



SAN DIEGO CITY SCHOOLS

EDUCATION CENTER · 4100 Normal Street, San Diego, CA 92103-2682

(619) 293-8063

FAX (619) 294-2625

FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Office of the Director - Annex 2-101

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

(SCH No. 1999091102)

for the proposed

Central Area Elementary School

Prepared for:

SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Proposition MM Implementation Department
4100 Normal Street – Annex 2
San Diego, CA 92103-2682

Environmental Consultant:

BRG CONSULTING, INC.
304 Ivy Street
San Diego, CA 92101-2030

June 2001

Central Area Elementary School
Final Environmental Impact Report

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
	FOREWORD	
	Response to Public Comments Made on the Draft EIR	
1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1-1
1.1	Introduction	1-1
1.2	Background	1-1
	1.2.1 Project Location	1-1
	1.2.2 Environmental Setting	1-2
1.3	Project Description	1-3
	1.3.1 Site Selection	1-3
	1.3.2 Acquisition/Relocation	1-4
	1.3.3 Site Clearance/Construction	1-4
	1.3.4 Discretionary Actions	1-5
1.4	Summary of Environmental Effects and Mitigation	1-5
2.0	INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.1	Background	2-1
	2.1.1 Long-Range Facilities Master Plan	2-1
2.2	Purpose and Need.	2-1
	2.2.1 Standards for School Facilities Planning	2-2
	2.2.2 Enrollment and Capacity Information	2-2
2.3	School Site Selection Process	2-4
	2.3.1 Community Meeting	2-5
	2.3.2 Staff Analysis	2-5
	2.3.3 Task Force Membership	2-6
	2.3.4 Task Force Meetings	2-6
2.4	Site Selection Criteria	2-6
	2.4.1 Site Size/Configuration/Topography	2-7
	2.4.2 Site Location	2-7
	2.4.3 Land Use	2-11
2.5	Environmental Procedures	2-11
	2.5.1 Notice of Preparation	2-11
2.6	Scope of This EIR	2-12
2.7	Intended Uses of This EIR	2-12

Table of Contents

(continued)

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
3.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	3-1
3.1	Environmental Setting	3-1
3.1.1	Regional Setting	3-1
3.1.2	Project Location	3-1
3.1.3	Physical Characteristics	3-4
3.2	Characteristics of the Proposed Central Area Elementary School	3-6
3.2.1	School Operations	3-6
3.2.2	Transportation	3-7
3.2.3	Concept Plans	3-7
3.3	Demolition/Removal and Construction	3-8
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	4.1-1
4.1	Land Use/Recreational Resources	4.1-1
4.1.1	Existing Conditions	4.1-2
4.1.2	Impact Significance Criteria	4.1-8
4.1.3	Impact Analysis	4.1-8
4.1.4	Significant Impacts	4.1-11
4.1.5	Mitigation Measures	4.1-11
4.1.6	Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.1-11
4.2	Housing, Population & Displacement	4.2-1
4.2.1	Existing Conditions	4.2-1
4.2.2	Impact Significance Criteria	4.2-1
4.2.3	Impact Analysis	4.2-1
4.2.4	Significant Impacts	4.2-3
4.2.5	Mitigation Measures	4.2-3
4.2.6	Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.2-6
4.3	Cultural Resources	4.3-1
4.3.1	Existing Conditions	4.3-1
4.3.2	Impact Significance Criteria	4.3-2
4.3.3	Impact Analysis	4.3-5
4.3.4	Significant Impacts	4.3-7
4.3.5	Mitigation Measures	4.3-7
4.3.6	Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.3-8
4.4	Traffic and Transportation	4.4-1
4.4.1	Existing Conditions	4.4-1
4.4.2	Impact Significance Criteria	4.4-4
4.4.3	Impact Analysis	4.4-6
4.4.4	Significant Impacts	4.4-16

Table of Contents

(continued)

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
	4.4.5 Mitigation Measures	4.4-17
	4.4.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.4-17
4.5	Noise	4.5-1
	4.5.1 Existing Conditions	4.5-1
	4.5.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.5-8
	4.5.3 Impact Analysis	4.5-8
	4.5.4 Significant Impacts	4.5-12
	4.5.5 Mitigation Measures	4.5-12
	4.5.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.5-13
4.6	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4.6-1
	4.6.1 Existing Conditions	4.6-1
	4.6.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.6-5
	4.6.3 Impact Analysis	4.6-6
	4.6.4 Significant Impacts	4.6-8
	4.6.5 Mitigation Measures	4.6-8
	4.6.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.6-8
4.7	Hydrology/Water Quality	4.7-1
	4.7.1 Existing Conditions	4.7-1
	4.7.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.7-1
	4.7.3 Impact Analysis	4.7-2
	4.7.4 Significant Impacts	4.7-2
	4.7.5 Mitigation Measures	4.7-5
	4.7.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.7-5
4.8	Geology and Soils	4.8-1
	4.8.1 Existing Conditions	4.8-1
	4.8.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.8-4
	4.8.3 Impact Analysis	4.8-6
	4.8.4 Significant Impacts	4.8-7
	4.8.5 Mitigation Measures	4.8-7
	4.8.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.8-7
4.9	Paleontological Resources	4.9-1
	4.9.1 Existing Conditions	4.9-1
	4.9.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.9-1
	4.9.3 Impact Analysis	4.9-1
	4.9.4 Significant Impacts	4.9-1
	4.9.5 Mitigation Measures	4.9-2
	4.9.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.9-2

Table of Contents

(continued)

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
4.10	Visual Quality/Community Character	4.10-1
	4.10.1 Existing Conditions	4.10-1
	4.10.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.10-1
	4.10.3 Impact Analysis	4.10-2
	4.10.4 Significant Impacts	4.10-5
	4.10.5 Mitigation Measures	4.10-5
	4.10.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.10-5
4.11	Public Services	4.11-1
	4.11.1 Existing Conditions	4.11-1
	4.11.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.11-5
	4.11.3 Impact Analysis	4.11-5
	4.11.4 Significant Impacts	4.11-8
	4.11.5 Mitigation Measures	4.11-8
	4.11.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.11-8
4.12	Public Utilities	4.12-1
	4.12.1 Existing Conditions	4.12-1
	4.12.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.12-2
	4.12.3 Impact Analysis	4.12-3
	4.12.4 Significant Impacts	4.12-3
	4.12.5 Mitigation Measures	4.12-4
	4.12.6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.12-4
4.13	Air Quality	4.13-1
	4.13.1 Existing Conditions	4.13-1
	4.13.2 Impact Significance Criteria	4.13-6
	4.13.3 Impact Analysis	4.13-6
	4.13-4 Significant Impacts	4.13-9
	4.13-5 Mitigation Measures	4.13-9
	4.13-6 Significance of Impacts After Mitigation	4.13-9
5.0	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	5-1
5.1	Cumulative Projects	5-1
	5.1.1 Proposition MM Elementary Schools in Mid-City	5-1
	5.1.2 City Heights Urban Village	5-3
	5.1.3 Auto Dealership and Repair Shop	5-4
	5.1.4 Orange Avenue at 54 th Place Condominiums	5-4
	5.1.5 Teen Challenge	5-4
	5.1.6 University Terrace	5-5
	5.1.7 Stepping Stone	5-5

Table of Contents

(continued)

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
	5.1.8 Asia Business Center	5-5
	5.1.9 Regional Transportation Center Project	5-5
	5.1.10 City Heights Service Plaza	5-6
	5.1.11 Mid-City Continuing Education Center	5-6
	5.1.12 Oak Park Drainage Channel	5-6
	5.1.13 Home Avenue Truck Sewer	5-6
	5.1.14 Mid-City Water Transmission Pipeline Project	5-7
	5.1.15 Mid-City Parks	5-7
5.2	Cumulative Impact Analysis	5-8
	5.2.1 Land Use	5-8
	5.2.2 Traffic and Circulation	5-8
	5.2.3 Noise	5-9
	5.2.4 Air Quality	5-9
6.0	OTHER REQUIRED CONSIDERATIONS	6-1
6.1	Growth Inducement	6-1
6.2	Effects Found Not to Be Significant	6-1
	6.2.1 Agriculture Resource	6-1
	6.2.2 Biological Resources	6-2
	6.2.3 Mineral Resources	6-2
7.0	ALTERNATIVES	7-1
7.1	Alternative Sites Analysis	7-1
	7.1.1 Alternative Site One	7-2
	7.1.2 Alternative Site Two	7-12
	7.1.3 Alternative Site Three	7-24
	7.1.4 Alternative Site Four	7-34
7.2	No Project Alternative	7-43
7.3	Non-Construction Alternatives	7-44
	7.3.1 Level One Solution Strategies	7-44
	7.3.2 Level Two Solution Strategies	7-46
7.4	Smaller Sites Alternative	7-47
7.5	Comparison of Project Alternatives	7-47
8.0	REFERENCES	8-1
9.0	AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND PERSONS CONTRACTED	9-1
10.0	PREPARERS OF EIR AND CERTIFICATION	10-1
11.0	GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS	11-1

Table of Contents

(continued)

List of Figures

<u>Figures</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
2.4-1	Central Area Elementary School Study Area	2-10
3.1-1	Regional Location Map	3-2
3.1-2	Mid-City Communities Planning Area	3-3
3.1-3	Existing Elementary School, Preferred and Alternative Site Locations	3-5
4.1-1	Existing Land Uses Within the Preferred Central Area Elementary School Project Site	4-1-3
4.1-2	Existing Land Uses Within One-Quarter Mile Of Project Area	4.1-4
4.4-1	Existing Conditions	4.4-2
4.4-2	Existing Traffic Volumes	4.4-5
4.4-3	Project Traffic Distribution Percentages	4.4-8
4.4-4	Project Traffic Volumes AM/PM Peak Hours Map	4.4-9
4.4-5	Redistributed Traffic Volumes	4.4-11
4.4-6	Existing + Cumulative Projects + Project + Redistributed Traffic Volumes	4.4-12
4.7-1	Existing Drainage at Preferred Site and Expansion Area	4.7-3
4.7-2	Concept Grading and Drainage at Preferred Site	4.7-4
5.1-1	Cumulative Projects Mid-City Communities Planning Area	5-2

