternative Sites Proposed Central Area Elementary School

Site	Approximate Gross Acreage	Estimated Population	Estimated Dwelling Units			Street Segment Closures
			Single Family	Multiple Family	Total DUs	
Preferred Site	6.9 acres	393	18	113	131	39 th Street
Potential Expansion Area	22 acres	96	3	29	32	39 th Street
Alternative Site One	7.4 acres	258	34	52	86	37 th Street
Alternative Site Two	9.1 acres	153	39	12	51	Central Avenue
Alternative Site Three	9.0 acres	543	27	154	181	39 th Street
Alternative Site Four	11.3 acres	747	12	237	249	41 st Street

Source: BRG Consulting, Inc., 1999.

Central Urbanized PDO identifies schools as an allowable use within a residential zone. Therefore, land use impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of a new elementary school within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area would be consistent with the goal of eliminating overcrowded conditions in schools. Additionally, the proposed school facilities would have playgrounds and joint-use turf fields that would be available for organized community group use after normal school hours. General public access to the play fields would be precluded during school hours. Even with these logical limitations, the development of a playground would have a positive impact on recreation resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

The “City Heights Blight Study” identified that “blighted conditions” occur on Alternative Site One and on all of the alternative proposed elementary school sites. These conditions include, but are not limited to, visual blighted influences; barred windows and doors; deficient, deteriorated or dilapidated structures; and deteriorated alleys. Construction of the proposed elementary school at this site would remove the blighting influences and establish a new school within the City Heights Redevelopment Project Area. This would be consistent with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan. Impacts to single-family residences would not be avoided at this or any of the other alternative sites.

An adult entertainment establishment is located approximately 1,100 feet northwest of the project site at the northwest corner of University Avenue and 36th Street. However, because its location is more than

1,000 feet from the alternative site, potential adverse impacts associated with the presence of this type of land use would not be significant.

Six alcoholic beverage outlets were identified within a quarter-mile of Alternative Site One. However, all six alcoholic beverage outlets are located between 640 to 1,320 feet of this alternative, which is more than the 600-foot School District and Municipal Code standard for the sale of beer, wine or liquor. Therefore, land use compatibility impacts would not be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

The land use impacts associated with development of the proposed Central Area Elementary School at Alternative Site One would be similar to those associated with the Preferred Site, and would not be significant

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant land use/recreational use impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant land use impacts were identified.

7.1.1.2 Housing, Population and Displacement

Although Alternative Site One is larger in area than the Preferred Site, it has fewer dwelling units than the Preferred Site. Impacts to housing, population and displacement on Alternative Site One would be less than those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, but would still be significant.

Estimated population for the alternative sites is provided on Table 7.1-1. As shown on Table 7.1-1, the total number of existing DUs on Alternative Site One is 86, with approximately 34 single-family DUs and 52 multi-family DUs. This is less than the 163 dwelling units at the Preferred Site and expansion area. Similar to the Preferred Site and expansion area, the loss of 86 DUs would not result in a significant housing impact when compared to the housing supply in the San Diego Region.

Based on the population estimates described in Section 4.2.1 of this EIR, the estimated population for Alternative Site One is 258 persons. This is less than the estimated 489 persons identified for the Preferred Site and expansion area. Although Alternative Site One would reduce population and displacement impacts, compared to the Preferred Site, impacts would still be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

The displacement of an estimated 258 persons associated with Alternative Site One would result in significant population and displacement impacts of a lesser magnitude than the Preferred Site.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for the significant population and displacement impacts associated with Alternative Site one would be the same as described in Section 4.2.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Because the proposed project includes a comprehensive relocation program, the significant impact on population and displacement would be reduced to below a level of significance.

7.1.1.3 Cultural Resources

Historic Structures

Impacts to cultural resources on Alternative Site One would likely be identical to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site (Section 4.3). The Alternative Site One includes the south side of the 3651-3700 Blocks of Wightman Street, the east side of the 3700 Block of Cherokee Avenue, the north side of the 3650-3700 Blocks of Landis Street, and the eastern alley behind the 3700 Block of 37th Street. The Alternative Site One contains approximately 39 structures more than 45 years of age which have retained their historic appearance to varying degrees.

Of the 39 potential historic resources evaluated, nine buildings were built before 1921. Thirty-three of the 39 buildings were determined to have been constructed in a largely Craftsman vernacular architectural style. Other architectural styles in the area include Modern Minimal Traditional (4 examples), Spanish Eclectic (1 example), and Modern (1 example).

None of the structures were found to have been associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of the City's history or its cultural heritage. None of the structures were found to have been associated with the lives of persons significant in our past. None of the structures were found to represent the work of a master or an important creative individual. None of the structures were found to possess high artistic value. None of the structures or their sites were found to have yielded or to be likely to yield, information important in local history or prehistory.

Archaeological Resources

The area that includes the five sites considered for the proposed Central Area Elementary School project was the subject of an archaeological records search at the South Coastal Information Center for both prehistoric and historic archaeology, and of a block-by-block field survey for the same purpose. As a result of these investigations, it was determined that there are no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites within the study area.

No archaeological resources meeting the definition of an historical resource under California Register criteria or the definition of a unique resource under Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code were found within the study area. Although the potential for prehistoric resources is low, archaeological

monitoring is recommended during initial grading to address the potential for buried historic cultural resources.

A. Significant Impacts

The selection of Alternative Site One would have no adverse impact on historical structures. The potential for impacts to historic archaeological resources, however, would be significant.

B. Mitigation Measures

Archaeological monitoring during initial grading would be required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Archaeological monitoring would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.1.4 Traffic and Transportation

Impacts to transportation and traffic at Alternative Site One would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, and would not be significant. The proposed elementary school would generate approximately 900 daily trips. Siting an elementary school at Alternative Site One would require the closure of a portion of 37th Street between Wightman Street and Landis Street.

A. Significant Impacts

Based on the City's significance criteria, development of the proposed school at the Preferred Site would not significantly impact any intersection or street segment in the project area. Because roadway ADT's at Alternative Site One are similar to the Preferred Site and this alternative is within the "project area" studied, it has been determined that traffic associated with the project at Alternative Site One would not significantly impact any intersection or street segment in the project area.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts have been identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

The proposed project will have no significant traffic impacts in terms of the capacity of intersections and street segments surrounding Alternative Site One.

7.1.1.5 Noise

Noise impacts for Alternative Site One would be less than the Preferred Site, but would still be significant. Existing noise levels (CNEL and Leq) were measured at two locations at Alternative Site One. Measurements were taken at the intersections of Wightman Street and 37th Street, as well as 37th Street and Landis Street.

Alternative Site One would have less noise exposure from SR-15 traffic when compared to the Preferred Site. SR-15 is approximately 2.5 blocks east of this alternative and would not affect Alternative Site One. Other noise impacts would be similar to those described for the Preferred Site. Specifically, Alternative Site One would result in significant interior and exterior noise impacts from traffic along Wightman Street.

School yard noise would also play a role in the interior school building noise levels. Similar to the Preferred Site, the maximum exterior noise levels would be 72 dBA Leq. Open window conditions would mean interior noise levels of 62 dBA Leq. The closed window condition would be 52 dBA Leq. Using the 52 dBA Leq figure used for highways as a guideline, the open window condition would exceed that significance threshold. Therefore, school yard noise impacts on interior school building noise levels would be significant. School yard noise impacts for Alternative Site One on adjoining residential uses would not be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

Interior and exterior noise levels would exceed noise standards for the proposed school on Alternative Site One. Therefore, significant noise impacts would occur with implementation of Alternative Site One.

B. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures for traffic and school yard noise impacts would be similar to the Preferred Site for Alternative Site One.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce interior noise impacts associated with traffic and school yard noise on the proposed project to below a level of significance.

7.1.1.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and Hazardous Materials discussion for all alternatives is based on the GTC Preliminary Site Assessment Report (September 1999) (Appendix E-2). The SCS&T Phase I Assessment did not address alternative sites for the proposed project. The significance criteria used in the GTC Report are presented in Table 7.1-2. It should be noted that the basis for significance determination for the Preferred Site was derived from a more quantitative analysis from the criteria provided in the SCS&T Phase I Assessment. The GTC Report provides similar criteria for significance determination for the alternatives, although it is more on a qualitative basis. Overall, both Phase I Assessments provide essentially the same significance criteria for determining impacts on the preferred and alternative sites.

Hazards and hazardous waste impacts at Alternative Site One would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.6. Known historic and current residential land use within the vicinity of the alternative sites greatly reduces the potential for hazardous materials contamination. There was one site listed that was considered to have a potential “low” impact if the project were developed on Alternative Site One – Copley Family YMCA at 3901 Landis Street (one UST).

Table 7.1-2
Contaminated Properties Impact Criteria

Impact Potential	Criteria
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites within or immediately adjacent to the project site with leaking underground storage tanks that are reported as no action taken. • Sites within or immediately adjacent to the project site where site assessment efforts are reported to be in progress. • Sites within or immediately adjacent to the project site where remediation/cleanup efforts are reported to be in progress.
Moderate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites within or immediately adjacent to the project site where the number and/or status of underground storage tanks on-site is not reported. • Sites within or immediately adjacent to the project site with active underground storage tanks. • Sites within or immediately adjacent to the project site with inactive underground storage tanks.
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites where underground storage tanks have been removed. • Sites which generate large quantities of hazardous materials. • Sites where historic or current use may be associated with large quantities of hazardous materials.
Low/None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites outside of or physically separated from (by roads) the project site.
None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites which generate small amounts of hazardous materials. • Sites where no further action is required. • Sites where case has been closed following site remediation/cleanup.

