



San Diego Unified Port District
P.O. Box 120488
San Diego, California 92112-0488
(619) 686-6283

**NOTICE OF PREPARATION
of a
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

PROJECT TITLE: Port Master Plan Update (UPD #EIR-2017-035)
APPLICANT: San Diego Unified Port District
LOCATION: Port of San Diego (All Planning Districts)
REFERENCE: California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15375

The San Diego Unified Port District (District) will be the lead agency for preparing a program environmental impact report (PEIR) for the Port Master Plan Update (PMPU or proposed project). The District is soliciting input and feedback from various agencies, stakeholders, and the public pertaining to the scope and content of the environmental information that will be included in the PEIR. For certain agencies, this may be germane to statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. An agency may need to use the proposed project's PEIR when considering its permit or other approval for the proposed project. The project description, location, and possible environmental effects are contained in the attached materials.

Because of time limits mandated by state law, your comments should be sent at the earliest possible date but no later than 30 days after receiving this notice. **Comments regarding environmental concerns will be accepted until 4:30 p.m. on Monday, May 1, 2017,** and should be mailed to San Diego Unified Port District, Planning and Green Port, 3165 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 92101 or emailed to: mmedel@portofsandiego.org.

A public scoping meeting and open house regarding the proposed PEIR will be held on Wednesday, April 12, 2017, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the San Diego Unified Port District Administration Building, Training Room, 3165 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 92101.

For questions about this Notice of Preparation, please contact Mayra Medel, Senior Planner, at (619) 686-6598.

Signature: _____

Jason H. Giffen
Assistant Vice President, Planning and Green Port

Date: March 30, 2017



NOTICE OF PREPARATION
of a
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
for the
PORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE

(UPD #EIR-2017-035)

Publication of this Notice of Preparation (NOP) initiates the San Diego Unified Port District's (District's) compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for the Port Master Plan Update (PMPU or proposed project). The NOP is the first step in the preparation of the program environmental impact report (PEIR). It describes the proposed project and is distributed to responsible agencies, trustee agencies, cooperating federal agencies, and the general public. As presented in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15375, the purpose of the NOP is "to solicit guidance from those agencies as to the scope and content of the environmental information to be included in the EIR." Additionally, opportunities to comment on the Draft PEIR will be available during public circulation. The District is the CEQA lead agency, and also the project applicant/proponent.

PROJECT SUMMARY

The planning area of the PMPU encompasses approximately 2,403 acres of land¹ and 3,535 acres of water. The PMPU would provide the official planning policies of the District consistent with the general statewide purpose, for the physical development of the tide and submerged lands (District Tidelands) conveyed and granted in trust to the District, as well as acquired uplands. In accordance with the California Coastal Act² (Coastal Act) and Port Act,³ the PMPU would:

- Control the allowable land and water uses within the District;
- List known "appealable" projects;⁴ and
- Include goals and policies that would implement the broad policies of the Coastal Act, as well as shape the characteristics of development, coastal access, recreation, and environmental conservation throughout the District's jurisdiction.

The PMPU would contain six elements that would apply across District Tidelands, covering the following areas:

- Land and Water Use
- Natural Resources

¹ This includes approximately 670 acres of land that is currently leased to San Diego International Airport.

² The Coastal Act is codified in California Public Resource Code § 30000 et seq.

³ The Port Act is codified in California Harbors and Navigation Code Appendix 1. (Available at <https://www.portofsandiego.org/document/about-port-of-san-diego-documents/7473-san-diego-unified-port-district-act-revised-2016/file.html> or the Office of the District Clerk.)

⁴ Coastal Act §§ 30711 and 30715.

- Mobility
- Coastal Access and Recreation
- Resiliency and Safety
- Economic Development

Additionally, the planning area would be divided into 10 Planning Districts (PDs):

- PD 1: Shelter Island
- PD 2: Harbor Island
- PD 3: Embarcadero
- PD 4: Working Waterfront
- PD 5: National City Bayfront
- PD 6: Chula Vista Bayfront
- PD 7: South Bay
- PD 8: Imperial Beach Oceanfront
- PD 9: Silver Strand
- PD 10: Coronado Bayfront

Each PD would reflect the land and water use designations established by the Land and Water Use element, have location-specific policies, and describe proposed appealable projects.

The PMPU would also contain sections that would describe the regulatory process and implementation for projects, and the plan's relation to, and compliance with, the Coastal Act.

PROJECT LOCATION

The area of San Diego Bay (Bay), encompassed by the historic mean high-tide line, comprises approximately 14,951 acres of filled and submerged lands and an existing shoreline stretching approximately 54.01 miles. These historic tideland areas are owned, controlled, or held in trust by the federal government, the State of California, the County of San Diego, the cities of San Diego and Coronado, and the District.

The planning area for the PMPU is the entirety of the District's jurisdiction, including acquired upland parcels, which amounts to approximately 2,403 acres of land and 3,535 acres of water in and around the Bay and along the Imperial Beach oceanfront. Figure 1 shows the project location and Figure 2 shows the planning area.

The District is surrounded by the incorporated cities of San Diego, National City, Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, and Coronado, all of which conveyed or granted tidelands and submerged lands to the District in accordance with the Port Act.⁵ The city of San Diego, which is the largest city in the region, covers approximately 372.4 square miles and is home to an estimated population of approximately 1.37 million residents. National City is 5 miles south of downtown San Diego, with an area of approximately 9.2 square miles and an estimated population of approximately 60,000 residents. Chula Vista is the second-largest city in San Diego County, with an area of approximately 52 square miles and a population of approximately 258,000 residents. Chula Vista is 7.5 miles from downtown San Diego. The city of Imperial Beach is a beach community in the southwestern corner of San Diego County. It encompasses approximately 4.5 square miles and has a population of approximately 27,000 residents. Across Bay from downtown San Diego, the city of Coronado encompasses approximately 14 square miles and has a resident population of 24,000.

⁵ Pursuant to Port Act, the District's land use and management authority and police powers supersede those of these cities.

BACKGROUND

Port Act

On December 18, 1962, the state legislature created the District with the enactment of the Port Act and charged the District with management of certain tidelands and submerged waters of the San Diego Bay. The District holds these areas in trust for all of California to promote and implement commerce, navigation, fisheries, recreation, and ecological preservation on the granted lands consistent with the uses specified in Section 87 of the Port Act. Section 19 of the Port Act specifies that the Board of Port Commissioners (Board) shall draft a port master plan (PMP) for harbor and port improvements and for the uses of all the tidelands and submerged waters which are conveyed to the District. The existing PMP and the proposed PMPU, if adopted, satisfies this obligation.

Coastal Act

Chapter 8 of the Coastal Act applies to the District and specifies the required contents of a port master plan. In summary, the PMPU must include:

- Proposed land and water uses where known;
- Projected design and location of land and water areas, berthing, navigation ways and systems intended to serve commercial traffic;
- Estimated effects on, and mitigation for, biological resources and water quality;
- Proposed list of “appealable” projects in sufficient detail to determine their consistency with Chapter 3 policies; and
- Provision for adequate hearings and public participation in the District planning and development decisions.⁶

The PMPU must also comply with Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act for “appealable” projects; uses that support such projects and other designated wetlands, estuaries, and recreational areas; and Chapter 8 policies of the Coastal Act for the remaining types of uses, projects, or development.⁷ The PMPU would implement the Coastal Act and the applicable policies within the District.

Port Master Plan

The existing PMP was prepared in 1980 and certified by the California Coastal Commission (Coastal Commission) on January 21, 1981. It is the primary document that governs land and water uses within the District’s jurisdiction. The PMP is organized into four sections: (I) Introduction, (II) Planning Goals, (III) Master Plan Interpretation, and (IV) Precise Plans. Section II establishes planning goals and related policies that pertain to development and operation of lands within the District’s jurisdiction. Section III provides additional land use objectives and criteria that apply to specific land use types, including commercial, industrial, recreation, conservation, military, and public facility uses. Section IV identifies 10 PDs, each of which is guided by a Precise Plan that guides future development.

Existing land and water uses within the study area can be generally divided into six categories: Commercial, Industrial, Public Recreation, Conservation, Public Facilities, and Military. Commercial

⁶ See Coastal Act § 30711. “Appealable” projects are listed in Section 30715 of the Coastal Act.