Table of Contents

(continued)

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
ES-1	Preferred Site Area Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-6
ES-2	Alternative Site One Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-12
ES-3	Alternative Site Two Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-16
ES-4	Alternative Site Three Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-20
ES-5	Alternative Site Four Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-25
2.2-1	School Planning Standards	2-3
2.2-2	Preliminary Five-Year Enrollment Forecast for Mid-City Elementary Schools	2-4
2.4-1	Site Ranking Criteria	2-8
3.3-1	Potential Number of Demolitions per Site	3-9
4.2-1	Estimation of Population and Dwelling Units Preferred Central Area Elementary School Site	4.2-2
4.4-1	Existing Daily Traffic Volumes	4.4-3
4.4-2	Project Traffic Generation	4.4-7
4.4-3	Unsignalized Intersection Operations	4.4-13
4.4-4	Daily Street Segment Operations	4.4-15
4.5-1	City of San Diego Noise Land Use Compatibility Chart	4.5-3
4.5-2	Noise Measurements for Preferred Site	4.5-4
4.5-3	Existing, Build-Out and Post Project CNEL Noise Levels at 50 Feet for Area Streets in Vicinity of Preferred Site	4.5-5
4.5-4	Existing, Build-Out and Post Project AM Peak Hour Leq Noise Levels at 50 Feet for Area Streets in Vicinity of Preferred Site	4.5-6
4.5-5	Existing, Build-Out and Post Project PM Peak Hour Leq Noise Levels at 50 Feet for Area Streets in Vicinity of Preferred Site	4.5-7
4.5-6	Construction Equipment Noise Levels (Leq Values) at 30 Feet from Source	4.5-13
4.8-1	Active Potentially Active Fault Criteria	4.8-5
4.8-2	Active Potentially Active Fault Criteria	4.8-5
4.11-1	Average Response Times for Mid-City Division and City of San Diego (1998)	4.11-2

Table of Contents

(continued)

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page Number</u>
4.11-2	Fire Department Station Location, Equipment and Response Times	4.11-3
4.13-1	Ambient Air Quality Standards	4.13-3
4.13-2	Downtown San Diego Air Quality Monitoring Summary	4.13-5
4.13-3	Expected Ambient Air Quality at Central Area School Site	4.13-8
5.2-1	Buildout Street Segments Operations	5-10
7.1-1	Comparison of Preferred and Alternative Sites Proposed Central Area Elementary School	7-3
7.1-2	Contaminated Properties Impact Criteria	7-8
7.1-3	Comparison of Direct Environmental Impacts of the Preferred Site and Alternatives	7-13

Table of Contents

(continued)

Technical Appendices

(Bound Separately)

Appendix

- A** **Notice of Preparation and Responses**
(Bound with the Final EIR)
- B1** **Cultural Resource Report for the Central Area Elementary School Preferred and Alternative Sites**
Prepared by Marie Burke Lia, Attorney at Law and Dr. Ray Brandes
October 1999 – *(Bound in Volume I)*
- B2** **Archaeological Inventory of the Central Area Elementary School Site, City of San Diego, California**
Prepared by Tierra Environmental Services
November 1999 – *(Bound in Volume I)*
- C** **Traffic Impact Analysis – Central Area Elementary School, San Diego, California**
Prepared by Linscott, Law & Greenspan, Engineers
November 3, 2000 – *(Bound in Volume I)*
- D** **Environmental Noise Analysis, Central Area Elementary School, City of San Diego**
Prepared by Gordon Bricken & Associates, Acoustical and Energy Engineers
May 24, 2000 – *(Bound in Volume I)*
- E1** **Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment and Geologic Hazard Report, Proposed Central Area Elementary School – Alternative Site 1, San Diego, California**
Prepared by Southern California Soil & Testing, Inc.
October 12, 2000– *(Bound in Volume II)*
- E2** **Preliminary Site Assessment, Central Area Elementary School, San Diego, California**
Prepared by Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.
September 1999 – *(Bound in Volume II)*
- F** **Preliminary Geologic, Seismic and Water Resources Assessment, Central Area Elementary School, San Diego, California**
Prepared by Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.
September 1999 – *(Bound in Volume II)*
- G** **Assembly Bill 3205 Compliance Letters and Responses**
(Bound in Volume II)
- H** **Public Service Letters and Responses**
(Bound in Volume II)

This page intentionally left blank.

Foreword

A Draft EIR for the Central Area Elementary School was prepared and circulated for a 45-day public review beginning July 17, 2000 (SCH #1999091102). The Draft EIR public review distribution list, which identifies the agencies, individuals and special interest groups that were provided a copy of the Draft EIR, is available for review at the San Diego Unified School District during regular business hours.

This Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq., [revised December 1998] herein, CEQA) and the State of California CEQA guidelines, as amended February 1999 (California Administrative Code, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.). The purpose of the Final EIR is to provide the decision making body, in this case the San Diego Unified School District, and respective governing boards, and Responsible Agencies (e.g., City of San Diego) with environmental impact information relative to the proposed Central Area Elementary School project. The second purpose of the Final EIR is to communicate public concerns regarding environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIR. The District and respective governing boards must consider the information contained in this Final EIR prior to approving the proposed project.

Summary of Revisions Incorporated into the Final EIR

The Final EIR includes the Draft EIR and Technical Appendices. The Final EIR includes minor revision including clarifications, corrections, and updated information. Where revisions were made in response to public comments, a description and location of each revision are included in the District's corresponding Response to Comment. No new information has been presented in response to public comments that would require re-circulation of the Draft EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15088.5(a). Specifically, the responses do not show any new significant environmental impacts would result from the project or, new mitigation measures proposed for implementation. The project would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact unless mitigation measures are adopted that reduce the impact to a level of insignificance. No feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project. In addition, other revisions including clarifications, corrections, and updated information have been incorporated into the Final EIR.

The following Response to Comment section of this Final EIR includes the comments received on environmental issues raised during the public review process for the Draft EIR as well as the District's responses. Each comment is assigned a comment number that corresponds to a response number.

This page intentionally left blank.

The Response to Public Comments made on the
Draft EIR is located in another sub-section of
Central Area Elementary School titled:

"Response to Public Comments-Draft EIR."

1 Executive Summary

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The San Diego Unified School District (District) has prepared this Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site acquisition, construction and operation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School. The EIR analyzes the District’s preferred site for the proposed elementary school, as well as four alternative elementary school sites. The objective of the proposed project is two-fold: first, to provide additional capacity for elementary school students within the existing Central Elementary School attendance area; and second, to assist the District in achieving the standards contained in the Long-Range Facilities Master Plan (LRFMP). The proposed Central Area Elementary School would provide enrollment relief to the existing Central Elementary School, and to a lesser degree, Edison Elementary School.

This EIR will be used by the District’s Board of Education for approval of property acquisition, construction, and operation of the Central Area Elementary School. The City of San Diego (City) is a responsible agency for the purpose of any necessary street closures. This document may be used by all agencies involved in reviewing these actions. In addition, this EIR may also be used for any necessary supplemental review of site specific design issues.

1.2 BACKGROUND

The District has settled into an established pattern of incremental enrollment growth. In 1992, the District reconfirmed the inevitability of growth and set forth a strategy to address that growth through the development of new schools. Given the projected enrollment increases, additional facilities must be provided if the District is to achieve school planning criteria defined in the District’s LRFMP, which is described in more detail in EIR Section 2.1.1 and Table 2.2-1.

1.2.1 Project Location

The preferred site and alternative sites for the proposed Central Area Elementary School are located in the City Heights Community of the Mid-City Communities Planning Area. The City Heights Community is bound on the north by El Cajon Boulevard, on the east by 54th Street and Chollas Creek, on the south by State Route 94 (SR-94), and on the west by Interstate 805 (I-805) and SR-15. According to the *Mid-City Communities Plan*, residential land uses constitute the majority of the neighborhoods of City Heights, followed by commercial uses and open space (City of San Diego, 1998).

The proposed Central Area Elementary School study area is bound by El Cajon Boulevard on the north, Thorn Avenue on the south, 37th Street on the west, and Fairmount Avenue on the east (Figure 2.4-1). The eastern boundary of the preferred site with expansion area is located immediately adjacent to State Route 15 (SR-15). The District identified this study area to place the new school in an area within which the existing enrollment resides, and where the projected enrollment increases are anticipated to occur.

The District prefers to locate schools where they would be convenient to the students. Locating a neighborhood school in an area outside of the enrollment service area would require students to travel farther to get to school. Neighborhood schools are designed to enable students to walk to school. If a site is not convenient to the students (i.e., is not within walking distance), the parents would likely have to drive the students to school. This would increase traffic in the vicinity, especially at general arrival and departure times.

The preferred site encompasses 1.5 city blocks, bound by Wightman Street, Landis Street, 38th Street and the alley between 39th Street and 40th Street on the east. The boundary excludes a City-owned property at the southwest corner of the block at 38th Street and Landis Street. In the event the District deems it necessary to expand a school on the preferred site, they have identified a potential expansion area to the immediate east, the one-half block bound by an alley, Wightman Street, 40th Street and Landis Street. Four alternative sites have also been identified, as shown on Figure 3.1-3. Alternative Site One encompasses two blocks bound by Wightman Street on the north, the alley between 37th Street and 38th Street on the east, Landis Street on the south and Cherokee Avenue on the west. Alternative Site Two is bound by Landis Street on the north, 41st Street on the east, Dwight Street on the south and State Route 15 on the west. Alternative Site Three is bound by the southern portion of the block on the north side of Polk Street, 40th Street on the east, 38th Street on the west and the rear property lines of the commercial properties along University Avenue on the south. Alternative Site Four is bound by Orange Avenue on the north, Marlborough Avenue on the east, Polk Avenue on the south, and Central Avenue on the west. The locations of the sites are shown on Figure 3.1-3.