Source: Geotechnical Consultants, Inc., 1999.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with construction demolition identified in Section 4.6.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site One.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant construction demolition impacts associated with Alternative Site One would be the same as identified in Section 4.6.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce significant construction demolition impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.1.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

Alternative Site One has substantially similar hydrology characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.7.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant water quality impacts associated with construction runoff identified in Section 4.7.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site One.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant water quality impacts associated with Alternative Site One would be the same as identified in Section 4.7.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce significant water quality impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.1.8 Geology and Soils

The Geology and Soils discussion for all alternatives is based on GTC's *Preliminary Geologic, Seismic and Water Resources Assessment: Central Area Elementary School* (September 1999) (Appendix F). Alternative Site One has substantially similar geology and soils characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.8.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant geology and soils impacts identified in Section 4.8.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site One.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative Site One would be the same as identified in Section 4.8.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce all identified significant impacts associated with strong ground motion and corrosive soils to below a level of significance.

7.1.1.9 Paleontological Resources

Alternative Site One has substantially similar characteristics for potential paleontological resources as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.9.

A. Significant Impacts

Development of Alternative Site One would have no potential to affect paleontological resources, as would the Preferred Site.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to paleontological resources were identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts on paleontological resources were identified.

7.1.1.10 Visual Quality/Community Character

Alternative Site One has substantially similar characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.10. Impacts to visual quality and community character at Alternative Site One would be similar to those identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.10.3.

A. Significant Impacts

The short-term visual quality impacts associated with demolition/construction activities would be the same at Alternative Site One as described in Section 4.10.4 for the Preferred Site.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for short-term visual quality impacts associated with demolition/construction activities would be the same for Alternative Site One as described in Section 4.10.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.10.5 would reduce the potential significant impacts on aesthetics to below a level of significance.

7.1.1.11 Public Services

The public services characteristics relative to Alternative Site One are substantially similar to the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.11.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant solid waste impacts identified in Section 4.11.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site One.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant landfill capacity impacts associated with Alternative Site One would be the same as identified in Section 4.11.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce landfill capacity impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.1.12 Public Utilities

Alternative Site One has substantially similar characteristics for public utilities as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.12.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant impacts to public utilities were identified for the Preferred Site; therefore, no significant public utilities impacts would likely occur for Alternative Site One.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to public utilities were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts to public utilities would occur as a result of selection of Alternative Site One.

7.1.1.13 Air Quality

Alternative Site One has substantially similar characteristics for air quality as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.13.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant impacts to air quality were identified for the Preferred Site; therefore, no significant air quality impacts would likely occur for Alternative Site One.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to air quality were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts to air quality would occur as a result of selection of Alternative Site One.

Summary

Most environmental impacts of Alternative Site One would be similar to the Preferred Site, with the exception of those listed below. Alternative Site One is considered the environmentally superior alternative (Section 7.5). A comparison table of direct environmental impacts of the Preferred Site and alternatives is provided in Table 7.1-3.

Alternative Site One would avoid or reduce the following significant impacts of the proposed project on the Preferred Site:

- Avoid the significant and unmitigated impact associated with the loss of historical resources.
- Avoid the significant and mitigated impacts associated with SR-15 traffic noise for interior spaces.
- Reduce the total number of residential DUs lost to approximately 86, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 163 DUs.

However, Alternative Site One would increase the loss of single-family DUs to approximately 34, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 21 DUs.

7.1.2 Alternative Site Two

Alternative Site Two consists of 9.1 gross acres (8.4 net acres) encompassing most of two blocks bound by Landis Street on the north, 41st Street on the east, Dwight Street on the south and SR-15 on the west (See Figure 3.1-3). Development of the site would require the closure of Central Avenue, between Landis Street and Dwight Street. The site is zoned R1-5000 and MR-3000, with a Community Plan designation is mixed single- and multi-family residential. Alternative Site Two is generally flat, with an elevation that ranges from 330 to 340 feet AMSL. Land uses on the site consist of 39 single- and 12 multi-family DUs and one small commercial property called Landis Street Market located at 4069 Landis Street. An estimated 51 dwelling units are located on Alternative Site Two with approximately 153 persons residing on the site (Table 7.1-1).

Surrounding land uses to the north, east and south consist primarily of residential uses, the western boundary of the site is the extension of SR-15. Surrounding zoning is MR-1500B to the north, MR-3000 to the east, and R1-5000 to the south of the site; its Community Plan land use designation is single- and multi-family residential.

**Table 7.1-3
Comparison of Direct Environmental Impacts
of the Preferred Site and Alternatives**

Environmental Issue	Preferred Site	Alternative Site One	Alternative Site Two	Alternative Site Three	Alternative Site Four	No Project Alternative
Chapter 4.1 – Land Use/Recreational Resources						
Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
City of San Diego Adopted Plans and Policies	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Effect on Existing Facilities	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Chapter 4.2 – Housing, Population and Displacement						
Loss of Dwelling Units and Displacement	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS
Chapter 4.3 – Cultural Resources						
Historical Resources	SNM	NS	NS	SNM	NS	NS
Archaeological Resources	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS
Chapter 4.4 – Traffic and Transportation						
Intersections and Street Segments	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Chapter 4.5 – Noise						
Traffic Noise (Usable outdoor spaces)	SM	SM	NS	SM	NS	NS

NS = Not Significant; SM = Significant and Mitigated; SNM = Significant and Not Mitigated

Table 7.1-3 (cont'd)

Environmental Issue	Preferred Site	Alternative Site One	Alternative Site Two	Alternative Site Three	Alternative Site Four	No Project Alternative
Chapter 4.5 – Noise cont.						
Traffic Noise (Interior spaces)	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS	NS
School Yard Noise	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS
Temporary Construction Noise	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Chapter 4.6 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials						
Location on or Near Known Potential Contamination Sources	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Construction Demolition and/or Removal Activities	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS
Chapter 4.7 – Hydrology/Water Quality						
Construction Runoff	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS
Chapter 4.8 – Geology and Soils						
Strong Ground Motion	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS
Corrosive Soils	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS
Chapter 4.9 – Paleontological Resources						
Disturbance of Paleontological Resources	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

NS = Not Significant; SM = Significant and Mitigated; SNM = Significant and Not Mitigated

Table 7.1-3 (cont'd)

Environmental Issue	Preferred Site	Alternative Site One	Alternative Site Two	Alternative Site Three	Alternative Site Four	No Project Alternative
Chapter 4.10 – Visual Quality/Community Character						
Construction Activities	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Chapter 4.11 – Public Services						
Police Protection	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Fire Protection	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Solid Waste	SM	SM	SM	SM	SM	NS
Chapter 4.12 – Public Utilities						
Potable Water	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Sewer Systems	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Electricity and Natural Gas	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Chapter 4.13 – Air Quality						
Air Quality impacts on and from surrounding land uses	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

NS = Not Significant; SM = Significant and Mitigated; SNM = Significant and Not Mitigated

Source: BRG Consulting, 2000

7.1.2.1 Land Use/Recreational Uses

Impacts to existing land uses on Alternative Site Two would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.1, and would not be significant. The District is not bound by local land use regulations because they operate as a separate lead agency. Similar to the Preferred Site, the loss of existing residential units is considered a de minimus impact when compared to the amount of housing in the San Diego Region. This would result in a less than significant impact. Additionally, the *Central Urbanized PDO* identifies schools as an allowable use within a residential zone. Therefore, land use impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of a new elementary school within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area would be consistent with the goal of eliminating overcrowded conditions in schools. Additionally, the proposed school facilities would have playgrounds and joint-use turf fields that would be available for organized community group use after normal school hours. General public access to the play fields would be precluded during school hours. Even with these logical limitations, the development of a playground would have a positive impact on recreation resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

The “City Heights Blight Study” identified that “blighted conditions” occur on Alternative Site Two and on all of the alternative elementary school sites. These conditions include, but are not limited to, visual blighted influences; barred windows and doors; deficient, deteriorated or dilapidated structures; and deteriorated alleys. Construction of the proposed elementary school at this site would remove the blighting influences and establish a new school within the City Heights Redevelopment Project Area. This would be consistent with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan. Impacts to single-family residences would not be avoided at this or any of the other alternative sites.

No adult entertainment establishments were identified within the quarter-mile study of Alternative Site Two. One alcoholic beverage outlet was identified, but it was approximately 1,120 feet away. Therefore, this alternative would not conflict with District Policy or the City’s Municipal Code, and impacts would not occur.

A. Significant Impacts

The land use impacts associated with development of the proposed Central Area Elementary School at Alternative Site Two would be similar to those associated with the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.1.4, and would not be significant.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant land use impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No additional significant land use impacts were identified.

7.1.2.2 Housing, Population and Displacement

Alternative Site Two has fewer dwelling units, than the Preferred Site. The impact on housing, population and displacement would be less, but would still be significant.

Estimated population for the Alternative Site Two is provided on Table 7.1-1. As shown on Table 7.1-1, the total number of existing DUs on Alternative Site Two is 51, with approximately 39 single-family DUs and 12 multi-family DUs. Additionally, there is a market, located at 4069 Landis Street. This is less than the 163 DUs at the Preferred Site and expansion area. Similar to the Preferred Site and expansion area, the loss of 51 DUs would not result in a significant housing impact when compared to the housing supply in the San Diego Region.