⁷ Coastal Act §§ 30700, 30711, 30715.

uses comprise approximately 15 percent of the planning area at present and include a variety of allowed uses, such as commercial recreation, airport-related commercial, marine sales and services, and commercial and sport fishing on the landside and berthing uses such as commercial fishing, marine services, and recreation on the waterside. Industrial uses comprise approximately 24 percent of the planning area at present and include aviation-related industrial, maritime services/industrial uses, and marine terminal uses on the landside and specialized and terminal berthing on the waterside. Public recreation uses constitute approximately 19 percent of the planning area at present and include open space, park/plaza, golf course, and promenade on the landside and open bay on the waterside. Conservation uses comprise approximately 28 percent of the planning area at present and include wetlands and habitat replacement on the landside and open bay and estuary on the waterside. Public Facilities comprise 11 percent of the planning area at present and include harbor services, city pump station, and streets on the landside and navigation corridor, anchorage, and harbor services on the waterside. Finally, Military uses comprise three percent of the planning area at present and include the Navy Fleet school on the landside and navy berthing on the waterside.

The PMPU would be the first comprehensive update of the PMP in the District's history. In 2013, the District initiated a multi-faceted integrated planning effort that includes a comprehensive update to the PMP, which is discussed below under "Project Description." The Board previously accepted the *Port Master Plan Update Assessment Report: Vision Statement and Guiding Principles* (August 2014)⁸ and the *Integrated Planning Port Master Plan Framework Report* (November 2015),⁹ which set the stage for development of the PMPU. In addition, extensive public outreach and stakeholder involvement helped to form the basis for preparation of the PMPU. If approved by the Board and certified by the Coastal Commission, the PMPU will implement the 30-year planning vision by addressing allowable land and water uses, coastal access, mobility, economic development, safety, and natural resources, among other topics.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves a comprehensive update to the existing PMP to provide goals and policies, as well as land and water uses, consistent with the Port Act and Public Trust Doctrine, for the physical development and conservation of District Tidelands. The PMPU would be composed of Baywide elements, which are described below.

Planning Elements

The existing PMP includes planning goals that are applicable to the entirety of the District's jurisdiction; however, these planning goals are not categorized by topics and are not divided into elements. The PMPU would include six Baywide elements with goals and policies that pertain to the topic addressed in each element. These Baywide elements are summarized below.

The **Land and Water Use Element** would establish land and water use designations that include descriptions of each type of land and water use, as well as supportive policies and guidance for all land and water uses within District Tidelands. The District proposes to consolidate the existing PMP uses and allow for a variety of primary and secondary uses under each land and water use.

⁸ Available at <https://www.portofsandiego.org/document/planning-projects/8014-vision-statement-and-guiding-principles/file.html> and the Office of the District Clerk. The *Port Master Plan Update Assessment Report: Vision Statement and Guiding Principles* is hereby incorporated by reference.

⁹ Available at <https://www.portofsandiego.org/document/planning-projects/7961-integrated-planning-framework-report/file.html> and the Office of the District Clerk. The *Integrated Planning Port Master Plan Framework Report* is hereby incorporated by reference.

The purpose of this element is to designate land and water uses allowed within the District to achieve a complementary range of uses Baywide and establish functional areas for private development, District facilities and operations, coastal access and recreation, as well as conservation open space. Environmental justice and greenhouse gas emissions reduction policies may also be included in this element.

Goals and policies to further attain a balanced, multi-modal transportation network and provide for the efficient movement of goods/cargo, vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians would be established in the **Mobility Element**. This element would guide future Baywide mobility, multi-modal facilities and road designs, transit facilities, mobility hubs, travel demand management, parking, rail corridors for freight and other goods movement, and ferry and water taxi access. Greenhouse gas emissions reduction policies may also be included in this element.

The **Coastal Access and Recreation Element** would establish goals and policies that address opportunities to enhance public coastal access and recreational opportunities, including the provision of lower cost visitor and recreational facilities. This element would also include goals and policies addressing environmental justice. Public coastal access will be discussed in terms of land connections, shoreline access, water access, views to the Bay, and wayfinding and signage. Recreation will be discussed in terms of activating public spaces, including parks and pavilions. The “Green Necklace,” a comprehensive and continuous public and coastal access system, will also be addressed in this element.¹⁰

The primary objective of the **Natural Resources Element** would establish goals and policies regarding the conservation, development compatibility, and utilization of natural resources. This element will discuss the existing natural resources, including habitat and marine resources, and contain policies related to the minimization and mitigation of impacts on, and conservation and enhancement of, those areas. Goals and policies addressing mitigation banking may also be included in this element.

The **Resiliency and Safety Element** would establish resiliency strategies related to climate change and its effects, seismic and geologic hazards, and flooding (although not required under Section 30711 of the Coastal Act). It would also provide goals and policies related to adapting to impacts from climate change, including such items as coastal flooding. Environmental justice and greenhouse gas emissions reduction policies may also be included.

Policies to improve economic viability through the provision of balanced employment and development opportunities, attraction and retention of businesses, and promotion of fiscal strength and stability will be contained within the **Economic Development Element**. Environmental justice and greenhouse gas emissions reduction policies may also be included in this element. Although not required by Section 30711 of the Coastal Act, this element is important to the District as it currently does not collect taxes to develop and maintain public amenities on District Tidelands; instead, the District pays for public amenities through its revenue stream.

¹⁰ It is proposed that the PMPU will include exceptions or alternatives for a continuous Green Necklace at certain locations based on factors such as safety and security, the physical characteristics of a location, and the existence of sensitive resources (species, habitat, etc.).

Planning Districts

The PMPU planning area would consist of 10 PDs. The PDs, as proposed, have been reorganized according to geographic location and renamed in a logical order that will accommodate the end users of the PMPU. The PDs also include redefined sub-district areas to simplify the numerous planning sub-areas currently contained in the PMP. Each PD would have its own planning framework (e.g., land use, water use, coastal access, mobility, conservation, etc.) and policies. In addition, each PD would be divided into sub-districts and include a list of projects that would be appealable to the Coastal Commission. Each PD and its sub-district are briefly described below, and Figure 3 shows their respective proposed locations.

1. The **Shelter Island PD** is a narrow strip of land, approximately 1 mile long and less than 0.1 mile wide, that extends off the Point Loma peninsula via Shelter Island Drive. Proposed uses along Shelter Island include hotels, restaurants, and yacht- or marine-related businesses. Fishing piers and boat launches are also located at various points along Shelter Island. The proposed sub-districts are West Shelter Island and East Shelter Island.

Within the Shelter Island PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Commercial Fishing, Marine Sales & Services, Recreation Open Space, Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial, Commercial Fishing Berthing, Marine Services Berthing, Recreational Berthing, and Sportfishing Berthing. The PMPU may also allow for realignment of roadways within this PD.

2. Similar to the Shelter Island PD, the **Harbor Island PD** is a narrow strip of land, approximately 1.5 miles long and 317 feet wide, that extends off the San Diego mainland via Harbor Island Drive. Harbor Island includes hotels, restaurants, and marinas in the inlets between Harbor Island and the mainland of San Diego. Other uses include yacht- and sailing-oriented retail shops (e.g., charter companies, sport fishing outlets) and publicly accessible shoreline parks. The Harbor Island PD includes San Diego International Airport, although this area is not under the land use authority of the District while the current lease is in effect.¹¹ The proposed sub-districts are West Harbor Island, East Harbor Island, and the Airport.

Within the Harbor Island PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Recreation Open Space, Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial, Recreational Berthing, and Institutional Berthing. The PMPU may also allow for realignment of roadways within this PD.

3. Spanning the length of the bayfront within the downtown San Diego area, the **Embarcadero PD** begins at Laurel Street to the north (just south of San Diego International Airport) and ends roughly at Park Boulevard, southeast of the Convention Center and north of the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal (TAMT). The Embarcadero is an active waterfront area. Harbor Drive, which runs the length of the Embarcadero, provides vehicular access and on-street parking for uses along the Embarcadero. The proposed sub-districts within this PD are North Embarcadero, Central Embarcadero, and South Embarcadero. The proposed North Embarcadero sub-district along North Harbor Drive includes large parcels of land that have been dedicated to the Solar Turbines facility, just south of the airport, as well as hotels, restaurants, and public parks. Waterside uses in the proposed North Embarcadero sub-district include maritime

¹¹ Pursuant to Senate Bill 1896, the District transferred to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (Authority) via lease(s) land necessary to operate the San Diego International Airport (Airport); land use authority for the leased land was also transferred to the Authority. However, the District retains trusteeship of this land, and at such time that the term of the lease(s) expires, land use authority of the leased land shall revert to the District.

museums, merchant ships, cruise ship terminals, commercial fishing boats, and pleasure craft. The proposed Central Embarcadero sub-district consists primarily of Seaport Village, a waterfront shopping and dining complex, and Embarcadero Marina Park North. Uses within the proposed South Embarcadero sub-district include restaurants, the San Diego Convention Center, and public parks. Marinas occupy the inlet created by the two L-shaped segments that form Embarcadero Marina Parks North and South. Three high-rise hotels are also located along the waterfront in the South Embarcadero area.