1.2.2 Environmental Setting

The proposed Central Area Elementary School is located within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area of the City of San Diego (Figure 3.1-2). The Mid-City communities are approximately four miles northeast of downtown San Diego, located between I-805 and SR-15 on the west, the cities of La Mesa and Lemon Grove on the east, I-8 on the north and SR-94 on the north. The regional location of the proposed project is shown on Figure 3.1-1. The Mid-City communities are bound by the communities of Mission Valley and the College Area on the north, the Mount Hope, Chollas View, Emerald Hills, and Encanto neighborhoods of the Southeast San Diego Community Planning Area on the south, the cities of La Mesa and Lemon Grove on the east, and the communities of North Park and Golden Hill on the west. Regional access to the site is provided by I-8, I-805, SR-15 and SR-94.

The predominant topographic features within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area are gently rolling mesa areas separated by numerous canyons (City of San Diego, 1998). The canyons are part of the west trending San Diego River system and the northeast to southwest trending Chollas Creek system. The very steep and precipitous canyons associated with the San Diego River, which have slopes of 25 percent or greater, extend southward from Mission Valley in the most northwesterly portion of the community planning area. These steep slope areas account for approximately five (5) percent of the Mid-City area. All of the potential school sites are situated on flat terrain with differences in elevation that vary only a few feet over the entire site.

1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

There are three major elements to the proposed project. These are:

1. Site Selection,
2. Acquisition/Relocation, and
3. Site Clearance/Construction.

1.3.1 Site Selection

Proposition MM provides funds for the construction of five new elementary schools in the Mid-City area, which would benefit the following schools:

- Adams Elementary
- Central Elementary
- Edison Elementary
- Euclid Elementary
- Franklin Elementary
- Hamilton Elementary
- Jackson Elementary
- Marshall Elementary
- Rosa Parks Elementary

The process that was utilized to identify alternative sites for the new elementary schools included community-wide meetings, staff analysis and individual task force meetings for each new school area.

The District formed a series of “Mid-City Site Selection Task Forces” to identify and evaluate alternative sites for each of the new elementary schools and recommend sites for acquisition by the Board of Education. These task forces addressed the Adams/Franklin Area, Central Area, Euclid Area, Edison/Hamilton/Rosa Parks Area and Jackson/Marshall Area. The preferred site and site alternatives for the proposed Central Area Elementary School are a direct result of this process.

There are no vacant sites within the study area for the proposed Central Area Elementary School that are large enough to accommodate the proposed elementary school. Therefore, in order to provide a site for a new elementary school in this community, the District must select a site that has existing uses. The District considered a number of criteria in selecting sites for the proposed schools. These

site selection criteria are based on the State of California’s selection criteria for school sites, and are assigned a maximum number of points to weigh them in the selection process. The criteria are:

1. Safety (maximum 20 points)
2. Location (maximum 10 points)
3. Environment (maximum 10 points)
4. Soils (maximum 10 points)
5. Size and Shape (maximum 10 points)
6. Topography (maximum 10 points)
7. Accessibility (maximum 10 points)
8. Public Services (maximum 3 points)
9. Utilities (maximum 3 points)
10. Cost (maximum 3 points)
11. Availability (maximum 3 points)
12. Political Implications (maximum 3 points)

1.3.2 Acquisition/Relocation

The preferred site consists of 1.5 city blocks and includes the property bound by Wightman Street on the north, Landis Street on the south, 38th Street on the west, and the land west of the alley between 39th Street and 40th Street on the east. The boundary excludes a City-owned property at the northeast corner of 38th Street and Landis Street. In the event the District deems it necessary to expand a school on the preferred site, they have identified a potential expansion area to the immediate east, the one-half block bound by an alley, Wightman Street, 40th Street and Landis Street. Existing land uses within the preferred site consist solely of residential uses. Specifically, the preferred site includes 18 single-family dwelling units (DUs) and 113 multi-family DUs. The expansion area for the preferred site includes 3 single-family DUs and 29 multi-family DUs. A total of 163 DUs are included in the preferred site with expansion area. Based on the population estimates described in Section 4.2.1 of this EIR, it is anticipated that an estimated 489 persons would be displaced by the proposed project (with expansion area).

In order to carry out the project with a minimum of hardship to persons, business concerns and others displaced from their respective places of residence or business by the proposed project, the District would implement a relocation program for persons, business concerns and others that would be displaced by the proposed project, in compliance with the California Relocation Assistance Law. The District would retain the services of a relocation consultant to coordinate and implement the relocation activities.

1.3.3 Site Clearance/Construction

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 the closed portion of existing city streets within the selected site.

Existing structures would be demolished or removed from the site soon after the District has acquired the property. Construction activities would include demolition and/or removal of existing structures, site preparation (grading and/or compaction), facilities construction and site finish (landscaping). Construction and/or removal activities for the proposed Central Area Elementary School are scheduled to last approximately 33 months, beginning early 2003 and ending Fall 2005.

1.3.4 Discretionary Actions

Implementation of the proposed project on the preferred or alternative sites would require discretionary approval from the following agency:

City of San Diego

- Approval of on-site street and alley vacations

1.4 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS AND MITIGATION

A summary of the identified environmental impacts is provided in separate summary tables for the preferred site and each alternative, Tables ES-1 through ES-5. These tables identify environmental impacts for each issue area, the recommended mitigation measures and the significance of impacts after mitigation. Table 7.1-3 is a comparison table showing a brief synopsis of impacts for the preferred and alternative sites. Impacts on this table are shown as either not significant, significant and mitigated or significant and unmitigable.

Table ES-1

**Preferred Site
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Preferred Site	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.2 – Housing, Population and Displacement			
Loss of Dwelling Units and Displacement	An approximate total of 163 DUs and 489 persons for preferred site with expansion area would be displaced. (Approximately 131 DUs at the preferred site, plus 32 DUs from expansion area = 163 DUs; and approximately 393 persons at preferred site, plus 96 persons from expansion area = 489 persons.)	The District shall implement a relocation program for persons, business concerns and others that would be displaced by the proposed project, in compliance with the California Relocation Assistance Law. The District shall retain the services of a relocation consultant to coordinate and implement the relocation activities.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-1

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Preferred Site	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.3 – Cultural Resources			
Historical Resources	Local historical resources were identified.	<p>The environmental impacts to the two historical structures (one on the Preferred Site and the other on the Potential Expansion Area) identified as eligible for the City’s Historical Sites List may be avoided by retaining the structures 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 historical structures may also be reduced to below a level of significance by relocation of the structures to an appropriate site and their subsequent rehabilitation in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. An appropriate site is defined as a neighborhood with a similar setting (i.e., single-family residential structures) and similar historic context (i.e., similar architectural styles and construction dates). The environmental impact to the two historical structures may be reduced, but not to below a level of significance, by documentation of the structures with historic narrative, photographs and architectural drawings, prior to demolition.</p>	<p>Two of the evaluated historic structures were determined to be significant. Only preservation on-site or relocation would mitigate impacts to below a level of significance. The District has indicated that the preservation or relocation of these historical resources would be infeasible. However, the District has agreed to document the historical sites, which would reduce impacts, but not to below a level of significance. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unmitigated and the District would have to adopt Findings and a Statement of Overriding Consideration.</p>
Archaeological Resources	The potential for significant archaeological resources exists.	<p>Archaeological construction monitoring during the grubbing and topsoil removal phases of construction is needed to address the potential for historic archaeological resources. A qualified archaeologist and/or archaeological monitor shall be retained to implement the archaeological construction monitoring program.</p> <p>Within three months following the end of the monitoring program, a monitoring report (with appropriate graphics) which describes the results, analysis and conclusions of the archaeological monitoring program shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center.</p>	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-1

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Preferred Site	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.5 – Noise			
Traffic Noise	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic noise impacts on usable outdoor school areas and interior school structures along Wightman Street. <li>2. Traffic noise impacts on interior multi-story school structures along SR-15 would impact the preferred project site. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Usable outdoor school areas shall maintain a minimum setback of 75 feet from the roadway centerline of Wightman Street to reduce traffic noise levels to below 65 dBA CNEL. School structures along Wightman Street shall maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in a closed window condition with mechanical ventilation, or shall maintain a minimum setback of 122 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in an open window condition. <li>2. Multi story school structures along SR-15 shall maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in a closed window condition with mechanical ventilation or, shall maintain a minimum setback of 125 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in an open window condition. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mitigated to below a level of significance. <li>2. Mitigated to below a level of significance.
School yard Noise	School yard noise levels on interior school noise levels.	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.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-1

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Preferred Site	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.5 – Noise (continued)			
Construction Demolition and/or Removal Activities	Construction demolition impacts due to the removal of old residential buildings on the preferred site, which may contain asbestos, lead-based paint or other hazardous materials would be significant.	Prior to construction demolition and/or removal of old residential buildings at the project site the District shall conduct a survey to test for asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint. All activities associated with asbestos shall be conducted under the direct supervision of a certified asbestos consultant. Lead-based paint analysis and removal shall be performed in conformance with federal, state, and local regulations.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.6 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Construction Demolition and/or Removal Activities	Construction demolition impacts due to the removal of old residential buildings on the preferred site, which may contain asbestos, lead-based paint or other hazardous materials would be significant.	Prior to construction demolition and/or removal of old residential buildings at the project site the District shall conduct a survey to test for asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint. All activities associated with asbestos shall be conducted under the direct supervision of a certified asbestos consultant. Lead-based paint analysis and removal shall be performed in conformance with federal, state, and local regulations.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.7 – Hydrology/Water Quality			
Construction Runoff	Short-term construction runoff and sedimentation would be significant.	The District shall require the contractor to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-1