Based on the population estimates described in Section 4.2.1 of this EIR, the estimated population for Alternative Site Two is 153 persons. This is less than the estimated 489 persons estimated for the Preferred Site and expansion area. Although Alternative Site Two would reduce population and displacement impacts, compared to the Preferred Site, impacts would still be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

The displacement of an estimated 153 persons and one commercial property associated with the site would result in significant population and displacement impacts.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for the significant population and displacement impacts associated with Alternative Site Two would be the same as described in Section 4.2.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Because the proposed project includes a comprehensive relocation program, the impact on population and displacement would be reduced to below a level of significance.

7.1.2.3 Cultural Resources

Historic Structures

The Alternative Site Two includes the south side of the 4037-4100 Blocks of Landis Street, the west side of the 3600 Block of 41st Street, the east side of the 3600 Block of 40th Street, and the north side of the 4000 block of Dwight Street. The Alternative Site Two contains approximately 43 structures more than 45 years of age which have retained their historic appearance to varying degrees.

Of the 43 potential historic resources evaluated, none were built before 1921 and 28 buildings were determined to have been constructed in a largely Craftsman vernacular architectural style. Other architectural styles in the area include Spanish Eclectic (8 examples), Modern Minimal Traditional (5 examples), Mission Revival (1 example), and Commercial (1 example).

None of the 43 potentially historic structures on Alternative Site Two qualifies for the City's Historic Sites List or meets the National or State criteria for historic significance. Although one residence was determined to be ineligible for the National Register and City's List, it was determined to be of local interest due its architectural style. The residence is designed in a Mission Revival architectural style and is located at 3636 Central Avenue. No significant impact is anticipated.

Archaeological Resources

The area that includes the five sites considered for the proposed Central Area Elementary School project was the subject of an archaeological records search at the South Coastal Information Center for both prehistoric and historic archaeology, and a block-by-block field survey for the same purpose. As a result of these investigations, it was determined that there are no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites within the study area.

No archaeological resources meeting the definition of an historical resource under California Register criteria or the definition of a unique resource under Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code were found within the study area. Although the potential for prehistoric resources is low, archaeological monitoring is recommended during initial grading to address the potential for buried historic cultural resources.

A. Significant Impacts

The selection of Alternative Site Two would have no adverse impact on historical structures. The potential for impacts to historic archaeological resources, however, would be significant.

B. Mitigation Measures

Archaeological monitoring would be required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Archaeological monitoring would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.2.4 Traffic and Transportation

Impacts to transportation and traffic on Alternative Site Two would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site as described in Section 4.4, and would not be significant. The proposed elementary school would generate approximately 900 daily trips. Alternative Site Two would require the closure of a portion of Central Avenue between Landis Street and Dwight Street.

A. Significant Impacts

Based on the City's significance criteria, development of the proposed school at the Preferred Site would not significantly impact any intersection or street segment in the project area. Because roadway volumes at Alternative Site Two are substantially similar to the Preferred Site and this alternative is within the "project area" studied, traffic associated with the project at Alternative Site Two would not significantly impact any intersection or street segment in the project area.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts have been identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant traffic impacts were identified.

7.1.2.5 Noise

Noise impacts for Alternative Site Two would be less than the Preferred Site, but would still be significant. Existing noise levels (CNEL and Leq) were measured at two locations at Alternative Site Two. Measurements were taken at the intersections of Landis Street and 41st Street, as well as Dwight Street and SR-15.

Alternative Site Two would have less noise exposure from street traffic when compared to the Preferred Site. Estimated CNEL noise levels for roadways at Alternative Site Two do not exceed the 65 dBA CNEL significance threshold for the City's Noise Compatibility Standards. However, as with the Preferred Site, this alternative is directly adjacent to SR-15. Therefore, a multi-story school building with open windows would experience interior sound levels that exceed the 52 dBA Leq standard. Although roadway noise levels would not be significant, noise impacts from the SR-15 would be a significant impact for interior noise levels for multi-story buildings.

School yard noise impacts for Alternative Site Two on adjoining residential uses would not be significant. However, school yard noise would also play a role in the interior school building noise levels. Similar to the Preferred Site, the maximum exterior noise levels would be 72 dBA Leq. Open window conditions would mean interior noise levels of 62 dBA Leq. The closed window condition would be 52 dBA Leq. Using the 52 dBA Leq figure used for highways as a guideline, the open window condition would exceed the significance threshold. Therefore, school yard noise impacts on interior school building noise levels would be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

1. Traffic noise impacts on interior noise levels for multi-story school structures along SR-15.
2. School yard noise impacts would exceed noise standards.

B. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures for SR-15 noise levels and school yard noise impacts would be similar to the Preferred Site for Alternative Site Two.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce interior noise impacts associated with school yard noise on the proposed project to below a level of significance.

7.1.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous waste impacts on Alternative Site Two would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.6. Known historic and current residential land use within the vicinity of the alternative sites greatly reduces the potential for hazardous materials contamination. There was no site listed that was considered to have a potential impact if the project were developed on the Alternative Site Two.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with construction demolition identified in Section 4.6.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Two.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant construction demolition impacts associated with Alternative Site Two would be the same as identified in Section 4.6.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce significant construction demolition impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.2.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

Alternative Site Two has substantially similar hydrology characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.7.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant water quality impacts associated with construction runoff identified in Section 4.7.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Two.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant water quality impacts associated with Alternative Site Two would be the same as identified in Section 4.7.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. *Significance of Impacts After Mitigation*

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce significant hydrology and water quality impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.2.8 Geology and Soils

Based on the GTC geotechnical report, Alternative Site Two has substantially similar geology and soils characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.8.

A. *Significant Impacts*

The significant geology and soils impacts identified in Section 4.8.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Two.

B. *Mitigation Measures*

The mitigation measures for significant geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative Site Two would be the same as identified in Section 4.8.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. *Significance of Impacts After Mitigation*

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce all identified significant impacts associated with strong ground motion and corrosive soils to below a level of significance.

7.1.2.9 Paleontological Resources

Alternative Site Two has substantially similar characteristics for potential paleontological resources as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.9.

A. *Significant Impacts*

Development of Alternative Site Two would have no potential to affect paleontological resources, as would the Preferred Site.

B. *Mitigation Measures*

No significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. *Significance of Impacts After Mitigation*

No significant impacts on paleontological resources were identified.

7.1.2.10 Visual Quality/Community Character

Alternative Site Two has substantially similar characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.10. Impacts to visual quality and community character at Alternative Site Two would be similar to those identified for the Preferred Site (Section 4.10.3).

A. Significant Impacts

The short-term aesthetic impacts associated with demolition/construction activities would be the same at Alternative Site Two as described in Section 4.10.4 for the Preferred Site.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for short-term aesthetic impacts associated with demolition/construction activities would be the same for Alternative Site Two as described in Section 4.10.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.10.5 would reduce the short-term significant impacts on visual quality to below a level of significance.

7.1.2.11 Public Services

The public services characteristics relative to Alternative Site Two are substantially similar to the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.11.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant solid waste impacts identified in Section 4.11.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Two.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant landfill capacity impacts associated with Alternative Site Two would be the same as identified in Section 4.11.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce landfill capacity impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.2.12 Public Utilities

Alternative Site Two has substantially similar characteristics for public utilities as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.12.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant impacts to public utilities were identified for the Preferred Site; therefore, no significant public utilities impacts would likely occur for Alternative Site Two.

B. Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts to public utilities were identified.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts to public utilities would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School project.

7.1.1.13 Air Quality

Alternative Site Two has substantially similar characteristics for air quality as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.13.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant impacts to air quality were identified for the Preferred Site; therefore, no significant air quality impacts would likely occur for Alternative Site Two.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to air quality were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts to air quality would occur as a result of selection of Alternative Site Two.

Summary

Most environmental impacts of Alternative Site Two would be similar to the Preferred Site, with the exception of those listed below. A comparison table of direct environmental impacts of the Preferred Site and alternatives is provided in Table 7.1-3.

Alternative Site Two would avoid or reduce the following significant impacts of the proposed project on the Preferred Site:

- Avoid the significant and unmitigated impact associated with the loss of historical resources.
- Avoid the significant and mitigated impacts associated with street traffic noise for interior spaces. SR-15 noise impacts for a multi-story school would be similar to the Preferred Site.
- Reduce the total number of residential DUs lost to approximately 51, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 163 DUs.

However, Alternative Site Two would increase the loss of single-family DUs to approximately 39, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 21 DUs.

7.1.3 Alternative Site Three

Alternative Site Three consists of 9.0 gross acres (8.4 net acres) bound by the block on the north side of Polk Avenue, 38th Street on the west, 40th Street on the east, and the rear property lines of the commercial properties along University Avenue (See Figure 3.1-3). Development of the site would require the closure of 39th Street between Polk Avenue and University Avenue, retaining access to the rear of the commercial properties facing University Avenue. The site is zoned MR1500B and CN-2T, with a Community Plan designation of mixed single- and multi-family residential. Alternative Site Three is generally flat with an elevation that ranges from 360 to 365 feet AMSL. Land uses on the site consist of approximately 27 single- and 154 multi-family DUs, as well as a church. An estimated total of 181 DUs are located on Alternative Site Three with approximately 543 persons residing on the site (Table 7.1-1).