Within the Embarcadero PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Commercial Fishing, Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial, Recreation Open Space, Commercial Fishing Berthing, Industrial & Deep Water Berthing, and Recreational Berthing.

4. The **Working Waterfront PD** extends along Harbor Drive from TAMT south to the city of San Diego's border with National City (Division Street). Formerly referred to as the TAMT PD, it is proposed renamed to address the regional significance of the terminal land and water facilities. This PD is proposed to be divided into three sub-districts: TAMT, Cesar Chavez Park, and Harbor Drive Industrial. The TAMT is a maritime cargo facility that is managed with multiple tenant leaseholds and open/covered terminal spaces for handling diverse cargos. Cesar Chavez Park was developed in cooperation with San Diego's Barrio Logan community; this park offers a recreational pier, picnic and playground areas, a soccer field, and open space for active play. The BAE Systems, Continental Maritime of San Diego, CP Kelco, and General Dynamics National Steel and Shipbuilding Company (NASSCO) compose the Harbor Drive Industrial sub-district. This PD is anticipated to include uses and policies that support its continuation as a water-dependent marine industrial area with supporting recreational uses.

Within the Working Waterfront PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Marine Terminal, Maritime Services & Industrial, and Industrial & Deep Water Berthing. The proposed intensification would consider growth allowed by approved plans for this PD.

5. The National City Marine Terminal (NCMT), related industrial uses, areas located within the National City Balanced Land Use Plan area, and Navy berthing space compose the **National City Bayfront PD**. Pepper Park is sited at the southernmost extent of Tidelands Avenue, approximately 0.45 mile from the edge of the Bay. The National City Aquatic Center, operated by the District, is also located in this PD. Pier 32 Marina, east of the aquatic center, is adjacent to the Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge, which is farther to its east. The proposed sub-districts include Navy Berthing, North Corridor, Marina, and NCMT.

Within the National City Bayfront PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Marine Terminal, Maritime Services & Industrial, Recreation Open Space, Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial, and Industrial & Deep Water Berthing. The PMPU may also allow for realignment of roadways within this PD.

6. The **Chula Vista Bayfront PD** includes the adopted Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan area, which allows a variety of uses, such as hotel, retail, restaurant, and other uses that lie outside the District's jurisdiction. Currently, large portions of the Chula Vista Bayfront are dedicated to wildlife reserves and marshes. Other uses include public parks, marinas, a recreational vehicle campground, a salt works operation, and a boat repair facility. The proposed sub-districts include Sweetwater District, Harbor District, and Otay District.

Within the Chula Vista Bayfront PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Conservation Open Space, Recreation Open Space, Maritime Services & Industrial, Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial,

Conservation/Inter-tidal, Recreational Berthing, and Industrial & Deep Water Berthing. The PMPU may also allow for realignment of roadways within this PD. The proposed intensification would consider growth allowed by approved plans for this PD.

7. The **South Bay PD** includes the southernmost portion of the Bay and land adjacent to Imperial Beach. The area is characterized primarily by open water and large expanses of land that are planned for conservation purposes. The proposed sub-districts include Habitat Conservation and Pond 20.

Within the South Bay PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Conservation Open Space, Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial, and Conservation/Inter-tidal.

8. Characterized by a substantial length of ocean shoreline and open ocean, the **Imperial Beach Oceanfront PD** includes the approximately 1,300-foot-long Imperial Beach Pier—a publicly accessible pier that provides a promenade and fishing opportunities. A restaurant is located at the end of the pier. There are no proposed sub-districts within this PD.

Within the Imperial Beach Oceanfront PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial.

9. Similar to the Imperial Beach Oceanfront PD, the **Silver Strand PD** is characterized by a length of shoreline, although its shoreline is bayside. This PD includes existing private-use marinas east of Silver Strand Boulevard/State Route 75. This PD, which is adjacent to Silver Strand State Beach, also includes a hotel resort off Coronado Bay Road. The proposed sub-districts include State Park Basin, Park Basin Crowne Isle, and Grand Caribe Isle/South Cays.

Within the Silver Strand PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Conservation Open Space, Recreation Open Space, Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial, and Recreational Berthing.

10. The **Coronado Bayfront PD** is characterized by shorelines, parks, and water-oriented uses adjacent to Coronado. Uses along the north coast of the Coronado Bayfront include Naval Air Station North Island and single- and multi-family residential uses that front the Bay along 1st Street between Alameda Boulevard and A Avenue. Commercial uses are concentrated toward the eastern end of the north bayfront, including the Ferry Landing Marketplace, which offers a number of restaurants and small boutique or tourist-oriented shops. Public open spaces along the north bayfront include Bayview Park at I Avenue and 1st Street, Centennial Park at Orange Avenue and 1st Street, and Coronado Ferry Landing Park at B Avenue and 1st Street. Land uses along the east shore of the Coronado Bayfront include a marina, boat rentals, yacht clubs, hotels, Coronado Municipal Golf Course, high-rise condominiums, a community center and public parks, and Naval Amphibious Base Coronado. The proposed sub-districts of this PD include North Coronado and South Coronado.

Within the Coronado Bayfront PD, the PMPU may allow for intensification of the following proposed land and water uses (and potentially others): Visitor-Serving Recreation Commercial and Recreational Berthing.

The PMPU will be in compliance with the Coastal Act. Section 30711 of the Coastal Act identifies the required contents of a PMP. In accordance with Section 30711(a)(4) of Chapter 8, the PMPU will contain a project list for “appealable” projects in each PD. “Appealable projects,” defined in Section 30715 of the Coastal Act, must be described with sufficient detail to be able to determine their consistency with Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. Accordingly, the PMPU will provide

policies and development parameters to demonstrate consistency with Chapters 3 and 8 of the Coastal Act for “appealable projects” as well as Chapter 8 policies for non-appealable projects.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The PEIR will address the following potential project-related and cumulative environmental effects of the proposed project:

- Aesthetics and Visual Resources
- Air Quality and Health Risk
- Biological Resources (Marine and Terrestrial)
- Cultural Resources (Archaeological and Built Environment)
- Geologic Hazards and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise and Vibration
- Population and Housing
- Public Services and Recreation
- Transportation, Circulation, and Parking
- Utilities and Energy Use

The PEIR will also address any other potential impacts identified during the NOP process. The PEIR will include mitigation measures (if significant impacts are identified) and a reasonable range of alternatives as well as the additional mandatory sections required by CEQA. A mitigation monitoring and reporting program will be prepared to ensure implementation of mitigation.

The Initial Study/Environmental Checklist is attached.

COMMENTS

This NOP is available for a 30-day public review period that **starts on Thursday, March 30, 2017, and ends at 4:30 p.m. on Monday, May 1, 2017**. Comments regarding the scope and content of the environmental analysis included in the PEIR should be mailed to:

San Diego Unified Port District
Planning and Green Port
Attn: Mayra Medel
3165 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92101

or emailed to mmedel@portofsandiego.org

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

A public scoping meeting and open house to solicit comments on the scope and content of the PEIR for the proposed project will be held on **Wednesday, April 12, 2017, from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. at the San Diego Unified Port District Administration Building, Training Room, 3165 Pacific Highway, San Diego, CA 92101.**

The District, as lead agency pursuant to CEQA, will review the written public comments received during the scoping period to determine what issues should be addressed in the PEIR.

Other opportunities for the public to comment on the environmental effects of the proposed project include:

- A minimum 45-day public review and comment period for the Draft PEIR, and
- A public hearing for the Board to consider certification of the PEIR.

For questions regarding this NOP, please contact Mayra Medel, Senior Planner, at (619) 686-6598.