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Preferred Site	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.8 – Geology and Soils			
Strong Ground Motion	Due to the project area’s close proximity to the active Rose Canyon Fault zone, impacts associated with strong ground motion would be significant.	Standard engineering practices shall be considered in the design of school development. Seismic design according to the Division of the State Architect, Uniform Building Code, California Amendments to the Uniform Building Code, the City of San Diego Building Code and other regulations that provide more stringent design features for school development shall be incorporated.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Corrosive Soils	The potential for corrosive soils on-site would be significant.	A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be performed for soil corrosion potential. All site-specific geotechnical study recommendations shall be implemented.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.11 - Public Services			
Solid Waste	Impacts to landfill capacity due to the generation of solid waste volumes that exceed the City's standards and the potential deposition of construction/demolition debris into the Miramar Landfill would be significant.	The District shall prepare a waste management plan and provide the plan to the City's Environmental Services Department for comment	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-1

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Preferred Site	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 5.2.1 - Land Use			
Affordable Housing	The proposed Central Area Elementary School in conjunction with the cumulative projects, would result in a significant loss of single- and multi-family homes in the Mid-City Communities.	The District shall implement the relocation program described in Section 4.2.5, in compliance with California Relocation Assistance Law, for each Mid-City school. However, such mitigation would not reduce the cumulative loss of affordable housing in the Mid-City area.	Significant.

Table ES-2

**Alternative Site One
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site One	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.2 - Housing, Population and Displacement			
Loss of Dwelling Units and Displacement	An approximate total of 86 DUs and 258 persons on Alternative Site One would be displaced.	The District shall implement a relocation program for persons, business concerns and others that would be displaced by the proposed project, in compliance with the California Relocation Assistance Law. The District shall retain the services of a relocation consultant to coordinate and implement the relocation activities.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.3 – Cultural Resources			
Archaeological Resources	The potential for significant archaeological resources exists.	<p>Archaeological construction monitoring during the grubbing and topsoil removal phases of construction is needed to address the potential for historic archaeological resources. A qualified archaeologist and/or archaeological monitor shall be retained to implement the archaeological construction monitoring program.</p> <p>Within three months following the end of the monitoring program, a monitoring report (with appropriate graphics) which describes the results, analysis and conclusions of the archaeological monitoring program shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center.</p>	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-2

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site One	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.5 - Noise			
Traffic Noise	Traffic noise impacts on usable outdoor school areas and interior school structures along Wightman Street.	<p>Usable outdoor school areas shall maintain a minimum setback of 75 feet from the roadway centerline of Wightman Street to reduce traffic noise levels to below 65 dBA CNEL.</p> <p>School structures along Wightman Street shall maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in a closed window condition with mechanical ventilation, or shall maintain a minimum setback of 122 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in an open window condition.</p>	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
School yard Noise	School yard noise levels on interior school noise levels.	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.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-2

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site One	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.6 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Construction Demolition and/or Removal Activities	Construction demolition impacts due to the removal of old residential buildings on the preferred site, which may contain asbestos, lead-based paint or other hazardous materials would be significant.	Prior to construction demolition and/or removal of old residential buildings at the project site the District shall conduct a survey to test for asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint. All activities associated with asbestos shall be conducted under the direct supervision of a certified asbestos consultant. Lead-based paint analysis and removal shall be performed in conformance with federal, state, and local regulations.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.7 - Hydrology/Water Quality			
Construction Runoff	Short-term construction runoff and sedimentation would be significant.	The District shall require the contractor to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.8 – Geology and Soils			
Strong Ground Motion	Due to the project area's close proximity to the active Rose Canyon Fault zone, impacts associated with strong ground motion would be significant.	Standard engineering practices shall be considered in the design of school development. Seismic design according to the Division of the State Architect, Uniform Building Code, California Amendments to the Uniform Building Code, the City of San Diego Building Code and other regulations that provide more stringent design features for school development shall be incorporated.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-2

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site One	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.8 – Geology and Soils (continued)			
Corrosive Soils	The potential for corrosive soils on-site would be significant.	A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be performed for soil corrosion potential. All site-specific geotechnical study recommendations shall be implemented.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.11 – Public Services			
Solid Waste	Impacts to landfill capacity due to the generation of solid waste volumes that exceed the City’s standards and the potential deposition of construction/demolition debris into the Miramar Landfill would be significant.	The District shall prepare a waste management plan and provide the plan to the City’s Environmental Services Department for comment.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 5.2.1 - Land Use			
Affordable Housing	The proposed Central Area Elementary School in conjunction with the cumulative projects, would result in a significant loss of single- and multi-family homes in the Mid-City Communities.	The District shall implement the relocation program described in Section 4.2.5, in compliance with California Relocation Assistance Law, for each Mid-City school. However, such mitigation would not reduce the cumulative loss of affordable housing in the Mid-City area.	Significant.

Table ES-3

**Alternative Site Two
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Two	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.2 – Housing, Population and Displacement			
Loss of Dwelling Units and Displacement	An approximate total of 51 DUs and 153 persons on Alternative Site Two would be displaced.	The District shall implement a relocation program for persons, business concerns and others that would be displaced by the proposed project, in compliance with the California Relocation Assistance Law. The District shall retain the services of a relocation consultant to coordinate and implement the relocation activities.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.3 – Cultural Resources			
Archaeological Resources	The potential for significant archaeological resources exists.	<p>Archaeological construction monitoring during the grubbing and topsoil removal phases of construction is needed to address the potential for historic archaeological resources. A qualified archaeologist and/or archaeological monitor shall be retained to implement the archaeological construction monitoring program.</p> <p>Within three months following the end of the monitoring program, a monitoring report (with appropriate graphics) which describes the results, analysis and conclusions of the archaeological monitoring program shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center.</p>	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-3

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Two	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.5 – Noise			
Traffic Noise	Traffic noise impacts on interior multi-story school structures along SR-15.	Multi story school structures along SR-15 shall maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in a closed window condition with mechanical ventilation or, shall maintain a minimum setback of 125 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in an open window condition.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
School yard Noise	School yard noise levels on interior school noise levels.	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.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Construction Demolition and/or Removal Activities	Construction demolition impacts due to the removal of old residential buildings on the preferred site, which may contain asbestos, lead-based paint or other hazardous materials would be significant.	Prior to construction demolition and/or removal of old residential buildings at the project site the District shall conduct a survey to test for asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint. All activities associated with asbestos shall be conducted under the direct supervision of a certified asbestos consultant. Lead-based paint analysis and removal shall be performed in conformance with federal, state, and local regulations.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-3

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Two	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.7 – Hydrology/Water Quality			
Construction Runoff	Short-term construction runoff and sedimentation would be significant.	The District shall require the contractor to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.8 – Geology and Soils			
Strong Ground Motion	Due to the project area's close proximity to the active Rose Canyon Fault zone, impacts associated with strong ground motion would be significant.	Standard engineering practices shall be considered in the design of school development. Seismic design according to the Division of the State Architect, Uniform Building Code, California Amendments to the Uniform Building Code, the City of San Diego Building Code and other regulations that provide more stringent design features for school development shall be incorporated.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Corrosive Soils	The potential for corrosive soils on-site would be significant.	A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be performed for soil corrosion potential. All site-specific geotechnical study recommendations shall be implemented.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.11 – Public Services			
Solid Waste	Impacts to landfill capacity due to the generation of solid waste volumes that exceed the City's standards and the potential deposition of construction/demolition debris into the Miramar Landfill would be significant.	The District shall prepare a waste management plan and provide the plan to the City's Environmental Services Department for comment.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-3

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Two	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 5.2.1 - Land Use			
Affordable Housing	The proposed Central Area Elementary School in conjunction with the cumulative projects, would result in a significant loss of single- and multi-family homes in the Mid-City Communities.	The District shall implement the relocation program described in Section 4.2.5, in compliance with California Relocation Assistance Law, for each Mid-City school. However, such mitigation would not reduce the cumulative loss of affordable housing in the Mid-City area.	Significant.

Table ES-4
Alternative Site Three
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Three	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.2 – Housing, Population and Displacement			
Loss of Dwelling Units and Displacement	An approximate total of 181 DUs and 543 persons on Alternative Site Three would be displaced.	The District shall implement a relocation program for persons, business concerns and others that would be displaced by the proposed project, in compliance with the California Relocation Assistance Law. The District shall retain the services of a relocation consultant to coordinate and implement the relocation activities.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.3 – Cultural Resources			
Historical Resources	Local historical resources were identified on Alternative Site Three.	The environmental impacts to the two identified local historical resources may 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. The environmental impact to these resources may be reduced, but not to below a level of significance, by documentation of the resources with historic narrative, photographs and architectural drawings.	Two of the evaluated historic structures were determined to be significant. Only preservation on-site or relocation would mitigate impacts to below a level of significance. The District has indicated that the preservation or relocation of these historical resources would be infeasible. However, the District has agreed to document the historical sites, which would reduce impacts, but not to below a level of significance. Therefore, impacts would remain significant and unmitigated and the District would have to adopt Findings and a Statement of Overriding Consideration.