Surrounding land uses to the north, east and west consist primarily of residential uses, and the southern boundary of the site is bound by the commercial properties along University Avenue. Surrounding zoning is MR-1500B and CL-2 to the south of the site; its Community Plan land use designation is multi-family and commercial.

7.1.3.1 Land Use/Recreational Uses

Impacts to existing land uses on Alternative Site Three would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.1, and would not be significant. The District is not bound by local land use regulations because they operate as a separate lead agency. Similar to the Preferred Site, the loss of existing residential units is considered a de minimus impact when compared to the amount of housing in the San Diego Region. This would result in a less than significant impact. Additionally, the *Central Urbanized PDO* identifies schools as an allowable use within a residential zone. Therefore, land use impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of a new elementary school within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area would be consistent with the goal of eliminating overcrowded conditions in schools. Additionally, the proposed school facilities would have playgrounds and joint-use turf fields that would be available for organized community group use after normal school hours. General public access to the play fields would be precluded during school hours. Even with these logical limitations, the development of a playground would have a positive impact on recreation resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

The “City Heights Blight Study” identified that “blighted conditions” occur on Alternative Site Three and on all of the alternative elementary school sites. These conditions include, but are not limited to, visual blighted influences; barred windows and doors; deficient, deteriorated or dilapidated structures; and deteriorated alleys. Construction of the proposed elementary school at this site would remove the blighting influences and establish a new school within the City Heights Redevelopment Project Area.

This would be consistent with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan. Impacts to single-family residences would not be avoided at this or any of the other alternative sites.

An adult entertainment establishment was located 1,280 feet southwest of this alternative. However, it is more than 1,000 feet from the site; therefore, land use impacts would not be significant.

Six alcoholic beverage outlets were identified within the quarter-mile survey and five of them are less than 600 feet away from this alternative. As previously mentioned, it is the District's policy to protest the issuance or transfer of beer, wine, or liquor licenses for premises within 600 feet of any school in the District (Policy No. 0215). However, Policy No. 0215 applies to new development, not to existing uses. Although five alcoholic beverage outlets were identified less than 600 feet of this site, these are existing land uses that the District has no authority to protest under District Policy No. 0215. Impacts to this policy would be less than significant.

Additionally, San Diego Municipal Code § 141.0404(a) prohibits the location of alcoholic beverage outlets within 600 feet of a public school. As discussed in Chapter 4.1, Land Use, the San Diego Municipal Code only pertains to issuance of permits to new alcoholic beverage outlets in areas where existing schools are located, not to siting of new schools in areas where there are existing alcoholic beverage outlets. Based on this discussion, impacts from the alcoholic beverage outlets located less than 600 feet away, would be less than significant.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant land use compatibility impacts would occur at Alternative Site Three.

B. Mitigation Measures

No land use compatibility impacts would occur at this alternative site, and therefore, mitigation measures would not be necessary.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No land use compatibility impacts would occur at this alternative site.

7.1.3.2 Housing, Population and Displacement

Alternative Site Three has more dwelling units than the Preferred Site. The impact on housing, population and displacement would be greater and would be significant.

Estimated population for the Alternative Site Three is provided on Table 7.1-1. As shown on Table 7.1-1, the total number of existing DUs on Alternative Site Three is 181 (approximately 27 single- and 154 multi-family DUs), which is more than the 163 DUs at the Preferred Site and expansion area. Similar to the Preferred Site and expansion area, the loss of 181 DUs would not result in a significant housing impact when compared to the housing supply in the San Diego Region.

Based on the population estimates described in Section 4.2.1 of this EIR, the estimated population for Alternative Site Three is 543 persons. This is more than the estimated 489 persons estimated for the Preferred Site and expansion area. Therefore, Alternative Site Three would increase population and displacement impacts, compared to the Preferred Site and impacts would be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

The displacement of an estimated 543 persons associated with Alternative Site Three would result in significant population and displacement impacts.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for the significant population and displacement impacts associated with Alternative Site Three would be the same as described in Section 4.2.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Because the proposed project includes a comprehensive relocation program to address the dislocation of residents displaced by the project, the impact on population and displacement would be reduced to below a level of significance.

7.1.3.3 Cultural Resources

Historic Structures

The Alternative Site Three includes a portion of the City Heights Subdivision as well as a portion of the Teralta Resubdivision. This site includes the east side of the 4100 Block of 38th Street, both sides of the 3800-3900 Blocks of Polk Avenue, and the west side of the 4000-4100 Blocks of 40th Street. The Alternative Site Three contains approximately 48 structures more than 45 years of age which have retained their historic appearance to varying degrees.

Of the 48 potential historic resources evaluated, three buildings were built before 1921. Thirty-seven of the 48 buildings were determined to have been constructed in a largely Craftsman vernacular architectural style. Other architectural styles in the area include Modern Minimal Traditional (5 examples), Spanish Eclectic (2 examples), Mission Revival (1 example), Art Moderne (1 example), Tudor (1 example), and Modern (1 example).

Two residences embodied the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, and method of construction and appear to be eligible for the National Register on the basis of their architectural significance. These residences, located within the Alternative Site Three, are identified as 4082 and 4084 39th Street. Built in 1924 in a Mission Revival architectural style, the homes have retained their original architectural qualities and a high level of integrity. The residences embody many of the distinctive characteristics of the Mission Revival style, such as flat roofs with parapets, roof vents, angular projections, stucco exteriors,

cantilevered red Mission tile porch roofs, and double-hung windows. As rare and important architectural examples, they represent the Mission Revival style constructed on a small scale during the 1920s. One additional residence, designed in an Art Moderne architectural style is located at 4086-4088 39th Street, was determined to be ineligible for the National Register and City's List, but retained local interest due to its architectural style.

Archaeological Resources

The area that includes the five sites considered for the proposed Central Elementary Area School was the subject of an archaeological record search at the South Coast Information Center for both prehistoric and historic archaeology and of a block by block field survey for the same purpose. As a result of these investigations, it was determined that there are no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites within the study area.

No archaeological resources meeting the definition of an historical resource under California Register criteria or the definition of an unique resource under Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code were found within the study area. Although the potential for prehistoric resources is low, archaeological monitoring is recommended during initial grading to address the potential for buried historic cultural resources.

A. Significant Impacts

The selection of Alternative Site Three has the potential to create a significant environmental impact on historical resources if the two structures identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places are subject to substantial adverse change. The potential for impacts to historic archaeological resources would also be significant.

B. Mitigation Measures

The environmental impacts to the two structures identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places can be avoided by retaining them on site and maintaining them in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The environmental impacts to the two resources may also be reduced to below a level of significance by their relocation to an appropriate site and their subsequent rehabilitation in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The environmental impacts to such resources may be reduced, but not to below a level of significance, by documentation of the resource by historic narrative, photographs or architectural drawings. Archaeological monitoring would also be required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

If Alternative Site Three is chosen as the site for the proposed Euclid Area Elementary School and the two structures identified as eligible for the Local Register of Historical Sites cannot be retained on site, impacts could be reduced to below a level of significance by their relocation to an appropriate site and their subsequent rehabilitation according to applicable standards. The impacts may be reduced by the documentation mitigation measure described above, but under current CEQA regulations (Section

15126.4(b)(2)), such mitigation may not reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Archaeological monitoring would reduce impacts to archaeological resources to below a level of significance.

7.1.3.4 Traffic and Transportation

Impacts to transportation and traffic on Alternative Site Three would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site as described in Section 4.4, and would not be significant. The proposed elementary school would generate approximately 900 daily trips. Alternative Site Three would require the closure of a portion of 39th Street between Polk Avenue and University Avenue, as well as a portion of Polk Avenue between 38th Street and 40th Street.

A. Significant Impacts

Based on the City’s significance criteria, development of the proposed school at the Preferred Site would not significantly impact any intersection or street segment in the project area. Although Alternative Site Three would require the closure of two street segments, which is slightly more of an impact compared to the Preferred Site, neither of these segments generate a large amount of traffic, and therefore, would not result in any significant impacts. The proximity of Alternative Site Three to University Avenue is not expected to be problematic, since the project would generate similar traffic volumes on University Avenue compared to the Preferred Site. Because Alternative Site Three is substantially similar to the Preferred Site and is within the “project area” studied, traffic associated with the project on Alternative Site Three would not significantly impact any intersection or street segment in the project area.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts have been identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant traffic impacts were identified.

7.1.3.5 Noise

Noise impacts on Alternative Site Three would be similar to traffic and school yard noise impacts as the Preferred Site. Measurements were taken at the intersections of 40th Street and Polk Avenue, as well as University Avenue and 38th Street.

SR-15 is located directly adjacent to the east of this alternative. Alternative Site Three has a common southern boundary with a commercial district, which may indicate higher local noise typical of frontages with residential uses. Therefore, placing a school near University Avenue would tend to make the impact on the school greater than at the Preferred Site or the other alternative sites. Estimated CNEL noise levels for roadways at Alternative Site Three would exceed the 65 dBA CNEL significance threshold for the City’s Noise Compatibility Standards for usable outdoor areas at the intersection of 40th and Polk Avenue. In addition, peak noise levels exceed the significance threshold of 52 dBA Leq for interior noise levels. Because this alternative is directly adjacent to the SR-15 a multi-story school building, with

open windows, would experience a significant interior noise impact. Roadway noise levels for usable outdoor areas and interior noise levels along the intersection of 40th Street and Polk Avenue and SR-15 would be a significant impact.