ATTACHMENTS

Figure 1 – Project Location

Figure 2 – Project Boundaries

Figure 3 – Planning Districts

Initial Study/Environmental Checklist







PORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE

INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

UPD #EIR-2017-035

SCH # TO BE DETERMINED

PREPARED FOR:

San Diego Unified Port District
3165 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92101
Contact: Mayra Medel
(619) 686-6598

PREPARED BY:

ICF
525 B Street, Suite 1700
San Diego, CA 92101
Contact: Charlie Richmond
(858) 444-3911

March 2017

ICF. 2017. Port Master Plan Update, Initial Study/Environmental Checklist. March. (ICF 517.16.) San Diego, CA. Prepared for the San Diego Unified Port District, San Diego, CA.

Contents

Initial Study/Environmental Checklist	1
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected	2
Determination	2
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	3
I Aesthetics	5
II Agricultural Resources	7
III Air Quality	9
IV Biological Resources	11
V Cultural Resources	14
VI Geology and Soils	16
VII Greenhouse Gas Emissions	19
VIII Hazards and Hazardous Materials	20
IX Hydrology and Water Quality	23
X Land Use and Planning	27
XI Mineral Resources	28
XII Noise	29
XIII Population and Housing	31
XIV Public Services	32
XV Recreation	34
XVI Transportation/Traffic	35
XVII Tribal Cultural Resources	37
XVIII Utilities and Service Systems	38
XIV Mandatory Findings of Significance	41
References	43

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
ARB	California Air Resources Board
Bay	San Diego Bay
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CCC	California Coastal Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CMP	Congestion Management Program
County	County of San Diego
CWA	Clean Water Act
District	San Diego Unified Port District
DOC	California Department of Conservation
EIR	environmental impact report
GHG	greenhouse gas
HPD	Harbor Police Department
INRMP	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan
MHPA	Multi-Habitat Planning Area
MRZ	Mineral Resource Zone
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
OES	County of San Diego Office of Emergency Services
PM10	particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or smaller
PM2.5	particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or smaller
PMP	Port Master Plan
PMPU	Port Master Plan Update
RAQS	Regional Air Quality Strategy
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SDAPCD	San Diego Air Pollution Control District

SDIA	San Diego International Airport
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SR-	State Route
TIA	transportation impact analysis
TMA	transportation management area
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
VHFHSZ	very high fire hazard severity zone

Initial Study/Environmental Checklist

1. Project Title: Port Master Plan Update (PMPU)
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: San Diego Unified Port District
3165 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92101
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Mayra Medel, Senior Planner, (619) 686-6598
4. Project Location: The planning area for the PMPU is the entirety of the San Diego Unified Port District's (District's) jurisdiction, which consists of 2,403 acres of land and 3,525 acres of water in and around San Diego Bay and along the Imperial Beach oceanfront that the State Legislature has conveyed to the District to act as trustee for their administration. See Figures 1, 2, and 3 of the NOP for the project location and boundaries.
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: San Diego Unified Port District
3165 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92101
6. Port Master Plan Designation: Existing land and water uses within the study area can be generally divided into six categories: Commercial, Industrial, Public Recreation, Conservation, Public Facilities, and Military.
7. Zoning: No separate zoning; see Port Master Plan Designation
8. Description of Project: The PMPU, if approved, would provide the official planning policies and land use designations—consistent with the California State Constitution, Public Trust Doctrine, Port Act, and the California Coastal Act—for the physical development of the tidelands and submerged lands conveyed and granted in trust to the District.
9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: The PMPU study area is bordered by the City of San Diego to the north, northeast, and east; the Cities of National City and Chula Vista to the east; the City of Imperial Beach on the south; and the City of Coronado, the U.S. Naval Air Station North Island, and the Pacific Ocean to the west. See Figure 1 of the NOP.
10. Other Public Agencies Whose Approval Is Required:
 - California Coastal Commission: certification of the PMPU.

Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below could be affected by this project (i.e., the project would involve at least one impact that is a "potentially significant impact"), as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions to the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have an impact on the environment that is "potentially significant" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Jason H. Giffen

Printed Name

March 30, 2017

Date

San Diego Unified Port District

For

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects such as the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained if it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an environmental impact report (EIR) is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less-than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated” applies when the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from a “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less-than-Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used if, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063(c)(3)(D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where earlier analyses are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, when appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project’s environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>I. Aesthetics</i>					
Would the project:					
a.	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Potentially Significant Impact. The Port Master Plan Update (PMPU) study area includes all of the lands located in the San Diego Unified Port District's (District's) jurisdiction. A scenic vista is generally defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. There are numerous public areas within the study area that could be considered scenic vistas as they provide views of the San Diego Bay (Bay), San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge, and Downtown San Diego. The proposed project would update the existing Port Master Plan (PMP) to include updated planning policies for the physical development of the tidelands and submerged lands that constitute the District's jurisdiction. These would specifically include a comprehensive update to the land and water use designations and the list of projects appealable to the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The PMPU would include designated vista points and view corridors coupled with policies designed to protect and/or enhance views from these designated areas. However, it may also eliminate existing vista points, and subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the PMPU could have impacts on an identified vista point or view corridor. Therefore, impacts on scenic vistas would be potentially significant, and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings along a scenic highway?

Potentially Significant Impact. The San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge (State Route [SR-] 75) is the only state-designated scenic highway within the study area. It spans the Bay to connect the City of San Diego to the City of Coronado. The bridge provides a panoramic view of the study area and the surrounding area, including downtown San Diego, the Pacific Ocean, Coronado, Point Loma, and the South Bay. Additionally, the bridge is a landmark around the Bay, and views of the bridge from portions of the study area may also be significant. The PMPU would not propose to alter the bridge itself; therefore, aesthetic impacts from direct modification to the bridge would not occur. It is possible that future projects implemented using the PMPU may result in changes to other scenic

resources within the study area. Therefore, the impact on designated scenic highways and scenic resources, more generally, would be potentially significant. Further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area includes a multitude of developed land uses, including, but not limited to, marine terminals and marine-related industrial uses, hotels, restaurants and retail stores, open space, and recreational areas. Moreover, the concentration and location of land uses vary from planning district to planning district. The proposed project entails an update to the existing PMP that would include updated planning policies for the physical development of the study area, including updated land and water use designations. As such, it is reasonably foreseeable to assume the PMPU could intensify existing development in certain areas. Intensification of tidelands from subsequent projects, implemented in accordance with the policies and requirements of the PMPU, would have the potential to degrade the existing visual character or quality of the study area. Therefore, impacts on visual quality would be potentially significant, and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area includes numerous uses that provide existing sources of light and glare. Some examples of existing light sources within the study area include marine terminals and marine-related industrial activity, commercial uses such as hotels and restaurants, and public recreational areas that include promenades and parks. Sources of glare within the study area are typically from existing buildings and transportation-related lighting. The PMPU includes several elements, and some would potentially include policies that promote energy-efficient lighting and discourage the use of highly reflective building materials that result in substantial amounts of glare. However, subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the PMPU would have the potential to result in new sources of light or glare within the study area. Therefore, impacts on light and glare would be potentially significant, and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources</i>				
In determining whether impacts on agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts on forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forestland, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project, the Forest Legacy Assessment Project, and the forest carbon measurement methodology provided in the forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.				
Would the Project:				
a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to nonforest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes to the existing environment that, because of their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or the conversion of forestland to nonforest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?***

No Impact. The study area is an entirely urbanized area where there are no farmlands or agricultural resources. According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation (California Department of Conservation [DOC] 2017), the study area is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land and does not contain any Prime Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance. As such, there is no potential for any actions associated with the PMPU to convert agricultural resources to nonagricultural uses. No impact would occur, and no further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

- b. *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflict with a Williamson Act contract?***

No Impact. The study area is an entirely urbanized area where there are no farmlands or agricultural resources. The study area is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land, there are no parcels within the study area zoned for agricultural use, and there is no Williamson Act contract for any parcels within the study area (DOC 2013). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and no impact would occur. No further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

- c. *Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forestland (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?***

No Impact. The study area is entirely urbanized. No land zoned as forestland or timberland exists within the boundaries of the study area. No impact would occur, and no further analysis of this topic in the EIR is warranted.