Table ES-4

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Three	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.3 – Cultural Resources (continued)			
Archaeological Resources	The potential for significant archaeological resources exists.	<p>Archaeological construction monitoring during the grubbing and topsoil removal phases of construction is needed to address the potential for historic archaeological resources. A qualified archaeologist and/or archaeological monitor shall be retained to implement the archaeological construction monitoring program.</p> <p>Within three months following the end of the monitoring program, a monitoring report (with appropriate graphics) which describes the results, analysis and conclusions of the archaeological monitoring program shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center.</p>	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-4

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Three	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.5 – Noise			
Traffic Noise	<p>1. Traffic noise impacts on usable outdoor school areas and interior school structures at the intersection of 40th Street and Polk Avenue.</p> <p>2. Traffic noise impacts on interior multi-story school structures along I-15 would impact Alternative Site Three.</p>	<p>1. 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.</p> <p>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 close 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 CNEL.</p> <p>2. Multi story school structures along SR-15 shall maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in a closed window condition with mechanical ventilation or, shall maintain a minimum setback of 125 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in an open window condition.</p>	<p>1. Mitigated to below a level of significance.</p> <p>2. Mitigated to below a level of significance.</p>
School Yard Noise	School yard noise levels on interior school noise levels.	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.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-4

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Three	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.6 – Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Construction Demolition and/or Removal Activities	Construction demolition impacts due to the removal of old residential buildings on the preferred site, which may contain asbestos, lead-based paint or other hazardous materials would be significant.	Prior to construction demolition and/or removal of old residential buildings at the project site the District shall conduct a survey to test for asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint. All activities associated with asbestos shall be conducted under the direct supervision of a certified asbestos consultant. Lead-based paint analysis and removal shall be performed in conformance with federal, state, and local regulations.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.7 – Hydrology/Water Quality			
Construction Runoff	Short-term construction runoff and sedimentation would be significant.	The District shall require the contractor to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.8 – Geology and Soils			
Strong Ground Motion	Due to the project area's close proximity to the active Rose Canyon Fault zone, impacts associated with strong ground motion would be significant.	Standard engineering practices shall be considered in the design of school development. Seismic design according to the Division of the State Architect, Uniform Building Code, California Amendments to the Uniform Building Code, the City of San Diego Building Code and other regulations that provide more stringent design features for school development shall be incorporated.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Corrosive Soils	The potential for corrosive soils on-site would be significant.	A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be performed for soil corrosion potential. All site-specific geotechnical study recommendations shall be implemented.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-4

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Three	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.11 – Public Services			
Solid Waste	Impacts to landfill capacity due to the generation of solid waste volumes that exceed the City’s standards and the potential deposition of construction/demolition debris into the Miramar Landfill would be significant.	The District shall prepare a waste management plan and provide the plan to the City’s Environmental Services Department for comment.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 5.2.1 - Land Use			
Affordable Housing	The proposed Central Area Elementary School in conjunction with the cumulative projects, would result in a significant loss of single- and multi-family homes in the Mid-City Communities.	The District shall implement the relocation program described in Section 4.2.5, in compliance with California Relocation Assistance Law, for each Mid-City school. However, such mitigation would not reduce the cumulative loss of affordable housing in the Mid-City area.	Significant.

Table ES-5

**Alternative Site Four
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Four	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.2 – Housing, Population and Displacement			
Loss of Dwelling Units and Displacement	An approximate total of 249 DUs and 747 persons on Alternative Site Four would be displaced.	The District shall implement a relocation program for persons, business concerns and others that would be displaced by the proposed project, in compliance with the California Relocation Assistance Law. The District shall retain the services of a relocation consultant to coordinate and implement the relocation activities.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.3 – Cultural Resources			
Archaeological Resources	The potential for significant archaeological resources exists.	<p>Archaeological construction monitoring during the grubbing and topsoil removal phases of construction is needed to address the potential for historic archaeological resources. A qualified archaeologist and/or archaeological monitor shall be retained to implement the archaeological construction monitoring program.</p> <p>Within three months following the end of the monitoring program, a monitoring report (with appropriate graphics) which describes the results, analysis and conclusions of the archaeological monitoring program shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center.</p>	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-5

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Four	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.5 – Noise			
Traffic Noise	Traffic noise impacts on interior multi-story school structures along I-15 would impact Alternative Site Four.	Multi story school structures along SR-15 shall maintain a minimum setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in a closed window condition with mechanical ventilation or, shall maintain a minimum setback of 125 feet from the roadway centerline and operate in an open window condition.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
School yard Noise	School yard noise levels on interior school noise levels.	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.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.6 - Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
Construction Demolition and/or Removal Activities	Construction demolition impacts due to the removal of old residential buildings on the preferred site, which may contain asbestos, lead-based paint or other hazardous materials would be significant.	Prior to construction demolition and/or removal of old residential buildings at the project site the District shall conduct a survey to test for asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint. All activities associated with asbestos shall be conducted under the direct supervision of a certified asbestos consultant. Lead-based paint analysis and removal shall be performed in conformance with federal, state, and local regulations.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-5

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Four	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 4.7 – Hydrology/Water Quality			
Construction Runoff	Short-term construction runoff and sedimentation would be significant.	The District shall require the contractor to prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.8 – Geology and Soils			
Strong Ground Motion	Due to the project area’s close proximity to the active Rose Canyon Fault zone, impacts associated with strong ground motion would be significant.	Standard engineering practices shall be considered in the design of school development. Seismic design according to the Division of the State Architect, Uniform Building Code, California Amendments to the Uniform Building Code, the City of San Diego Building Code and other regulations that provide more stringent design features for school development shall be incorporated.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Corrosive Soils	The potential for corrosive soils on-site would be significant.	A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be performed for soil corrosion potential. All site-specific geotechnical study recommendations shall be implemented.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.
Section 4.11 – Public Services			
Solid Waste	Impacts to landfill capacity due to the generation of solid waste volumes that exceed the City’s standards and the potential deposition of construction/demolition debris into the Miramar Landfill would be significant.	The District shall prepare a waste management plan and provide the plan to the City’s Environmental Services Department for comment.	Mitigated to below a level of significance.

Table ES-5

Issue Area	Significant Impact(s) Alternative Site Four	Recommended Mitigation Measure(s)	Significance of Impact(s) After Mitigation
Section 5.2.1 - Land Use			
Affordable Housing	The proposed Central Area Elementary School in conjunction with the cumulative projects, would result in a significant loss of single- and multi-family homes in the Mid-City Communities.	The District shall implement the relocation program described in Section 4.2.5, in compliance with California Relocation Assistance Law, for each Mid-City school. However, such mitigation would not reduce the cumulative loss of affordable housing in the Mid-City area.	Significant.

2 Introduction

The San Diego Unified School District (District) has prepared this Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the site acquisition, construction and operation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School. This EIR analyzes the District’s Preferred Site for the elementary school, as well as four alternative elementary school sites. Although the District has identified a "Preferred Site" in the EIR, the site for the proposed project has not yet been chosen. The proposed Central Area Elementary School would provide enrollment relief to the existing Central Elementary School.

2.1 BACKGROUND

The District operates more than 177 school facilities with enrollment of over 141,000 students (Pers. Comm., Sue Lawrence, San Diego Unified School District, September 17, 1999). By the 2013-2014 school year, enrollment within the District is expected to total almost 165,000 students.

2.1.1 Long-Range Facilities Master Plan

The District’s *Long-Range Facilities Master Plan* (LRFMP) is intended to describe how the District will house its students, including projected growth in student enrollment, and to identify the appropriate resources to address school facility needs.

The District began a comprehensive update of the LRFMP in 1998. New enrollment forecasts were prepared for the next 15 years, and the facilities that would be needed to accommodate enrollment growth and reduce overcrowding at existing schools were identified. The District also evaluated alternative enrollment sizes for schools, and determined that 700 students is the size that would be used in determining how many new elementary schools would be needed in the future.

The results of the LRFMP evaluation indicated that new elementary school facilities would be needed in several communities, including the City Heights community served by Central Elementary School. That information was used in the planning for a bond election and, on November 3, 1998, voters approved a \$1.51 billion general obligation bond measure (Proposition MM) that included funding for the proposed Central Area Elementary School.

2.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The updated *Mid-City Communities Plan* was adopted by City Council on August 4, 1998 (Resolution No. 290608) (City of San Diego, 1998). A primary objective of the plan is to provide “first class schools, educational and recreation facilities.” Within the document, each of the four communities of Mid-City has a separate community plan. There is a list of “City Heights Issues” under the City Heights Community Plan (City of San Diego, 1998). The first item on that list states: “*In spite of the addition of new facilities, schools remain severely overcrowded and parks are deficient*”.

The objective of the proposed project is two-fold: first, to provide additional capacity for elementary school students within the existing Central Elementary School attendance area; and second, to assist the District in achieving the standards outlined in the LRFMP.

2.2.1 Standards for School Facilities Planning

During the development process for the LRFMP and Proposition MM, the Facilities Review Public Working Committee (FRPWC) reviewed and validated standards for the development of new school sites and the modernization of existing sites. The results of that process are outlined below.

2.2.1.1 Enrollment Size

The *Mid-City Communities Plan* provides a recommendation regarding the development of elementary schools to accommodate approximately 100 students per acre, or the design capacity of permanent structures on existing school sites, for a preferred average of 500 students per school. However, the FRPWC engaged in a lengthy discussion relative to the optimum enrollment size for all school types that would result in an environment supportive of teaching and learning. The FRPWC recommended to the Board of Education that the District enrollment standard for elementary schools be 700 students, based on the District's needs. As a result, the new elementary schools included in Proposition MM are planned for an enrollment of 700 students, with permanent classroom facilities housing 500 students (70% of enrollment), portable classroom facilities housing 200 students (30% of enrollment), and support/playfield facilities to accommodate 700 students. Sufficient classroom facilities are included to support the new District standards of single-session kindergarten and reduced class size (20:1) in grades K-3.