Estimated school yard noise for Alternative Site Three would be similar to the Preferred Site. This alternative is located immediately adjacent to residential uses on the north side of the site. On the sides immediately adjacent to residential uses, school yard noise would reach a maximum of 72 dBA Leq which exceeds the standard. Therefore, in areas where the school would be immediately adjacent to residential uses, and no intervening roads occur to buffer the school yard noise, significant interior noise impacts on existing residences would occur. The higher noise level on University Avenue would serve to buffer school yard noise adjacent to the commercial land uses on University Avenue.

School yard noise would also play a role in the interior school building noise levels. Similar to the Preferred Site, the maximum exterior noise levels would be 72 dBA Leq. Open window conditions would mean interior noise levels of 62 dBA Leq. The closed window condition would be 52 dBA Leq. Using the 52 dBA Leq figure used for highways as a guideline, the open window condition would exceed that significance threshold. School yard noise impacts on interior school building noise levels would be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

The following have been identified as significant noise impacts Alternative Site Three:

1. Traffic noise impacts on usable outdoor school areas and interior school structures at the intersection of 40th and Polk Avenue.
2. Traffic noise impacts on interior noise levels for multi-story school structures along SR-15.
3. School yard noise levels on residential uses immediately adjacent to the site, and where no intervening roads separate the two uses.
4. School yard noise levels on interior school noise levels.

B. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures for the identified significant noise impacts of school use and vehicular traffic are provided below.

Usable outdoor school areas shall maintain a minimum setback of 68 feet from the roadway centerline of the intersection of 40th Street and Polk Avenue to reduce traffic noise levels to below 65 dBA CNEL.

School structures shall maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline at the intersection of 40th Street and Polk Avenue and operate in a closed window condition with mechanical

ventilation, or shall maintain a minimum setback of 63 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in an open window condition to reduce interior traffic noise levels to below 52 dBA Leq. Multi-story school structures along SR-15 shall maintain a minimum setback of 125 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in an open window to reduce interior traffic noise levels to below 52 dBA Leq.

School structures shall maintain an 80-foot set back from residential uses immediately adjacent to the project site.

School structures shall operate in a closed window condition with mechanical ventilation to reduce school interior noise levels from school yard noise to below 52 dBA CNEL, if warranted by building code analysis in accordance with District Policy E-4100.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce exterior and interior noise impacts associated with vehicular traffic noise and school yard noise on the proposed project to below a level of significance.

7.1.3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous waste impacts on Alternative Site Three would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.6. Known historic and current residential land use within the vicinity of the alternative sites greatly reduces the potential for hazardous materials contamination. There were no sites listed that were considered to have an impact if the project were developed on Alternative Site Three.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with construction demolition identified in Section 4.6.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Three.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant construction demolition impacts associated with Alternative Site Three would be the same as identified in Section 4.6.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce significant construction demolition impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.3.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

Alternative Site Three has substantially similar hydrology characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.7.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant water quality impacts associated with construction runoff identified in Section 4.7.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Three.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant water quality impacts associated with Alternative Site Three would be the same as identified in Section 4.7.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce significant hydrology and water quality impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.3.8 Geology and Soils

Based on the GTC geotechnical report, Alternative Site Three has substantially similar geology and soils characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.8.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant geology and soils impacts identified in Section 4.8.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Three.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative Site Three would be the same as identified in Section 4.8.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce all identified significant impacts associated with strong ground motion and corrosive soils to below a level of significance.

7.1.3.9 Paleontological Resources

Alternative Site Three has substantially similar characteristics for potential paleontological resources as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.9.

A. Significant Impacts

Development of Alternative Site Three would have no potential to affect paleontological resources, as would the Preferred Site.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts on paleontological resources were identified.

7.1.3.10 Visual Quality/Community Character

Alternative Site Three has substantially similar characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.10. Impacts to visual quality and community character at Alternative Site Three would be similar to those identified for the Preferred Site (Section 4.10.3).

A. Significant Impacts

The short-term aesthetic impacts associated with demolition/construction activities would be the same at Alternative Site Three as described in Section 4.10.4 for the Preferred Site.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for short-term aesthetic impacts associated with demolition/construction activities would be the same for Alternative Site Three as described in Section 4.10.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.10.5 would reduce the short-term significant impacts on visual quality to below a level of significance.

7.1.3.11 Public Services

The public services characteristics relative to Alternative Site Three are substantially similar to the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.11.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant solid waste impacts identified in Section 4.11.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Three.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant landfill capacity impacts associated with Alternative Site Three would be the same as identified in Section 4.11.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce landfill capacity impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.3.12 Public Utilities

Alternative Site Three has substantially similar characteristics for public utilities as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.12.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant impacts to public utilities were identified for the Preferred Site; therefore, no significant public utilities impacts would likely occur for Alternative Site Three.

B. Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts to public utilities were identified.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts to public utilities would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School project.

7.1.1.13 Air Quality

Alternative Site Three has substantially similar characteristics for air quality as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.13.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant impacts to air quality were identified for the Preferred Site; therefore, no significant air quality impacts would likely occur for Alternative Site Three.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to air quality were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts to air quality would occur as a result of selection of Alternative Site Three.

Summary

Alternative Site Three would not avoid or decrease any significant environmental impacts of the proposed project on the Preferred Site. This alternative would actually increase the environmental impacts. A comparison table of direct environmental impacts of the Preferred Site and alternatives is provided in Table 7.1-3.

Alternative Site Three would increase the following significant impacts when compared to the Preferred Site:

- Increase the loss of single-family DUs to approximately 27, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 21 DUs.
- Increase the total loss of residential units to approximately 181, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 163 DUs.
- Create a significant environmental impact on historical resources due to the two structures identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places on Alternative Site Three.
- Create a significant noise impact on existing residential uses immediately adjacent to Alternative Site Three.

7.1.4 Alternative Site Four

Alternative Site Four consists of 11.3 gross acres (10.8 net acres) encompassing most of two blocks bound by Orange Avenue on the north, Marlborough Avenue on the east, Polk Avenue on the south, and Central Avenue on the west (See Figure 3.1-3). Development of the site would require the closure of Marlborough Avenue and 41st Street between Orange Avenue and Polk Avenue. The site is zoned MR-1500B, with a Community Plan designation of mixed single- and multi-family residential. Land uses on the site consist of approximately 12 single- and 237 multi-family DUs, with approximately 747 persons residing on the site.

Alternative Site Four is generally flat, with an elevation that ranges from 360 to 365 feet AMSL. Land uses on the site consist of single- and multi-family, and two-on-one dwelling units (DU). An estimated 249 dwelling units are located on Alternative Site Four (Table 7.1-1).

Surrounding land uses to the north, east and west consist primarily of residential uses; existing Central Elementary School is across Polk Avenue to the south. Surrounding zoning is MR-1500B/10Z to the south, MR-1000B to the north and MR-1500B to the east and west of the site; its Community Plan land use designation is multi-family residential.

7.1.4.1 Land Use/Recreational Uses

Impacts to existing land uses on Alternative Site Four would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.1, and would not be significant. The District is not bound by local land use regulations because they operate as a separate lead agency. Similar to the Preferred Site, the loss of existing residential units is considered a de minimus impact when compared to the amount of housing in the San Diego Region. This would result in a less than significant impact. Additionally, the

Central Urbanized PDO identifies schools as an allowable use within a residential zone. Therefore, land use impacts would be less than significant.

Construction of a new elementary school within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area would be consistent with the goal of eliminating overcrowded conditions in schools. Additionally, the proposed school facilities would have playgrounds and joint-use turf fields that would be available for organized community group use after normal school hours. General public access to the play fields would be precluded during school hours. Even with these logical limitations, the development of a playground would have a positive impact on recreation resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

The “City Heights Blight Study” identified that “blighted conditions” occur on Alternative Site Four and on all of the alternative elementary school sites. These conditions include, but are not limited to, visual blighted influences; barred windows and doors; deficient, deteriorated or dilapidated structures; and deteriorated alleys. Construction of the proposed elementary school at this site would remove the blighting influences and establish a new school within the City Heights Redevelopment Project Area. This would be consistent with the goals of the Redevelopment Plan. Impacts to single-family residences would not be avoided at this or any of the other alternative sites.

No adult entertainment establishments were located within a quarter-mile of Alternative Site Four. Six alcoholic beverage outlets were identified within a quarter-mile of this alternative. However, they are all over 600 feet away from Alternative Site Four. Land use compatibility impacts associated with these establishments would not occur.

A. Significant Impacts

The land use impacts associated with development of the proposed Central Area Elementary School at Alternative Site Four would be similar to those associated with the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.1.4, and would not be significant.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant land use impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No additional significant land use impacts were identified.

7.1.4.2 Housing, Population and Displacement

Alternative Site Four is larger in area and has more dwelling units than the Preferred Site and expansion area. The impact on housing, population and displacement would be greater and would be significant.

Estimated population for the Alternative Site Four is provided on Table 7.1-1. As shown on Table 7.1-1, the total number of existing DUs on Alternative Site Four is 249 (approximately 12 single- and 237

multi-family DUs), which is more than the 163 DUs at the Preferred Site and expansion area. Similar to the Preferred Site and expansion area, the loss of 249 DUs would not result in a significant housing impact when compared to the housing supply in the San Diego Region.