- d. *Result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to nonforest use?***

No Impact. No forestland or timberland exists within the boundaries of the study area. Approval of the proposed project would not result in a loss of forestland or the conversion of forestland to other uses. No impact would occur, and no further analysis of this topic in the EIR is warranted.

- e. *Involve other changes to the existing environment that, because of their location or nature, could result in the conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use or the conversion of forestland to nonforest use?***

No Impact. No agricultural land, forestland, or timberland exists within or near the study area that could be converted from Farmland to nonagricultural use or from forestland to nonforest use. No impact would occur, and no further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

<i>III. Air Quality</i>	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
When available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the determinations below.				
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment for an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. The San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) is required, pursuant to the federal and state Clean Air Acts, to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants for which the County of San Diego (County) is in nonattainment (i.e., ozone, particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or smaller [PM10], and particulate matter 2.5 microns in diameter or smaller [PM2.5]). The most recent SDAPCD air quality attainment plans are the 2016 Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and the 2002 and 2012 ozone maintenance plans. The RAQS outlines SDAPCD's plans and control measures to attain the state air quality standards for ozone, while the 2002 and 2012 maintenance plans include the SDAPCD's plans and control measures for attaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone. The 2016 RAQS forecasts future emissions and determines the strategies necessary for the reduction of stationary-source emissions through regulatory controls. The federal Clean Air Act also mandates that the state submit and implement a State Implementation Plan (SIP) for local areas that fail to meet those standards. California Air Resources Board (ARB) mobile-source emissions projections and San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) growth projections are based on population and vehicle trends as well as land use plans developed by local agencies.

The PMPU will be the governing land use document for physical development of tidelands and submerged lands that are under the jurisdiction of the District. Development on these lands that could end up being greater than what is currently anticipated by the ARB and SANDAG would potentially lead to air emissions that are not accounted for in the applicable air quality plans.

Therefore, the PMPU will be evaluated for consistency with the RAQS and SIP, which will be analyzed in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project entails an update to the existing PMP and, as such, would not directly result in any construction activities or operational air quality emissions. However, reasonably foreseeable subsequent projects implemented under the PMPU would have the potential to result in emissions as a result of their construction and operation. Consequently, the project has the potential to indirectly contribute to a violation of an air quality standard or an existing or projected air quality violation. This issue area will be analyzed in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The San Diego Air Basin is in nonattainment for ozone at the federal and state level (8-hour standard) and is in nonattainment for ozone, PM10, and PM2.5 at the state level (1-hour standard). As mentioned in III.b., although the project would not directly result in any construction activities or operational air quality emissions, reasonably foreseeable subsequent projects implemented under the guidance put forth in the PMPU would have the potential to result in emissions as a result of their construction and operation. These potential indirect impacts of the PMPU would potentially result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria pollutants, including those for which the region is in nonattainment. Further analysis will be provided in the EIR.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Potentially Significant Impact. Sensitive receptors are people most affected by air pollution: children younger than 14, the elderly older than 65, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. These receptors are considered to be present at residential areas, hospitals, daycare facilities, elder-care facilities, elementary schools, and parks. Several sensitive receptors are present throughout the study area. An air quality technical study will be conducted to evaluate short-, medium-, and long-term pollutant emissions and concentrations associated with the reasonably foreseeable development associated with the PMPU. The study will determine if the proposed project has the potential to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Further analysis will be provided in the EIR.

e. Create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people?

Potentially Significant Impact. According to ARB's *CEQA Air Quality and Land Use Handbook*, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting facilities, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding facilities. Although it is not expected that any of these types of facilities would be proposed by the PMPU, there is the potential that uses are proposed that have the potential to emit odors. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and this topic will be analyzed further in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources				
Would the project:				
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, etc.), through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances to protect biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Potentially Significant Impact. A biological resources analysis will be prepared as part of the EIR that will detail existing conditions and potential impacts from reasonably foreseeable development that could occur under the PMPU. The study area contains marine and upland habitats that support sensitive or special-status species (San Diego Unified Port District 2017a). Upland habitats can include coastal scrub, created bay fills, and river mouths. Ruderal lands supporting grasslands and saline flats are also present along the coastal strand environment. Marine habitat present within the study area includes subtidal vegetated habitat, open water, intertidal flats, sandy beach, and marshes. Reasonably foreseeable development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially result in impacts on sensitive species. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR will be provided.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. As previously noted under IV.a., the study area contains riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities. In addition, the study area contains eelgrass, which is a rooted aquatic plant that inhabits shallow, soft-bottom habitats in quiet waters of bays and estuaries as well as sheltered coastal areas. It can form dense beds that provide substrate, food, and shelter for a variety of marine organisms. Eelgrass beds are considered “special aquatic sites” under the Clean Water Act (CWA). Reasonably foreseeable development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially result in impacts on riparian or sensitive natural communities. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Wetlands, as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), are present within the study area as coastal salt marshes, the largest of which are along the unarmored shorelines of south San Diego Bay (San Diego Unified Port District 2017a). A small amount of freshwater and brackish marsh, as well as riparian scrub, occurs along the mouths of the creeks and rivers that enter the Bay and the wetlands of the Tijuana Estuary. The largest of the San Diego Bay wetlands include the Sweetwater River, Otay River, Chula Vista Wildlife Reserve, South San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge, and Telegraph Creek. Reasonably foreseeable development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially result in impacts on federally protected wetlands. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area does not provide any terrestrial movement corridors as it is entirely urbanized (San Diego Unified Port District 2017a). Moreover, no marine mammal,

reptile, or fish migratory corridors occur within the study area. However, some marine fish species, such as anchovy, sardine, and topsmelt likely move into and out of the Bay for spawning, nursery, and foraging. The southern portions of the Bay, including the South San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge and South Bay Salt Ponds, provide stopover habitat for migrating waterfowl and shorebirds. San Diego Bay and the Imperial Beach shoreline, like all of California, is within the Pacific Flyway. Several whale species migrate along the coast of California, including the California gray whale (*Eschrichtius robustus*). Reasonably foreseeable development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially result in impacts on wildlife spawning, nursery, and foraging, including stopover habitat for migrating waterfowl and shorebirds. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances to protect biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Potentially Significant Impact. There are several local regulations applicable to the project that will be addressed within the EIR, including the San Diego Bay Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan (INRMP) and the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan NRMP. In the City of San Diego, local habitat, species, and biological resources are protected under the City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), which is implemented through the MSCP Subarea Plan. To implement its portion of the MSCP preserve, the City of San Diego developed the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), which is considered an urban preserve that delineates core biological resource areas and corridors targeted for conservation. The City of Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan was developed in February 2003. The Subarea Plan is also consistent with the County of San Diego MSCP Subregional Plan and qualifies as a Subarea Plan document to implement the MSCP Subregional Preserve within the City of Chula Vista. Reasonably foreseeable development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially conflict with one or more local policies or ordinances. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat conservation plan, natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. As noted in IV(e), there are two natural resource plans, the San Diego Bay INRMP and the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan NRMP, that have direct application to the treatment of biological resources in the Bay. In addition, both the City of San Diego and Chula Vista have approved habitat conservation plans. Reasonably foreseeable development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially conflict with approved habitat conservation plans. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

V. Cultural Resources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in Section 15064.5?

Potentially Significant Impact. Because of the size of the study area and the important role the waterfront has played over time, historic resources are potentially present. A high-level cultural resources technical study will be prepared for the project, suitable to inform the program-level analysis of the PMPU EIR. Reasonably foreseeable future development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially cause a substantial change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Much of the landside portion of the study area has been created since the early 20th century by dredged fill from the Bay. However, as stated in IV.a., the size of the study area and the important role the waterfront has played over time indicate that it is at least possible that archaeological resources are present and further study would be needed. Reasonably foreseeable future development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially cause a substantial change in the significance of an archaeological resource, as defined per State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area is primarily composed of artificial fill, undivided marine deposits, and young alluvial floodplain deposits (California Geologic Survey 2008). Because of the size of the study area, it is likely that paleontological resources are present in the deeper geologic formations. Reasonably foreseeable future development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially cause a substantial change in the significance of a paleontological

resource or unique geologic feature. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Potentially Significant Impact. There are no known burials within the study area. It is also unlikely that any human remains would be located within the study area given that much of the landside portion of the study area has been created over the past century. However, because there is a remote possibility that unknown human remains are present within the study area, the cultural resources study will consider if any evidence suggests their presence and will also discuss the existing regulations in place to prevent any destruction. Therefore, further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