The FRPWC also recognized that the enrollment standard for schools may need to be exceeded on an interim basis due to changes in neighborhood demographics and the lead-time needed to obtain resources and plan for the construction of new school facilities. To provide the flexibility needed to address these situations when they occur, the new schools would be master-planned to accommodate up to 900 students, if and when that action becomes necessary. The additional capacity of 200 students would be accommodated with one- or two-story portable classrooms. It is the District's goal to return enrollments to a maximum of 700 students as soon as is practicable.

2.2.1.2 Other Facilities Standards

The FRPWC recommended to the Board of Education that the District use the new facilities standards developed by District staff and consultants for the development of new school sites and the modernization of existing schools. These standards are outlined in Table 2.2-1.

2.2.2 Enrollment and Capacity Information

The District has settled into an established pattern of incremental enrollment growth. In 1992, the District reconfirmed the inevitability of growth and set forth a strategy to address that growth through the development of new schools. As shown in Table 2.2-2, most schools within the Mid-City communities exceed the new school elementary school standard of 700 students, and enrollment growth and reduction of overcrowding continue to be dominant issues for the District. Given the existing overcrowding and the

projected enrollment increases, additional facilities must be provided if the District is to achieve the standards described in the LRFMP.

Table 2.2-1

School Planning Standards

	Elementary 700 Enrollment	Middle Level 1,500 Enrollment	Senior High 2,000 Enrollment
1. Building Area	75 sq. ft./student	87 sq. ft./student	100 sq. ft./student
2. Physical Education Hardcourt	1.1 acres	1.5 acres	2.9 acres
Field Area	2.3 acres	7.8 acres	16.2 acres
Kdn. Play Area	0.2 acres	N/A	N/A
3. Classrooms	Number of classrooms based on District student/teacher loading standards for each grade. Maximum 30% portables on any site.		
4. Library/Media Ctr.	3,450 sq. ft. ⁽¹⁾	9,300 sq. ft. ⁽²⁾	9,300 sq. ft. ⁽²⁾
5. Student Dining Indoor	2,625 sq. ft.	4,500 sq. ft.	6,750 sq. ft.
Covered Outdoor	1,500 sq. ft. ⁽³⁾	3,000 sq. ft. ⁽³⁾	4,500 sq. ft. ⁽³⁾
6. Indoor Assembly/ Performing Arts	4,380 sq. ft.	9,000 sq. ft.	13,500 sq. ft.
7. Landscaping	Site-Specific Evaluation		
8. On-Site Parking	Two spaces per classroom, plus spaces for visitors, police and handicapped access, plus (for senior high schools) student parking spaces for 100% of grade 12 enrollment.		
9. Students/Acre	107	76	50

Notes: (1) DeJong criteria for a 1,000-student school. Assume 3.45 sq. ft./student for other enrollments.

(2) DeJong criteria for a 1,500-student school. Assume 6.20 sq. ft./student for other enrollments.

(3) Assumptions for calculation: 15 sq. ft./student (indoor), 10 sq. ft./student (covered outdoor), two lunch periods with 50% of the students eating inside, 50% outside. Sum of the indoor and covered outdoor dining areas should serve 50% of the enrollment at any given time.

Source: San Diego Unified School District, 1999.

Table 2.2-2

Preliminary Five-Year Enrollment Forecast for Mid-City Elementary Schools

School Location	Actual 1998-1999	Forecast 1999-2000	Forecast 2000-2001	Forecast 2001-2002	Forecast 2002-2003	Forecast 2003-2004	Growth 1999-2000 to 2003-2004
Adams	757	865	879	888	897	910	45
Central	1,149	1,134	1,154	1,166	1,183	1,200	66
Edison	826	827	876	869	889	903	76
Euclid	991	999	1,029	1,031	1,042	1,047	48
Franklin	636	644	627	636	633	643	-1
Hamilton	1,291	1,203	1,218	1,225	1,231	1,234	31
Jackson	1,136	1,134	1,151	1,159	1,168	1,179	45
Marshall	847	879	872	875	873	875	-4
Rosa Parks	1,423	1,550	1,597	1,628	1,658	1,682	132
TOTAL	9,056	9,235	9,403	9,477	9,574	9,673	438

Source: San Diego Unified School District, 1999.

2.3 SCHOOL SITE SELECTION PROCESS

Proposition MM provides funds for the construction of five new elementary schools in the Mid-City area, which would benefit the following schools:

- Adams Elementary
- Central Elementary
- Edison Elementary
- Euclid Elementary
- Franklin Elementary
- Hamilton Elementary
- Jackson Elementary
- Marshall Elementary
- Rosa Parks Elementary

The process that was utilized to identify alternative sites for the new elementary schools included community-wide meetings, staff analysis and individual task force meetings for each new school area.

The District formed a series of “Mid-City Site Selection Task Forces” to identify and evaluate alternative sites for each of the new elementary schools and recommend sites for acquisition by the Board of Education. These task forces addressed the Adams/Franklin Area, Central Area, Edison/Hamilton/Rosa Parks Area, Euclid Area, and Jackson/Marshall Area. The Preferred Site and site alternatives for the proposed Central Area Elementary School that are addressed in this EIR are a direct result of this process.

2.3.1 Community Meeting

On Saturday, March 13, 1999, a community meeting was held at Clark Middle School to explain the process of school site selection and solicit public input on potential school sites. The meeting received broad notification. Community planning groups, public agencies, schools, parents, and others were notified of the meeting.

The March 13th meeting included a general session where the audience was informed of the process and the criteria for selecting school sites. Following the general session, individual breakout sessions were held for each of the five new Mid-City schools where the public was invited to discuss possible locations for the schools and provide information about the community that would help in the site identification process. Several general geographic areas were identified in the breakout sessions for each new school. Everyone at these sessions who expressed an interest in attending the subsequent task force meetings was mailed an invitation.

Participants in the break-out sessions were provided with materials to assist in the discussion of alternative school sites including maps of the area showing the existing school sites, proposed construction schedules, site selection criteria, task force membership information, and student population/enrollment information for each existing school’s attendance area.

2.3.2 Staff Analysis

Following the community meeting, District staff evaluated every general location that was identified at the community meeting for a possible school site and identified specific areas within each general location that best satisfied the site selection criteria. The specific blocks were noted on plans of each community for further evaluation by the task forces.

2.3.3 Task Force Membership

Task force membership was comprised of individuals representing the following groups:

- One member representing each affected school, selected by the respective parent organization.
- One member representing each recognized community planning group. For the proposed Central Area Elementary School the recognized community planning group is:
 - City Heights Area Planning Committee
- One member selected by the Institute for Learning.
- One member selected by the San Diego Education Association (SDEA).
- One member from the District’s Facilities Development Department.
- One member from the City of San Diego (City) Park and Recreation Department.

Additional support was provided, as needed, by:

- Other District departments (e.g., Facilities Planning, Institute for Learning, Police, Finance, Communications, Transportation, Maintenance, Operations, Warehousing and Distribution, etc.).
- Other City departments (e.g., Planning, Traffic Engineering, Redevelopment, appropriate City Council office, Police, Economic Development, etc.).

2.3.4 Task Force Meetings

Separate task force meetings were conducted for each new school. The task force meetings were held after regular working hours to be more convenient for community members to attend.

Each task force was presented information on the general areas identified at the March 13, 1999 community meeting, and the specific site areas that were identified by District staff. The task force members were advised that their task was to identify a Preferred Site for the new school in each area and the best alternative sites that should be included for consideration in the environmental impact reports. A minimum of one Preferred Site and one alternative site was required. Each task force was provided with maps of the general locations identified at the community meeting, specific locations identified by staff, maps showing relative student population density in the study area, and existing land use maps of the area. The site selection criteria were distributed and reviewed.

2.4 SITE SELECTION CRITERIA

There are no vacant sites within the study area for the proposed Central Area Elementary School that are large enough to accommodate the new elementary school. Therefore, in order to provide a site for a new elementary school in this community, the District must select a site that has existing uses. The District considered a number of criteria in selecting sites for the proposed schools. The site selection criteria, provided in Table 2.4-1, are based on the State of California’s selection criteria for school sites. These criteria are not discussed in order of importance, but instead have been grouped to provide a logical

understanding of the District’s site selection considerations. Each of the criteria has been assigned a maximum weight for evaluating potential school site locations.

2.4.1 Site Size/Configuration/Topography

In selecting a site for a new school, the District considers the net usable acreage on the site, as well as the shape of the site. The District must consider whether the net usable acreage would be adequate for the proposed school program and whether the site’s size and configuration would allow for an efficient layout of the proposed facilities. The site’s potential for expansion is also considered. That is, the District considers whether there is an area adjacent to the site where future expansion could occur, if necessary and if additional funding becomes available.

The topography of the site is another important consideration. Ideally, the site’s topography would be such that the site could accommodate a large building pad and playfield, with a minimum amount of grading. Site drainage must also be considered.

2.4.2 Site Location

The proposed Central Area Elementary School study area incorporates the current attendance boundary for the existing Central Elementary School, which is generally bound by El Cajon Boulevard on the north, Thorn Street on the south, Fairmount Avenue on the east, and 37th Street on the west (Figure 2.4-1). The District identified this study area so that the new school would be located in an area where existing enrollment resides, and where the projected enrollment increases are anticipated to occur. As required by Proposition MM, the proposed Central Area Elementary School is intended to relieve enrollment pressures at the existing Central Elementary School. The majority of students who would likely attend the proposed elementary school reside south of University Avenue and east of the Interstate 805 (I-805) freeway.

The District considers whether the location of the site is convenient to the students. Locating a neighborhood school in an area outside of the enrollment service area would require students to travel farther to get to school. Neighborhood schools are designed to enable students to walk to school. If a site is not convenient to the students (i.e., is not within walking distance), the parents would likely have to drive the students to school. This would increase traffic in the vicinity, both before and after school.