Based on the population estimates described in Section 4.2.1 of this EIR, the estimated population for Alternative Site Four is 747 persons. This is substantially more than the 489 persons estimated for the Preferred Site and expansion area. Therefore, Alternative Site Four would increase population and displacement impacts, compared to the Preferred Site and impacts would be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

The displacement of an estimated 747 persons associated with the site would result in significant population and displacement impacts.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for the significant population and displacement impacts associated with Alternative Site Four would be the same as described in Section 4.2.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Because the proposed project includes a comprehensive relocation program to address the dislocation of residents displaced by the project, the impact on population and displacement would be reduced to below a level of significance.

7.1.4.3 Cultural Resources

Historic Structures

The Alternative Site Four includes as a portion of the Teralta Resubdivision. This site includes the south side of the 4000-4200 Blocks of Orange Avenue, the east side of the 4100 Block of Central Avenue, the north side of the 3900-4100 Blocks of Polk Avenue, both sides of the 4100 Block of 41st Street, and the west side of the 4100 Block of Marlborough Avenue. Alternative Site Four contains approximately 32 structures more than 45 years of age which have retained their historic appearance to varying degrees.

Of the 32 potential historic resources evaluated, four buildings were built before 1921. Twenty-one of the 32 buildings were determined to have been constructed in a largely Craftsman vernacular architectural style. Other architectural styles in the area include Modern Minimal Traditional (6 examples), Spanish Eclectic (2 examples), Art Moderne (1 example), Pueblo Revival (1 example), and Commercial (1 example).

One residence, designed in an Art Moderne architectural style, and located at 4073 Orange Avenue, was determined to be ineligible for the National Register and City’s List, but retained local interest due its architectural style.

Archeological Resources

The area that includes the five sites considered for the proposed Central Elementary Area School was the subject of an archaeological record search at the South Coast Information Center for both prehistoric and historic archaeology and of a block by block field survey for the same purpose. As a result of these investigations, it was determined that there are no prehistoric or historic archaeological sites within the study area.

No archaeological resources meeting the definition of an historical resource under California Register criteria or the definition of an unique resource under Section 21083.2 of the Public Resources Code were found within the study area. Although the potential for prehistoric resources is low, archaeological monitoring is recommended during initial grading to address the potential for buried historic cultural resources.

A. Significant Impacts

The selection of Alternative Site Four would have no adverse impact on historical structures. The potential for impacts to historic archaeological resources, however, would be significant.

B. Mitigation Measures

Archaeological monitoring would be required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Archaeological monitoring would reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.4.4 Traffic and Transportation

Impacts to transportation and traffic on Alternative Site Four would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site as described in Section 4.4, and would not be significant. The proposed elementary school would generate approximately 900 daily trips.

A. Significant Impacts

Based on the City’s significance criteria, development of the proposed school at the Preferred Site would not significantly impact any intersection or street segment in the project area. Because roadways and traffic volumes at Alternative Site Four are substantially similar to the Preferred Site and this alternative is within the “project area” studied, traffic associated with the project at Alternative Site Four would not significantly impact any intersection or street segment in the project area.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts have been identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant traffic impacts were identified.

7.1.4.5 Noise

Noise impacts for Alternative Site Four would be less than the Preferred Site, but would still be significant. Existing noise levels (CNEL and Leq) were measured at two locations at Alternative Site Four. Measurements were taken at the intersections of Orange Avenue and Central Avenue, as well as 41st and Polk Avenue.

Alternative Site Four would have less noise exposure from traffic when compared to the Preferred Site. Estimated CNEL noise levels for roadways at Alternative Site Four do not exceed the 65 dBA CNEL significance threshold for the City's Noise Compatibility Standards. Therefore, roadway noise impacts on the exterior and interior uses of the proposed school would not be significant. As with the Preferred site, this alternative is directly adjacent to the SR-15. However, this portion of SR-15 will be covered with Teralta Park. Therefore, significant noise impacts would not occur.

Estimated school yard noise for Alternative Site Four would be similar to the Preferred Site. However, school yard noise would also play a role in the interior school building noise levels. Similar to the Preferred Site, the maximum exterior noise levels would be 72 dBA Leq. Open window conditions would mean interior noise levels of no more than 62 dBA Leq. The closed window condition would be no more than 52 dBA Leq. Using the 52 dBA Leq figure used for highways as a guideline, the open window condition would exceed that significance threshold. School yard noise impacts on interior school building noise levels would be significant.

A. Significant Impacts

1. Traffic noise impacts on interior noise levels for multi-story school structures along SR-15.
2. School yard noise impacts would exceed interior noise standards.

B. Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures for multi-story school structures along SR-15 and school yard noise impacts would be similar to the Preferred Site for Alternative Site Four.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce interior noise impacts associated with school yard noise on the proposed project to below a level of significance.

7.1.4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Hazards and hazardous waste impacts on Alternative Site Four would be similar to those impacts identified for the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.6. Known historic and current residential land use within the vicinity of the alternative sites greatly reduces the potential for hazardous materials contamination. There was one site listed that was considered to have a potential “low” impact if the project were developed on Alternative Site Four – Central Elementary (GEN, UST, LUST).

A. Significant Impacts

The significant hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with construction demolition identified in Section 4.6.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Four.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant construction demolition impacts associated with Alternative Site Four would be the same as identified in Section 4.6.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce significant construction demolition impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.4.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

Alternative Site Four has substantially similar hydrology characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.7.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant water quality impacts associated with construction runoff identified in Section 4.7.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Four.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant water quality impacts associated with Alternative Site Four would be the same as identified in Section 4.7.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce significant hydrology and water quality impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.4.8 Geology and Soils

Based on the GTC geotechnical report, Alternative Site Four has substantially similar geology and soils characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.8.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant geology and soils impacts identified in Section 4.8.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Four.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant geology and soils impacts associated with Alternative Site Four would be the same as identified in Section 4.8.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce all identified significant impacts associated with strong ground motion and corrosive soils to below a level of significance.

7.1.4.9 Paleontological Resources

Alternative Site Four has substantially similar characteristics for potential paleontological resources as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.9.

A. Significant Impacts

Development of Alternative Site Four would have no potential to affect paleontological resources, as would the Preferred Site.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts were identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts on paleontological resources were identified.

7.1.4.10 Visual Quality/Community Character

Alternative Site Four has substantially similar characteristics as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.10. Impacts to visual quality and community character at Alternative Site Four would be similar to those identified for the Preferred Site (Section 4.10.3).

A. Significant Impacts

The short-term aesthetic impacts associated with demolition/construction activities would be the same at Alternative Site Four as described in Section 4.10.4 for the Preferred Site.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for short-term aesthetic impacts associated with demolition/construction activities would be the same for Alternative Site Four as described in Section 4.10.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 4.10.5 would reduce the short-term significant impacts on visual quality to below a level of significance.

7.1.4.11 Public Services

The public services characteristics relative to Alternative Site Four are substantially similar to the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.11.

A. Significant Impacts

The significant solid waste impacts identified in Section 4.11.4 for the Preferred Site would also apply to Alternative Site Four.

B. Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures for significant landfill capacity impacts associated with Alternative Site Four would be the same as identified in Section 4.11.5 for the Preferred Site.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measures would reduce landfill capacity impacts to below a level of significance.

7.1.4.12 Public Utilities

Alternative Site Four has substantially similar characteristics for public utilities as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.12.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant impacts to public utilities were identified for the Preferred Site; therefore, no significant public utilities impacts would likely occur for Alternative Site Four.

B. Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required because no significant impacts to public utilities were identified.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts to public utilities would occur as a result of implementation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School project.

7.1.1.13 Air Quality

Alternative Site Four has substantially similar characteristics for air quality as the Preferred Site, as described in Section 4.13.

A. Significant Impacts

No significant impacts to air quality were identified for the Preferred Site; therefore, no significant air quality impacts would likely occur for Alternative Site Four.

B. Mitigation Measures

No significant impacts to air quality were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

C. Significance of Impacts After Mitigation

No significant impacts to air quality would occur as a result of selection of Alternative Site Four.

Summary

Most environmental impacts of Alternative Site Four would be similar to the Preferred Site, with the exception of those listed below. A comparison table of direct environmental impacts of the Preferred Site and alternatives is provided in Table 7.1-3.

Alternative Site Four would avoid or reduce the following significant impacts of the proposed project on the Preferred Site:

- Avoid the significant and unmitigated impact associated with the loss of historical resources.
- Avoid the significant and mitigated impact associated with traffic noise for usable outdoor spaces.
- Reduce the number of single-family DUs lost to approximately 12, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 21 single-family DUs.

However, Alternative Site Four would increase the total loss of DUs to approximately 249, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 163 DUs.

7.2 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative is defined as not acquiring land for construction of the proposed Central Area Elementary School. In addition, the street closure required to develop the Preferred Site would not be required. Under the No Project Alternative, no further action would be taken by the District to increase its capacity to accommodate elementary school students within the Central Elementary School attendance area. In addition, no further action would be taken to achieve the enrollment standards contained in the District's LRFMP.