VI. Geology and Soils		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
	1. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	2. Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	3. Seismically related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	4. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Have soils that would be incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area is in a seismically active region of Southern California. Active faults in the study area include the Rose Canyon Fault Zone, which runs under San Diego Bay; the Coronado Fault Zone, which includes north/south-trending faults that run through

Coronado (DOC 2003); and the La Nacion Fault Zone. A geologic conditions study, which will detail the existing geologic conditions within the study area, will be prepared as part of the EIR. Reasonably foreseeable future development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from fault rupture; however, it is uncertain whether the PMPU would exacerbate the existing conditions and cause impacts. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

2. Strong seismic ground shaking?

Potentially Significant Impact. Southern California is a seismically active region, and future development under the PMPU would be susceptible to ground-shaking produced by seismic events. Reasonably foreseeable future development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking; however, it is uncertain whether the PMPU would exacerbate the existing conditions and cause impacts. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

3. Seismically related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Potentially Significant Impact. Liquefaction refers to the event when loose sand and silt is saturated with water and can behave like a liquid when shaken by an earthquake. There are numerous soil types throughout the study area, some of which contain silty sand adjacent to or below groundwater level. Reasonably foreseeable future development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; however, it is uncertain whether the PMPU would exacerbate the existing conditions and cause impacts. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

4. Landslides?

No Impact. Landslide activity generally occurs in areas that lack vegetation and have steep slopes. The study area primarily contains fill areas that are flat. According to the California Geological Survey (2011), the study area has a low potential for landslides to occur. According to the City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study (2008a), there are two areas within Point Loma where historic landslides have occurred; however, these areas are not located within the study area. Therefore, no portion of the study area would be susceptible to landslides and no further analysis of landslides is warranted in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Construction and operation of development projects can cause soil erosion if adequate best management practices are not implemented. The PMPU would provide the land development guidance with a combination of policies and land use designations that would lead to future development. As such, reasonably foreseeable future development, consistent with the PMPU, would potentially result in substantial soil erosion if adequate best management practices are not implemented. Further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in an on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?

Potentially Significant Impact. There are numerous soil types throughout the study area, some of which may be unstable in their existing condition. Reasonably foreseeable future development,

consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially be located on soil that is unstable or that would become unstable, leading to lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse; however, it is uncertain whether the PMPU would exacerbate the existing conditions and cause impacts. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis will be provided in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Expansive soils are fine-grained soils (generally, high-plasticity clays) that can undergo a significant increase in volume with an increase in water content or, conversely, a significant decrease in volume with a decrease in water content. Changes in the water content of an expansive soil can result in severe distress to structures built upon it. Although both expansive and liquefiable soil conditions are influenced by the presence of groundwater, soil expansion differs from soil liquefaction in that soil expansion is not seismically induced. There is the potential that expansive soils are located within the study area, as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code. Reasonably foreseeable future development, consistent with the PMPU should it be approved, would potentially be located on expansive soil; however, it is uncertain whether the PMPU would exacerbate the existing conditions and cause impacts. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis will be provided in the EIR.

e. Have soils that would be incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems in areas where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

No Impact. The entire study area is urbanized and has sewer service. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems would be required for any project that would be proposed in accordance with the PMPU. Therefore, no impact would occur and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The project entails an update to the existing PMP and, as such, would not directly result in any construction- or operation-related greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. However, reasonably foreseeable subsequent projects implemented under the PMPU would have the potential to result in GHG emissions from their future construction and operation. Consequently, the project has the potential to indirectly exceed an established threshold for GHG emissions. This issue area will be analyzed in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The District has enacted a variety of policies and plans to reduce GHG emissions as part of its Climate Action Plan (CAP). However, The CAP has a time horizon through 2035 and the PMPU's time horizon may be longer. As a result, reasonably foreseeable future projects under the PMPU would potentially increase GHG emissions around the port. Therefore, the project may conflict with or impede implementation of plans, policies, or regulations that were adopted to reduce GHG emissions. This issue will be analyzed in the EIR.

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Be located within an airport land use plan area or, where such a plan has not been adopted, be within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g.	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including in areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

- a. *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The project is a comprehensive update to the existing PMP. Although the PMPU would not directly create a significant hazard, the indirect effect of the PMPU's implementation would lead to reasonably foreseeable future development planned in accordance with the policies contained within the PMPU. This anticipated future development would have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. See VIII.a. The indirect effect of the PMPU's implementation would lead to reasonably foreseeable future development planned in accordance with the policies contained within the PMPU. This anticipated future development would have the potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

- c. *Emit hazardous emissions or involve handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school?***

Potentially Significant Impact. There are many schools within 0.25 mile of the study area. The indirect effect of the PMPU's implementation would lead to reasonably foreseeable future development planned in accordance with the policies contained within the PMPU. This anticipated future development would potentially involve handling acutely hazardous materials and could emit hazardous emissions near a school. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

- d. *Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

Potentially Significant Impact. There are known hazardous materials sites within the study area. The indirect effect of the PMPU's implementation would lead to reasonably foreseeable future development planned in accordance with the policies contained within the PMPU. This anticipated future development would potentially be located within or near existing hazardous material sites. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

- e. *For a project within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area includes the San Diego International Airport (SDIA). It is within Review Areas 1 and 2 of the Airport Influence Area, per the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for this airport (SDIA 2014). Future development planned in accordance with the policies contained within the PMPU is reasonably foreseeable. This anticipated future development would potentially be located within 2 miles of the SDIA. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

No Impact. The study area is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No hazard impacts related to private airstrips would occur with implementation of the proposed project, and no further analysis of this threshold is warranted in the EIR.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. Applicable emergency response plan requirements are set forth by the County of San Diego Office of Emergency Services (OES) Operational Area Emergency Plan and other local police and fire departments within or adjacent to the study area. OES coordinates emergency response at the local level in the event of a disaster, including fires. Emergency response coordination is generally facilitated by the Operational Area Emergency Operations Center as well as other local responding agencies. Reasonably foreseeable projects implemented in accordance with the PMPU would have the potential to conflict with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

No Impact. State law requires that all local jurisdictions identify very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZs) within their areas of responsibility (California Government Code, Section 51175–51189). Inclusion within these zones is based on vegetation density, slope severity, and other relevant factors that contribute to fire severity. According to the VHFHSZ Maps (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection [CAL FIRE] 2009), the study area is located within a “non-VHFSZ.” The study area is located in and around San Diego Bay and is completely developed. There are no wildlands or heavily vegetated areas near the study area; therefore, subsequent projects implemented under the PMPU would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. No impacts would occur, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. Hydrology and Water Quality					
Would the project:					
a.	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on or off site?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h.	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i.	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j.	Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project entails the comprehensive update to the existing PMP, which would not directly result in construction or operational activities that would violate any water quality standards. However, projects implemented subsequent to the PMPU would have the potential to result in water quality violations and this would be considered an indirect effect of the proposed project. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. See IX. There are groundwater wells within or adjacent to the study area, including the National City Wells operated by the Sweetwater Authority. Reasonably foreseeable future projects implemented subsequent to, and consistent with, the PMPU would have the potential to result in the interference of groundwater recharge. Impacts would be potentially significant, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. See IX. Reasonably foreseeable future projects implemented subsequent to, and consistent with, the PMPU would have the potential to result in the alteration of drainage patterns and erosion/siltation. Impacts would be potentially significant, and further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. See IX. Reasonably foreseeable future projects implemented subsequent to, and consistent with, the PMPU would have the potential to result in the alteration of drainage patterns and result in flooding, as it is not specifically known what types of proposed changes to land uses would occur. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

e. *Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

Potentially Significant Impact. See IX. Reasonably foreseeable future projects implemented subsequent to, and consistent with, the PMPU would have the potential to create or contribute runoff. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

f. *Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?*

Potentially Significant Impact. As described in IX.a. through e., the proposed project would have the potential to indirectly cause significant water quality impacts. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed further in the EIR.

g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

No Impact. Pursuant to the Port Act and Public Trust Doctrine, no housing would be allowed within the study area under the PMPU. Therefore, further analysis in the EIR is not warranted.

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows?