Because all schools require public services and utilities (i.e., police, fire, libraries, recreational resources, public transportation, water, gas, sewer, and electricity), the availability of public services and utilities and their capacity to serve the site are considered in the site selection process. The District also considers a site’s proximity to existing recreational resources and parks. A site adjacent to a park provides the opportunity for a smaller school campus, where the District can enter into a joint-use agreement with the City for use of the park as the playfield component of the school.

**Table 2.4-1
Site Ranking Criteria**

Category	Criteria and Factors to Avoid
Safety Maximum weight: 20 points	Factors to Avoid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjacent to highways and railroads and lacks a sound buffer • Within two miles of an airport • Close to high-voltage power lines • Contaminants or toxins in the soil • Close to open-pit mining • On or near a fault zone or active fault • In an inundation area of a dam or floodplain • Social hazards in the area such as high incidents of crime or drug and alcohol abuse
Location Maximum weight: 10 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe, non-intrusive adjacent uses compatible with public school functions • Located convenient to student population to avoid excessive student transporting • Compatible with existing and future zoning regulations • Close to public services (e.g., libraries, parks, museums, transit) • Favorable orientation to prevailing winds and natural light
Environment Maximum weight: 10 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Free from sources of noise that may impede the instructional process • Outside the 65 CNEL noise contour (present and future) for vehicles and aircraft operations • Free from air pollution, smoke, dust and odors • Provides aesthetic view from and of the site • Compatible with curriculum
Soils Maximum weight: 10 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percolation from septic system and drainage • Adequate water table • Existing landfill properly compacted Factors to Avoid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close to faults and fault traces • Unstable subsurface and local bearing capacity • Dangers of slides and liquefaction
Size and Shape Maximum weight: 10 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum size of seven net useable acres. Net useable acreage is defined as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flat, buildable without slopes, gullies, creeks, ravines, etc. • Contains no public rights-of-way or easements which restrict construction • Vacant, cleared of all improvements above and below ground • Square or rectangle shape • Appropriate length-to-width ratio, minimum width 400 feet • Sufficient open play area and open space • Potential for expansion for future needs (speculative) • Adequate and separate bus loading and parking

Table 2.4-1
Site Ranking Criteria
(continued)

Category	Criteria and Factors to Avoid
Topography Maximum weight: 10 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface and subsurface drainage • Rock ledges or outcroppings • Feasibility of mitigating steep grades • Level area for playfields
Accessibility Maximum weight: 10 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access and dispersal roads • Freeway access for bus transportation • Safe, efficient routing patterns of foot traffic and bicycles Factors to Avoid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural obstacles such as grades or gullies • Obstacles such as crossings on major streets and intersections, narrow/winding streets, heavy traffic patterns
Public Services Maximum weight: 3 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire and Police protection readily available • Convenient public transit service • Convenient trash and garbage disposal
Utilities Maximum weight: 3 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability and adequacy of water, electricity, gas, sewer, telephone, cable TV • Feasibility of bringing utilities to site (cost) • Utilities reasonably available to site • Restrictions on right-of-way
Cost Maximum weight: 3 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimize cost for acquisition • Reasonable costs for site preparation • Reasonable costs for condemnation, severance damage, and legal fees • Reasonable maintenance costs • Potential to be cost effective by incorporating joint-use facilities such as parks and playfields, libraries and recreation centers
Availability Maximum weight: 3 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of a clear title to property • Condemnation of buildings and relocation of residents, if applicable • Timing
Political Implications Maximum weight: 3 points	Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public acceptance of Preferred Site • Receptivity of City Planning Commission • Zoned for prime agricultural use or industrial use • Coordination of proposed school site with future community plans Factors to Avoid: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative environmental impact

Figure 2.4-1 — Study Area for Central Area Elementary School

2.4.3 Land Use

Land use factors, such as existing/planned uses on the site, the site's underlying zone classification, and surrounding uses are important factors in selecting a school site. Existing/planned uses on the site are particularly relevant because siting a school in a developed area requires that all uses on the site be relocated. Existing land uses also play a role in determining the site's acquisition cost, and affect the timing as to when the site would be available for school use. The existing land uses also determine what type of additional site improvements would be necessary for the proposed school, if any (i.e., curbs/gutters, drainage, sidewalks).

The proposed school's compatibility with the community is another site selection consideration. A school's compatibility with and effect upon the surrounding neighborhood are directly linked to surrounding uses in the area. Typically, residential uses, including single-family, multi-family, and two-on-ones are considered to be compatible land uses. However, the effect of the school on surrounding residential uses has become an increasing concern to nearby property owners.

Potential noise impacts on the site are also tied to surrounding uses. Potential noise sources include, but are not limited to, vehicular traffic and aircraft.

Another issue that is linked to surrounding uses is the safety of the students and school employees at the site. Safety factors that are considered include pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular hazards; aircraft crash hazards; seismic considerations; contaminated soils; the proximity of facilities that use hazardous materials, or emit toxic air contaminants; and, the site's proximity to high voltage power lines. A school site should be located a sufficient distance from such factors so that potential safety hazards are minimized.

2.5 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This EIR has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq.; herein, "CEQA") and the procedures for implementation of CEQA set forth in the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, et seq.; herein "State CEQA Guidelines"). The District is the lead agency for the purpose of preparing this EIR, as defined by Section 15051 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

2.5.1 Notice of Preparation

The District distributed a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on September 15, 1999, describing its intent to prepare an EIR for the proposed acquisition, construction and operation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School.

The NOP was mailed to 86 agencies, organizations and individuals, including the State Clearinghouse, requesting comments on the scope of the environmental analysis to be presented in the EIR

(Appendix A). The following persons, agencies or organizations responded to the NOP within the 30-day comment period:

Respondent	Date of Response
Melvin Shapiro	September 16, 1999
San Diego County Archeological Society	September 18, 1999
City of San Diego Fire and Hazard Protection	September 22, 1999
California Regional Water Quality Control Board	September 27, 1999
City Heights Community Development Corporation	October 5, 1999
Mid-City Transit Interchanges Project	October 12, 1999
City of San Diego Planning and Development Review	October 15, 1999

The Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) forwarded copies of the NOP to the California Department of Recreation, Department of Fish and Game, Department of Transportation (CALTRANS), and Department of Health; the San Diego Air Pollution Control District; the Regional Water Quality Control Board; the State Lands Commission; and the Office of Local Assistance. OPR also requested that responsible agencies transmit the EIR concerns and comments on the scope and content of the EIRs to the District within 30 days of receipt of the NOP.

2.6 SCOPE OF THIS EIR

This EIR addresses the overall direct, indirect and cumulative environmental effects of the proposed Central Area Elementary School. Impacts associated with the site specific design are defined to the extent possible. The overall scope of the proposed project, such as site location, student enrollments, grade level configuration, and the school program, has been defined and is described in Chapter 3 of this EIR.

The Initial Study, dated September 15, 1999, identified the following primary environmental concerns to be addressed in the EIR:

- Cultural Resources
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Housing, Population and Displacement
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Recreational Resources
- Mandatory Findings of Significance
- Noise
- Public Services
- Traffic and Transportation
- Utilities and Service Systems

The Environmental Initial Study and subsequent EIR analysis identified a number of areas of potential environmental concern where no significant adverse impacts would be anticipated as a result of implementing the proposed project. Those issues for which effects were found not to be significant are described in Chapter 6 of this EIR, (State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15128).

2.7 INTENDED USES OF THIS EIR

This EIR will be used by the District's Board of Education for approval of property acquisition, construction and operation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School. The City is a responsible

agency for the purpose of any necessary street closures. This document may be used by all agencies involved in reviewing this action. In addition, this EIR may be used for any necessary supplemental review of site specific design issues.

The proposed Central Area Elementary School site is located within the Mid-City Communities Planned District. The *Mid-City Communities Planned District Ordinance (PDO)* (City of San Diego, 1986) contains the zoning regulations that apply to new and reconstructed development within the Mid-City Communities Planned District area. However, according to Section 53091 of the Government Code, a school district need not comply with a zoning ordinance unless the ordinance contains provisions for the location of public schools and the local planning commission has adopted a master plan. Because the Mid-City Communities PDO does not contain provisions for the location of public schools and the City's Planning Commission has not adopted a master plan as part of the PDO, the District is not subject to the Mid-City Communities PDO and the proposed project would not require a Mid-City Communities Planned District Permit. In addition, Section 53094 of the Government Code authorizes a school board to override a local zoning ordinance by a 2/3 vote. Such a vote may be conducted by the District's Board of Education, as necessary.

This page left intentionally blank.

3 Project Description

The proposed project addressed in this EIR is the acquisition of land, construction and operation of the proposed Central Area Elementary School. This school is planned to provide relief for the existing Central Elementary School and allow students currently transported to overflow schools to be returned to their neighborhood schools. It is anticipated that the proposed Central Area Elementary School would open in as early as Fall 2005.

3.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1.1 Regional Setting

The proposed Central Area Elementary School would be located within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area of the City of San Diego. The Mid-City communities are approximately four miles northeast of downtown San Diego, located between I-805/SR-15 on the west, the cities of La Mesa and Lemon Grove on the east, I-8 on the north, and SR-94 on the south. The regional location of the proposed project is shown on Figure 3.1-1. The Mid-City communities are bound by the communities of Mission Valley and the College Area on the north, the Mount Hope, Chollas View, Emerald Hills, and Encanto neighborhoods of the Southeast San Diego Community Planning Area on the south, the cities of La Mesa and Lemon Grove on the east, and the communities of North Park and Golden Hill on the west (Figure 3.1-2). Regional access to the site is provided by I-8, I-805, SR-15, and SR-94.