There are two primary objectives of the proposed project. The first part of the project objective is to provide additional capacity for elementary students within the existing Central Elementary School attendance area and adjacent overflow transportation areas; and the second part of the objective is to assist the District in achieving the enrollment standards contained in the LRFMP. With the No Project Alternative, the elementary school capacity within the existing Central Elementary School attendance areas would not be expanded. The enrollment at most schools in the City Heights Community of the Mid-City Communities Planning Area is approaching the schools' operating capacity. Fifth grade students from Central and Edison attendance areas attend Wilson Middle School. Central Elementary School also is on a multi-track year-round calendar. Under the No Project Alternative, projected enrollments would continue to increase and the overcrowded situation at the existing school facilities would not be relieved. Increased enrollments, without additional facilities, would preclude the District from adequately housing the expected students.

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Central Area Elementary School would not be constructed and the existing uses on the alternative sites would not be demolished. This would avoid the impacts to existing and planned land uses on the alternative sites, which are not considered significant. In addition, the proposed elementary school would remove blighting influences and further the goals of the adopted City Heights Community of the *Mid-City Communities Plan*. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in a continuation of physical, social and economic characteristics of the site, and would not be consistent with the goals of the *City Heights Redevelopment Plan*. The No Project Alternative would also not provide the additional educational facilities desired by the adopted Redevelopment Plan.

Section 4.10 of the EIR finds that the proposed elementary school, by eliminating conditions of blight and providing a new public facility, would improve the neighborhood character and visual quality of the area. This would be a beneficial impact. Under the No Project Alternative, this beneficial impact would not occur.

The No Project Alternative would avoid significant population, housing and displacement impacts, and significant noise impacts associated with the proposed project. The No Project Alternative would also avoid the significant short-term visual impact associated with demolition of existing residences. Although the No Project Alternative would avoid most of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed

project on the Preferred Site, this alternative would not meet the proposed project objectives. The No Project Alternative would not meet the objectives to increase elementary school enrollment capacity, implement the District’s school planning standards and implement the District’s LRFMP. In addition, the No Project Alternative would eliminate the positive effects of the proposed project to further the community development and redevelopment goals of the *Mid-City Communities Plan* and the City Heights Redevelopment Plan.

7.3 NON-CONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES

The District’s LRFMP identifies two separate levels of solution strategies employed by the District to address its identified facilities needs. The majority of these solution strategies would not involve the construction of new school facilities and are referred to in this EIR as Non-Construction Alternatives. The first level strategies tend to be less costly and are tied to District policies related to classroom usage standards, kindergarten scheduling, and other planning guideline priorities. The second set of strategies is employed only after the first level strategies have been implemented and have proven insufficient to address facility needs of a school or cluster of schools.

The following discussion analyzes the effectiveness of Non-Construction alternatives in meeting the project objectives of providing additional capacity for elementary school students within the City Heights Community of the Mid-City Communities Planning Area and assisting the District in achieving the standards contained in the LRFMP.

7.3.1 Level One Solution Strategies

7.3.1.1 Double Session Kindergarten Programs

The District has initiated a policy for the 1999-2000 school year and beyond to operate single session, full-day kindergarten programs system-wide. Double session kindergarten is no longer an option.

7.3.1.2 Boundary Changes

Geographic boundaries designate which students attend which schools within the District. Changes to the enrollment boundaries are used each year throughout the District to adjust enrollment and improve school housing capacity. Changing the enrollment boundaries within the City Heights Community would not meet the objectives of the project. As shown on Table 2.2-2, actual enrollment rates from 1998 to 1999 for most schools within the City Heights Community have already exceeded, or are close to exceeding the 1999 to 2000 enrollment forecasts. Boundary changes would not provide additional capacity for elementary school children within the attendance areas. Instead, it would shift students to those schools with remaining operating capacity. In addition, five schools in the City Heights Community are projected to exceed their capacity. Therefore, changing the enrollment boundaries and

increasing the number of students at existing elementary schools sites would not meet the project's objective of achieving the District's planning standards.

7.3.1.3 Addition of Portable Classrooms

Another alternative is the provision of additional portable classrooms and/or the modification and modernization of permanent space. Enrollment levels in the area of the proposed elementary school can no longer be accommodated at existing schools. For the combined Hoover/Crawford Area the LRFMP identifies a total need of 9-11 elementary schools, 0.9-1.5 middle schools and 0.5-0.9 high schools through 2015 to meet the Districts enrollment needs and accommodate forecast enrollment growth. The upper end of the range assumes the residential redevelopment forecast by SANDAG is to occur.

7.3.1.4 Grade Level Reconfiguration

In a number of school clusters, the District has changed the grade level configuration of a particular school to provide more space for a given grade level. For example, in areas with increased K-6 elementary school enrollment, the District has reassigned the Grade 6 enrollment to a nearby middle-level school, thereby freeing necessary space at the elementary school. This solution strategy has enabled the District to operate a number of middle-level schools serving grades 6-8 and several high schools serving grades 9-12.

However, this strategy has not eliminated the need for additional elementary schools. Because there is no further opportunity to adjust grade levels, this is not a feasible alternative.

7.3.1.5 Conversion of Leased or Administrative Space into Classrooms

The District is currently leasing 10 closed school sites as part of its property management program to provide income to support construction programs. If any of the leased schools within the District were to be converted to District use, there would be a loss of the lease revenue. In addition, several District-owned facilities are used for administrative purposes. While it would appear that these facilities have the potential to be converted into operating schools as student enrollment warrants, the District has determined that there are no leased schools in the project vicinity available for re-establishment as operating schools. The conversion of leased sites outside of the study area would not serve the project's objective of providing additional neighborhood schools in the Central Area. In other areas of the District that contain leased space, there are insufficient school-aged children enrolled in public school to justify the re-opening of the sites as schools. Thus, converting leased space or administrative space into classrooms to increase the capacity for elementary school students in the City Heights Community is not a feasible alternative.

7.3.2 Level Two Solution Strategies

7.3.2.1 Multi-track Year Round Scheduling

After initiating multi-track year round scheduling at several District schools, the District, for the 1999-2000 school year and thereafter, adopted a policy of not implementing multi-track year round scheduling any longer, unless requested by a school and its community, and approved by the Board of Education. Central Elementary School currently uses multi-track, year-round scheduling to house the student population.

7.3.2.2 Relocation With Transportation

To address enrollment at overcrowded schools, the District, with Board of Education approval, may elect to transport students to underutilized school sites in other parts of the District. This solution strategy would begin in the 2000-2001 school year as an interim measure until the new neighborhood school is opened. Although relocation with transportation would reduce overcrowding in the existing Central Elementary School area, it would not provide additional capacity for elementary school students within the resident neighborhood, and therefore, would not meet the objectives of the project.

7.3.2.3 Reopening Closed School Sites

The District closed several underutilized school sites in the 1980s in response to enrollment declines in some parts of the City. Many of these sites are now leased and provide revenue to the District through the Property Management Program. As part of the annual review of the LRFMP, the need and cost effectiveness of reopening closed sites to house growing enrollments is assessed. Because many of the closed school sites are now leased by the District, the effects of reopening closed school sites would be similar to those discussed for the strategy of converting leased space into classrooms.

There are no remaining closed school sites within City Heights Community that could be reopened. Reopening closed school sites outside of the City Heights Community would not meet the objectives of the project and would not be a feasible alternative.

7.3.2.4 Additional Construction at Operating Schools

There is no more room at the existing Central Elementary School to build additional classrooms.

Throughout the District there are schools which are master planned for more permanent core facilities and classrooms than they now have. The LRFMP forecasts enrollment trends through the year 2013 that justify the construction of these additional permanent facilities in areas where enrollment growth is expected. This type of construction would serve three functions: 1) it would provide more adequate facilities for current programs, 2) it would relieve overcrowding, and 3) it would free portable classrooms which would become available for use throughout the District. In addition, the construction of additional permanent facilities would reduce the need for additional portables.

This strategy could provide additional capacity for elementary school students within the City Heights Community; however, it would also increase enrollment and would increase the number of students per acre at each of the affected school sites. Numerous schools in the City Heights Community exceed the District’s optimum and/or maximum enrollment guidelines. Providing additional capacity at these existing schools would only further hinder the District’s ability to meet its planning standards. Current enrollments and anticipated growth could not be accommodated at existing school sites because of the size and site limitations at the existing schools.

7.4 SMALLER SITES ALTERNATIVE

There are no vacant sites within the proposed Central Area Elementary School study area that are large enough to accommodate the proposed elementary school. Therefore, the significant housing, population and displacement impacts identified for the proposed project cannot be avoided within the study area. The Smaller Site Alternative has been examined in an effort to reduce housing, population and displacement impacts.

Utilizing a smaller portion of the Preferred Site would reduce the magnitude of the significant housing, population and displacement impacts identified for the proposed project. However, the Smaller Site Alternative above would not eliminate or reduce impacts to below a level of significance, because any reasonable size school site would displace existing residential uses.

A smaller site would also reduce the area that could be used in the future to accommodate additional classrooms. Reducing the area available for additional classrooms substantially reduces a school’s expansion potential within the site boundaries. The net site acreage that would be adequate for the proposed school program and a site that would allow an efficient layout of the proposed facilities are two of the District’s site selection criteria.

Reducing the size of the proposed school site could reduce the significant population, housing and displacement impacts. However, other school development-related impacts, such as noise impacts on adjacent uses, would remain unchanged. The reduced acreage would impede the District’s efficient use of the site and would not meet the objectives of the project.