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area includes several portions of the 100-year floodplain, as designated on Flood Insurance Rate Maps (Federal Emergency Management Agency 2012). Reasonably foreseeable future development under the PMPU would have the potential to be located within the 100-year floodplain; however, it is uncertain whether the PMPU will exacerbate the existing conditions and cause impacts. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed in the EIR.

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

Less-than-Significant Impact. Dam failures are rated as a low-probability, high-loss event. Only two major dam failures have been recorded in San Diego County. These occurred in 1916 and were caused by a flood event (County of San Diego 2010). Portions of the study area are located within a mapped dam inundation zone (California Office of Emergency Services 2003). The portions of the study area include a portion of the National City Bayfront near Civic Center Drive (Planning District 5) and the Chula Vista Bayfront (Planning District 6), which would be subject to inundation if the Sweetwater Dam were to fail. In addition, the majority of the southernmost portion of the Bay, which encompasses South Bay (Planning District 7), would be subject to inundation if the Upper and Lower Otay Dams were to fail, or if the Rodriguez Reservoir (located in Mexico) were to fail.

Information in this paragraph is based on GIS data from the San Diego County Office of Emergency Services (2015). The Sweetwater Reservoir is located approximately 6.5 miles east of the study area, and inundation is projected to occur in the study area within approximately 90 minutes if the dam were to fail. The Upper and Lower Otay Dams are approximately 10 miles to the east of the study area, and inundation is projected to occur in the study area within approximately 33 minutes if the dams were to fail. The Rodriguez Reservoir is located approximately 18 miles to the southeast of the study area in Mexico, and inundation is projected to occur in the study area within approximately 88 minutes if the dam were to fail.

The Division of Safety of Dams, within the State Department of Water Resources, is responsible for annual inspections of dams within California. In addition, each water district (or applicable water agency) is responsible for the safety of each dam. The Sweetwater Authority, which operates the Sweetwater Reservoir, is making required improvements that are in the final design stage to improve the safety of the dam (San Diego Union Tribune 2017). The City of San Diego operates the Upper and Lower Otay Reservoirs. The reservoirs have spilled over on a few occasions in the past 10 years, but no downstream flooding occurred (KPBS 2017). It is not known if the Rodriguez Reservoir in Mexico has experienced any failure or spillovers, nor is it known how often it is inspected for safety.

As the dams are not within the vicinity of the study area, there are no uses that could be proposed under the PMPU that would be expected to interfere with the dams or otherwise contribute to the potential failure of the dam. Existing uses within the study area are currently located within the dam inundation zones. No permanent housing would be implemented under the PMPU, as residential uses are not allowed within lands under the District's jurisdiction. If a dam failure were to occur, the uses within the study area are far enough away from the dams that no significant damage to structures

would occur. In addition, people within the study area could be evacuated in the amount of time it would take for inundation to reach the study area.

Therefore, it is highly unlikely that the proposed project would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam. Impacts would be less than significant, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

j. Contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project entails the comprehensive update to the existing PMP, which would not directly result in the contribution to inundation by seiche or tsunami. However, projects implemented subsequent to, and consistent with, the PMPU would have the potential to result in significant impacts. The study area is located within a designated high-risk zone for a tsunami (County of San Diego 2009); therefore, inundation from a tsunami or seiche is possible. Further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

X. Land Use and Planning	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. Physically divide an established community?

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project entails the comprehensive update to the existing PMP. The PMPU is expected to include policies that would promote connectivity between planning districts and the region as a whole. However, more detailed analysis is needed in the EIR to determine if the project would have the potential to physically divide an established community.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMP is the guiding land use policy document for all areas under the District's jurisdiction. The PMPU is being developed to be consistent with the Public Trust Doctrine and the Port Act and applicable provisions of the California Coastal Act. Further analysis is needed to determine if reasonably foreseeable future projects, consistent with the PMPU, would have the potential to result in inconsistencies with applicable regulations, which could then lead to a conflict with applicable land use plans.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Potentially Significant Impact. As previously detailed in IV.e., there are several resource management and habitat conservation plans applicable to the project that will be addressed within the EIR, including the San Diego Bay INRMP, the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan NRMP, the City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan, and the City of Chula Vista MSCP Subarea Plan. Further analysis is needed to determine if policies being proposed in the PMPU and/or reasonably foreseeable future projects that would be proposed consistent with the PMPU could conflict with applicable habitat conservation plans.

XI. Mineral Resources		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b.	Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

No Impact. The Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 required the State Geologist to initiate mineral land classification to help identify and protect mineral resources in areas within the state. In accordance with guidelines established by the State Mining and Geology Board, mineral deposits in western San Diego County have been classified into Mineral Resource Zones (MRZ). The study area does not contain aggregate resources and is not located in an MRZ that contains important resources, as shown in Figure CE-6 of the Conservation Element of the City of San Diego General Plan (City of San Diego 2008b). The study area is not designated or zoned as land with available mineral resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of known mineral resources. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

No Impact. See XI.a., above. The study area is not designated for mineral extraction. The study area and surrounding area do not contain locally important mineral resources. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

XII. Noise	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Be located within an airport land use plan area, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

a. Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would potentially result in noise from construction or operational activities from development that could occur pursuant to the PMPU. More specifically, reasonably foreseeable future projects implemented subsequent to, and consistent with, the PMPU would have the potential to expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards. Further analysis will be provided in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Reasonably foreseeable future projects implemented subsequent to, and consistent with, the PMPU would have the potential to expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise in excess of standards. Further analysis of this issue will be provided in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. As described in XII.a., the proposed project could indirectly increase ambient noise levels during the future construction and operation of reasonably foreseeable projects. Therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. As described in XII.a., the proposed project could indirectly increase ambient noise levels during construction and operation. Therefore, this issue will be evaluated in the EIR.

e. For a project located within an airport land use land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area includes the SDIA. It is within Review Areas 1 and 2 of the Airport Influence Area, according to the ALUCP for this airport (SDIA 2014). Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

No Impact. The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impacts related to private airstrips would occur with implementation of the proposed project. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. Population and Housing				
Would the project:				
a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace a substantial number of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Displace a substantial number of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would directly induce growth by planning for additional marine-related commercial and industrial uses within the study area. However, no residential uses would be proposed under the PMPU. The proposed project would also have the potential to indirectly induce growth, as subsequent uses could require the extension of infrastructure to accommodate growth. Therefore, further analysis will be included within the EIR.

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

No Impact. There is no housing within the study area; therefore, no housing would be displaced. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

No Impact. Please see XIII.b. There is no housing within the study area that would be displaced, and no housing would be proposed or implemented under the PMPU. No impact would occur, and no further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

XIV. Public Services	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities or a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the following public services:				
1. Fire protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Police protection?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Schools?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Parks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Other public facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

1. Fire protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area is served by numerous fire departments. The San Diego Harbor Police Department (HPD) provides marine firefighting services in and around San Diego Bay for the District. Specifically, HPD's jurisdiction includes all tidelands extending through five neighboring cities (San Diego Unified Port District 2017b). Other fire departments within the neighboring cities include the City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department, the Coronado Fire Department, the National City Fire Department, the Chula Vista Fire Department, and the Imperial Beach Fire Department. The PMPU would have the potential to result in the need for new or physically altered fire department facilities, as it could allow for new uses that in turn require additional firefighting personnel and facilities. Therefore, further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

2. Police protection?

Potentially Significant Impact. The study area is served by numerous fire departments. The HPD provides law enforcement services in and around San Diego Bay for the District. Other police departments within the neighboring cities include the City of San Diego Police Department, the Coronado Police Department, the National City Police Department, the Chula Vista Police Department, and the Imperial Beach Police Department (City of San Diego 2015). The PMPU would have the potential to result in the need for new or physically altered fire department facilities, as it could allow

for new uses that in turn require additional law enforcement personnel and facilities. Therefore, further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

3. *Schools?*

Potentially Significant Impact. Physical impacts on school facilities and services are usually associated with in-migration and population growth, which increase the demand for schools and result in the need for new or expanded facilities. The PMPU would not result in the construction of housing that would in turn generate new students within any of the school districts that are within or adjacent to the study area. However, the PMPU would allow for new employment by intensifying development within the District Tidelands, which in turn could increase the need for housing in the area and place a demand on schools. Therefore, the EIR will discuss the project's potential to result in an increased demand for schools that would require the need for new or physically altered facilities.