3.1.2 Project Location

The Preferred Site and alternative sites for the proposed Central Area Elementary School are located in the City Heights Community of the Mid-City Communities Planning Area. The City Heights Community is bound on the north by El Cajon Boulevard, on the east by 54th Street and Chollas Creek, on the south by SR-94, and on the west by I-805 and SR-15. According to the *Mid-City Communities Plan* (City of San Diego, 1998), residential land uses constitute the majority of the neighborhoods of City Heights, followed by commercial uses and open space.

The District formed a series of “Mid-City Site Selection Task Forces” to identify and evaluate alternative sites for each of the new elementary schools and recommend sites for acquisition by the Board of Education. These task forces addressed the Adams/Franklin Area, Central Area, Edison/Hamilton/Rosa Parks Area, Euclid Area, and Jackson/Marshall Area. The Preferred Site and site alternatives addressed in this EIR for the proposed Central Area Elementary School are a direct result of this process.

Figure 3.1-1 – Regional Location Map

Figure 3.1-2 – Mid-City Communities Planning Area

The task force evaluated various locations throughout the Central Elementary School attendance area. One Preferred Site and four alternatives were selected for further study in this EIR.

The 6.9-gross-acre (6.2-net-acre) Preferred Site consists of 1.5 city blocks (Figure 3.1-3). This site is bound by Wightman Street on the north, Landis Street on the south, 38th Street on the west, and the alley between 39th Street and 40th Street on the east. The Preferred Site excludes a City-owned property at the southwest corner of the block at 38th Street and Landis Street. In the event the District would deem it necessary to expand the school on the Preferred Site, the District has identified a potential 2.2 acre Expansion Area to the immediate east, the one-half block bound by Wightman Street, 40th Street and Landis Street. The total acreage for the Preferred Site with Expansion Area is 9.1 gross-acres. The eastern boundary of the Preferred Site with Expansion Area is located immediately adjacent to SR-15. Four alternative sites have also been identified, as shown on Figure 3.1-3.

Alternative Site One encompasses 1.5 blocks bound by Wightman Street on the north, the alley between 37th Street and 38th Street on the east, Landis Street on the south, and Cherokee Avenue on the west. Alternative Site Two is bound by Landis Street on the north, 41st Street on the east, Dwight Street on the south, and SR-15 on the west. Alternative Site Three is bound by the southern portion of the block on the north side of Polk Avenue, 40th Street on the east, 38th Street on the west, and the rear property lines of the commercial properties along University Avenue on the south. Alternative Site Four is bound by Orange Avenue on the north, Marlborough Avenue on the east, Polk Avenue on the south, and Central Avenue on the west.

3.1.3 Physical Characteristics

The predominant topographic features within the Mid-City Communities Planning Area are gently rolling mesa areas separated by numerous canyons (City of San Diego, 1998). The canyons are part of the west trending San Diego River system and the northeast to southwest trending Chollas Creek system. The very steep and precipitous canyons associated with the San Diego River, which have slopes of 25 percent or greater, extend southward from Mission Valley in the most northwesterly portion of the community planning area. The steep canyons associated with Chollas Creek are located in the central and southern portions of the planning area. These steep slope areas account for approximately five (5) percent of the Mid-City area. All of the potential school sites are situated on flat terrain, with differences in elevation that vary only a few feet over the entire site.

The majority of City Heights has a rectilinear grid pattern of surface streets. However, canyons and other steep slope areas in the eastern and southern portions of the community preclude the extension of streets and/or alleys in the typical grid pattern. These streets/alleys may appear on local maps of the area and are referred to as “paper streets” or “paper alleys” because they are not currently being used as public rights-of-way.

Figure 3.1-3 – Existing Elementary School, Preferred and Alternative Site Locations

Property conditions in the area range from stable to blighted. The existing land uses within the vicinity of the potential school sites are comprised mostly of single-family and multi-family residential uses. Commercial uses are primarily located along University Avenue, Euclid Avenue and Fairmount Avenue. Industrial uses are primarily located along Euclid Avenue. Institutional uses, which include schools, parks, and churches, occur throughout the City Heights community.

Schools in the area include Central, Edison, Euclid, Franklin, and Rosa Parks Elementary Schools. Wilson Middle School and Hoover High School are also in the project vicinity. Other land uses within the area include the East San Diego Adult Recreation Club. In addition, a community police satellite facility is located on the corner of Highland Avenue and Landis Street, and the Copley Family YMCA is to the south across Landis Street. To the west and south, a new public park is being constructed to mitigate the effects of the SR-15 construction.

3.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED CENTRAL AREA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The proposed Central Area Elementary School would accommodate a planned enrollment of approximately 700-900 students, kindergarten through grade five. This elementary school would operate as a “neighborhood school,” in that enrollment would be drawn from the surrounding neighborhood and allow students to walk to school without crossing major streets. The faculty would consist of approximately 52 full-time employees. Approximately 70 off-street parking spaces are required according to District planning criteria. Policies for the provision of off-street parking at school sites have been developed as part of the District’s *Landscape Design and Site Development Guidelines* (1991) and the District’s *Elementary School Planning Guide* (1992). The District will comply with these guidelines to the extent possible, however school-related on-street parking could occur. Playground areas could be used to provide temporary evening parking for special events (i.e., parents’ night, school plays, etc.). Playground areas and joint-use turf fields would be available to the public after school hours.

3.2.1 School Operations

The school-year calendar for the proposed Central Area Elementary School has not yet been established. In general, the daily schedules for classes would commence at 8:00 AM and would finish by 3:00 PM. “Bell times” (i.e., times when the school day begins and ends) are 7:30 AM to 3:30 PM. Certain after-school programs usually cause the school to remain in operation until 6:00 PM every school day.

The Preferred Site and Expansion Area consists of 2 blocks of privately-held residential properties. There is no public open space or parkland on the 2 blocks. The alternative sites are primarily occupied by privately held residential properties, with very limited commercial uses and contain no

public parkland or open space. An outdoor playground is a component of the project. The District's *Landscape and Site Development Guidelines* and the *Elementary School Planning Guide* would be consulted in the development of the design playground. Fencing may be erected around most or all of the playground. This fencing would be designed in a manner that maximizes public access to the play area during non-school hours, while providing adequate security for students when school is in session. The *Elementary School Planning Guide* recommends that a 10-foot chain link fence be provided around the perimeter of the playfield. In addition organized community group use of school facilities in the evening and on weekends would be made available.

3.2.2 Transportation

The proposed Central Area Elementary School would operate based on the “neighborhood school” concept. Enrollment would be drawn from the surrounding neighborhood, thereby allowing students to walk to school. A “Suggested Route to School” plan, consistent with the 1996 Caltrans *Traffic Manual*, would be prepared to address pedestrian and bicycle safety for the proposed project. Additionally, a registered traffic engineer will review the project site plans, once they are developed, to ensure that pick-up/drop off areas are well planned.

Bus transportation could be provided for special education and integration students. Because the school will most likely house a small number of these students, on average the number of bus trips generated by this activity would be minimal. The proposed project includes closure of 39th Street, between Wightman Street and Landis Street.

3.2.3 Concept Plans

Site-specific design concepts for the proposed elementary school have been defined to the extent possible. Certain project-specific design details are not known at this time. However, it has been determined that the school would consist of permanent facilities and portables that would accommodate 700 to 900 students. Presently, detailed site plans and architectural features are not available. It is assumed that school facilities would incorporate one- and two-story buildings. To assist in the design of school facilities, the District has prepared *Landscape Design and Site Development Guidelines* (San Diego Unified School District, 1991b) and the *Elementary School Planning Guide* (San Diego Unified School District, 1992c). The *Landscape Design and Site Development Guidelines* address the following issues for existing, reconstruction, and new facilities:

- Provide landscape design standards to be utilized at all school sites.
- Minimize maintenance costs.
- Provide barrier free access to all facilities.
- Encourage the use of energy efficient planting techniques through proper site planning.
- Encourage water conservation through the use of low water usage plant materials and water efficient irrigation techniques.
- Eliminate the use of potentially dangerous and poisonous plant materials.
- Enhance facility security and safety.

The purpose of the guidelines is to ensure that every new school design carefully considers the community in which it would be located. According to the *Landscape Design and Site Development Guidelines*, the design of the new school facility should be compatible with the natural setting and with neighboring properties.

The District's *Elementary School Planning Guide* would also provide the framework for the design and construction of the proposed Central Area Elementary School. The purpose of the planning guide is to assist the planning process and to offer guidance to architects. The *Elementary School Planning Guide* contains general planning characteristics for elementary schools, as well as design/development criteria for instructional and support facilities. A project advisory committee consisting of District staff and members of the community would be formed to assist in the development of the project design for the proposed elementary school.

3.3 DEMOLITION/REMOVAL AND CONSTRUCTION

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 the closed portion of existing city streets within the selected site.

Existing structures would be demolished or removed from the site soon after the District has acquired the property. Construction activities would include site preparation (grading and/or compaction), facilities construction and site finish (landscaping). Construction activities, including demolition, for the proposed Central Area Elementary School are scheduled to last approximately 33 months, beginning early 2003 and ending in Fall 2005.

The amount of estimated demolition and/or removal of structures varies from site-to-site and is depicted in Table 3.3-1. These estimates refer only to the number of structures, and not the cubic footage of demolition and/or removal. The Preferred Site would involve demolition and removal of an estimated 131 structures (including residences, garages and out-buildings), with an additional 32 structures in the "Expansion Area." The estimated demolitions and removals for the alternative sites range from 51 structures for Alternative Site Two to 249 structures for Alternative Site Four.

Table 3.3-1

Potential Number of Demolitions per Site

Site	Estimated Number of Structures (includes all structures)
Preferred	163 (131 + 32 in the Expansion Area)
Alternative 1	86
Alternative 2	51
Alternative 3	181
Alternative 4	249

Source: BRG Consulting, Inc. September 1999.

This page intentionally left blank.