7.5 COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Alternative Site One is the environmentally superior alternative for the proposed project. Alternative Site One, when compared to the other alternative sites, would have less environmental impacts, but would still achieve the proposed project objectives (see Table 7.1-3). This alternative would avoid the significant and unmitigated impact associated with the loss of historical resources, and the significant and mitigated impact associated with traffic noise for both usable outdoor and interior spaces. Additionally, this

alternative would reduce the total number of residential DUs lost to approximately 86, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 163 DUs. However, Alternative Site One would increase the loss of single-family DUs to approximately 34, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 21 DUs.

Alternative Site Two would avoid the significant and unmitigated impact associated with the loss of historical resources, and the significant and mitigated impact associated with traffic noise for usable outdoor spaces. Additionally, this alternative would reduce the total number of residential DUs lost to approximately 51, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 163 DUs. However, Alternative Site Two would increase the loss of single-family DUs to approximately 39, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 21 DUs.

Alternative Site Three would increase the significant impacts when compared to the Preferred Site. These impacts include an increase in the total loss of residential units to approximately 181, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 163 DUs; an increase in the loss of single-family DUs to approximately 27, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 21 DUs; and create a significant environmental impact on historical resources due to the two structures identified as eligible for the National Register of Historic Places on Alternative Site Three.

Alternative Site Four would avoid the significant and unmitigated impact associated with the loss of historical resources, and the significant and mitigated impact associated with traffic noise for usable outdoor spaces. Additionally, this alternative would reduce the number of single-family DUs lost to approximately 12, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 21 single-family DUs. However, Alternative Site Four would increase the total loss of DUs to approximately 249, compared to the Preferred Site, which has approximately 163 DUs.

Although the No Project Alternative would avoid all environmental impacts of the proposed project on the Preferred Site, this alternative would not achieve any of the proposed project objectives.

8 References

Air Pollution Control District, 1999
Annual Air Quality Report

Caltrans, 1995

City of San Diego, 1979
Progress Guide and General Plan.

City of San Diego, 1986
Mid-City Communities Planned District Ordinance.

City of San Diego, 1992
City Heights Redevelopment Plan, April 28, 1992.

City of San Diego, 1992
Final Centre City Redevelopment Environmental Impact Report

City of San Diego Environmental Services Department, 1994
Guide to Mitigating Impacts to Solid Waste Service

City of San Diego, 1995
Uniform Building Code.

Centre City Development Corporation, Selby, 1997

City of San Diego, 1998
Final Environmental Impact Report for the Mid-City Communities Plan Update
(SCH No. 98031095).

City of San Diego, 1998
Paleontological Guidelines.

City of San Diego, 1998a
Traffic Impact Study Manual.

City of San Diego, 1998b

Trip Generation Manual.

City of San Diego Environmental Services Department, Sturdevan, August 1999

City of San Diego Fire Department, Deputy Fire Marshall Medan, 1999

City of San Diego Police Department, Mid-City Division, Haley, August 1999

City of San Diego Planning and Development Review Department, Moshref 1999

City of San Diego, 1999

Significance Determination Guidelines Under the California Environmental Quality Act.

City of San Diego Water Department Web-site, updated 1999

City of San Diego, 2000

Central Urbanized Planned District Ordinance.

Geotechnical Consultants, Inc., 1999

Preliminary Geologic, Seismic and Water Resources Assessment: Central Area Elementary School, San Diego, California.

Geotechnical Consultants, Inc., 1999

Preliminary Site Assessment, Central Area Elementary School, San Diego, California.

Gordon Bricken & Associates, 1999

Environmental Noise Analysis, Central Area Elementary School, City of San Diego.

International Conference of Building Officials, 1994

Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Inc., 1999

Traffic Impact Analysis – Central Area Elementary School, San Diego, California.

Marie Burke Lia and Dr. Ray Brandes, 1999

Cultural Resource Report for the Central Area Elementary School Preferred and Alternative Sites.

Personal Communication, Lawrence, San Diego Unified School District, 1999

Relon, 1993

Air Quality Report

San Diego Gas & Electric, Coker, August 1999

San Diego Museum of Natural History, 1999

San Diego Unified School District, 1991
Landscape Design and Site Development Guidelines.

San Diego Unified School District, 1992
Elementary School Planning Guide.

San Diego Unified School District, 1998
Long-Range Facilities Master Plan.

Tierra Environmental Services, 1999
Archaeological Inventory of the Central Area Elementary School Site, City of San Diego, California.

Transportation Research Board, 1994
Highway Capacity Manual.

U.C. Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology, 1999

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and the State of California
Department of Transportation, 1987
*Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement/ Section 4 (f) Statement Completed for State
Route 15 from 0.6 miles north of I-805 to 0.5 miles south of I-8 in the City of San Diego, San
Diego County (SCH# 86021907)*

1995 Environmental Reevaluation
1999 Environmental Reevaluation

This page intentionally left blank.

9 Agencies, Organizations and Persons Contacted

Centre City Development Corporation, Selby, 1997

City of San Diego Environmental Services Department, Sturdevan, August 1999

City of San Diego Fire Department, Deputy Fire Marshall Medan, 1999

City of San Diego Planning and Development Review Department, Moshref 1999

City of San Diego Planning and Development Review Department, Romstad, 1999

City of San Diego Police Department, Mid-City Division, Haley, August 1999

City of San Diego Urban Analysis Section, Parry, 1999

Gordon Bricken & Associates, Gordon Bricken, 1999

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District, Wilkins, 1999

San Diego Gas & Electric, Coker, August 1999

San Diego Museum of Natural History, 1999

San Diego Unified School District, Lawrence, 1999/2000

San Diego Unified School District, Wolf, 2000

State of California Division of the State Architect, Mahar, 1999

University of California, Berkeley, Museum of Paleontology, 1999

10 Preparers of EIR and Certification

This Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the San Diego Unified School District by BRG Consulting, Inc., at 304 Ivy Street, San Diego, CA 92101-2030. The following professionals participated in its preparation:

BRG Consulting, Inc.

Patricia A. Butler, Principal-in-Charge
D. Seán Cárdenas, Senior Project Manager
Kiersten R. Giugno, Project Manager
Erich R. Lathers, Senior Environmental Planner
Randy F. Rodriguez, Environmental Planner
Liza A. Boquiren, Assistant Environmental Planner
Rhonda A. Darling, Assistant Environmental Planner
Diane M. Cantalo, Assistant Environmental Planner
Mary E. Brady, Graphics
Eddie Arcadia, Graphics
Erika B. Huber, Production Manager
Shayne Cannon, Production Assistant

BRG Consulting was assisted by the following consultants:

Maria Burke Lia, Attorney at Law – Cultural Resources
Marie Burke Lia
Dr. Ray Brandes

Tierra Environmental Services – Archaeological Inventory
Andrew R. Pignuolo, MA
Michael Baksh, Ph.D

Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Inc. – Transportation and Circulation, Parking
John Keating, P. E., Senior Transportation Engineer
John Boarman, Transportation Engineer

Gordon Bricken & Associates – Noise Analysis
Gordon Bricken, President

Geotechnical Consultants Inc. – Hazards and Hazardous Materials
Aurie C. Patterson, Project Geologist
James E. Thurber, Registered Geologist, No. 4197

Geotechnical Consultants Inc. – Geologic, Seismic and Water Resources Assessment
James E. Thurber, Certified Engineering Geologist, No. 1458

Southern California Soil & Testing – Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and Geologic Hazard
Report for Preferred Site
Barry S. Pulver, Certified Engineering Geologist, No. 1364, and Registered Environmental
Assessor-II, No. 20096

11 Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

AAA	Automatic Aid Agreement
AC	asphaltic concrete
ADT	average daily traffic
AFY	acre-feet per year
AHERA	Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act
AM	morning
AMSL	above mean sea level
APCD	Air Pollution Control District
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BMPs	best management practices
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CALTRANS	California Department of Transportation
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System
CIC	CityLink Investment Corporation
City	The City of San Diego
CNEL	Community Noise Equivalent Levels
CO	carbon monoxide
CORRACTS	Corrective Action Sites
dBA	sound level in decibels
District	San Diego Unified School District
DOG	Division of Oil and Gas
DUs	dwelling units
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System
ESD	Environmental Services Department
FRPWC	Facilities Review Public Working Committee
GTC	Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual

HMMD	Hazardous Materials Management Division
I-805	Interstate 805
IID	Imperial Irrigation District
LLG	Linscott, Law & Greenspan Engineers
LOS	Levels of Service
LRFMP	Long-Range Facilities Master Plan
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tanks Information System
MCE	maximum credible earthquake
msl	mean sea level
MWD	Metropolitan Water District
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NFRAP	No Further Remediation Action Plan
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO _x	nitrogen oxides
NPL	National Priority List
O ₃	ozone
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
PDO	Planned District Ordinance
PGA	peak ground acceleration
playground	outdoor school yard
PM	mid-afternoon
R/W	right-of-way
RAQS	Regional Air Quality Strategies
ROG	reactive organic gases
RTC	Regional Transportation Center
RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SCS&T	Southern California Soil & Testing, Inc.
SDAB	San Diego Air Basin
SDCWA	San Diego County Water Authority
SDEA	San Diego Education Association
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SO ₂	sulfur dioxide
SR-15	State Route 15
SR-94	State Route 94
SWLF	San Diego County Solid Waste Facilities
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan zone factor (Z),
UBC	Uniform Building Code
UST	Underground Storage Tank Registration Database