4. *Parks?*

Potentially Significant Impact. There are many parks and recreational facilities within the study area. The District manages 20 parks within the study area, and there are other parks operated by neighboring cities adjacent to the study area. The PMPU would have the potential to result in indirect significant impacts on the environment by planning for new or expanded park facilities, the physical construction of which may result in the significant impact. Therefore, further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

5. *Other public facilities?*

Potentially Significant Impact. There are numerous other public facilities within the study area. The PMPU would have the potential to result in indirect significant impacts on the environment related to the physical construction of new or expanded public facilities. Therefore, further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

XV. Recreation	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. *Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

Potentially Significant Impact. An increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities typically results from an increase in the number of housing units or residents in an area. The proposed project would not increase housing units or residents within the study area. However, the anticipated intensification of land uses associated with the proposed project could bring an increased number of workers to the project area. In addition, the anticipated intensification could result in more visitors to the area. These increases could have a potential impact on the neighborhood parks and recreational facilities. Moreover, as noted in XIV.a.4., the PMPU would have the potential to result in indirect impacts on population growth, which could lead to greater use of the existing parks and recreational facilities, and the need for future parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

b. *Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU may include new or expanded recreational facilities within the study area indirectly through land use designations and policies. Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

XVI. Transportation/Traffic	Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:				
a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation, including mass transit and nonmotorized travel, and relevant components of the circulation system, including, but not limited to, intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to, level-of-service standards and travel demand measures or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that would result in substantial safety risks?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially increase hazards because of a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would have the potential to indirectly increase vehicular traffic that could conflict with local policies that measure the effectiveness of the circulation system. A transportation impact analysis (TIA) will be prepared for the proposed project, and this issue will be furthered analyzed in the EIR.

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

No Impact. Federal Highway Administration 23 CFR 450.320 requires that each transportation management area (TMA) address congestion management through a process involving an analysis of multimodal metropolitan wide strategies that are cooperatively developed to foster safety and integrated management of new and existing transportation facilities eligible for federal funding. SANDAG has been designated as the TMA for the San Diego region. San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan, the region's long-range transportation plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy, meets the requirements of 23 CFR 450.320 by incorporating the following federal congestion management process: performance monitoring and measurement of the regional transportation system, multimodal alternatives and non-single occupancy vehicle analysis, land use impact analysis, the provision of congestion management tools, and integration with the Regional Transportation Improvement Program process.

California State Proposition 111, passed by voters in 1990, established a requirement that urbanized areas prepare and regularly update a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The requirements within the State CMP were developed to monitor the performance of the transportation system, develop programs to address near-term and long-term congestion, and better integrate transportation and land use planning. SANDAG provided regular updates for the state CMP from 1991 through 2008. In October 2009, the San Diego region elected to be exempt from the State CMP and, since this decision, SANDAG has been abiding by 23 CFR 450.320 to ensure the region's continued compliance with the federal congestion management process. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on an applicable CMP and no further analysis is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. As discussed in VIII.e., the study area includes the SDIA. It is within Review Areas 1 and 2 of the Airport Influence Area, per the ALUCP for this airport (SDIA 2014). Therefore, further analysis is warranted in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would have the potential to indirectly increase vehicular traffic and could substantially increase hazards because of a design feature. This issue will be further addressed in the TIA and the EIR.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would have the potential to indirectly result in inadequate emergency access by not properly considering such access in future development proposed under the PMPU. Therefore, this issue will be analyzed in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. See XVI.a. The PMPU would have the potential to indirectly increase vehicular traffic that could result in conflicts with any adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit or bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Further analysis will be included in the EIR.

XVII. Tribal Cultural Resources		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:					
a.	Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?***
- b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?***

Less-than-Significant Impact. A records search at the South Coast Information Center will be conducted for the proposed project to determine if tribal cultural resources are present within the project site. The Native American Heritage Commission will also be contacted to determine if sacred lands have been identified in the project site and to identify a list of interested tribes to be contacted.

Pursuant to AB 52, tribes can request to be notified of projects in particular geographies. However, at present, no Native American tribes have requested consultation for CEQA projects within the District's jurisdiction. As such and given the relatively recent creation land within the District's Tidelands, it is unlikely that any tribal resource impacts would occur within the study area.

XVIII. Utilities, Service Systems, and Energy		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project:					
a.	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d.	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or would new or expanded entitlements be needed?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e.	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f.	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g.	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h.	Result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Wastewater treatment to existing uses within the study area is provided by several jurisdictions, including the relevant wastewater departments/divisions of the Cities of San Diego, National City, Chula Vista, Imperial Beach, and Coronado. The PMPU would plan for an intensification of land uses that may require expanded wastewater treatment requirements and, if not properly addressed, may cause an exceedance of treatment requirements from the RWQCB. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. XVII.a. above discusses wastewater service. Water service to existing uses within the study area is provided by several jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, the Sweetwater Authority (serving National City and Chula Vista), and the Cal-Am Water Company (serving Imperial Beach and Coronado). The PMPU would plan for an intensification of land uses that may require new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

c. Require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would plan for an intensification of land uses that may require new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. See XVII.b. Impacts would be potentially significant, and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. See XVII.a. and b. Impacts would be potentially significant, and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would plan for an intensification of land uses that may generate solid waste that would exceed existing landfill capacity. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would plan for an intensification of land uses that may generate solid waste that would potentially conflict with existing solid waste regulations. Therefore, impacts would be potentially significant and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

h. Result in the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy?

Potentially Significant Impact. The PMPU would plan for an intensification of land uses that may require additional energy during construction and operation beyond what is currently used within the study area.

According to Appendix F, *Energy Conservation*, of the State CEQA Guidelines, a project has the potential to result in wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy when considering the following:

- The project's energy requirements and its energy-use efficiencies by amount and fuel type for each stage of the project, including construction, operation, maintenance, and/or removal.
- The effects of the project on local and regional energy supplies and on requirements for additional capacity.
- The effects of the project on peak- and base-period demands for electricity and other forms of energy.
- The degree to which the project complies with existing energy standards.
- The effects of the project on energy resources.

Considering the proposed project may result in an increase in energy demand, impacts associated with the consumption of energy are considered potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less-than- Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less-than- Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Mandatory Findings of Significance					
a.	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c.	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

Potentially Significant Impact. The proposed project involves a comprehensive update to the existing PMP, which would include new land use designations within the planning districts and policies that would be applicable to subsequent projects implemented under the PMPU. Although it is likely that the proposed project would include policies that aim to improve the quality of the environment, including fish and wildlife habitat and archaeological historical resources, the proposed land use designations and policies will require further evaluation to reach a determination. Therefore, the PMPU would have the potential to result in a significant impact and further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. A cumulative impact could occur for a given resource area if the project were to result in an incrementally considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact from past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future projects. As discussed in Sections I

though XVII, the proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts in several resource areas. Even issues that were found to be less than significant with implementation of the project could contribute to a cumulatively significant impact. However, the PMPU would not have the potential to contribute to a cumulatively significant impact on agricultural or mineral resources, as no such resources are present or adjacent to the study area. As such, the potential cumulative impact from all resource issues, excluding agricultural and mineral resources, will be evaluated in the EIR.

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

Potentially Significant Impact. Given the analysis provided in I. though XVIII., the proposed project could result in a potentially significant impact that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, these issue areas will be further analyzed in the EIR.

References

- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2003. *Point Loma Quadrangle*. California Geological Survey. Revised: May 1, 2003.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2013. *San Diego County Williamson Act Lands Map 2013/ 2014. Sheet 1 of 2*. Division of Land Resources Protection. Sacramento, CA. Available: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/wa/San_Diego_w_13_14_WA.pdf. Accessed: February 13, 2017.
- California Department of Conservation (DOC). 2017. *California Important Farmland Finder*. Division of Land Resources Protection. Sacramento, CA. Available: <http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/ciff/ciff.html>. Accessed: February 13, 2017.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2009. *Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones in LRA, San Diego County*. Available: http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_diego/fhszl_map.37.jpg. Accessed: June 10, 2016.
- California Geological Survey. 2008. Geologic Map of the San Diego Quadrangle. Available: <http://www.quake.ca.gov/gmaps/RGM/sandiego/sandiego.html>. Accessed: March 15, 2017.
- . 2011. Susceptibility to Deep-Seated Landslides in California. Available: <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/information/publications/ms/Documents/MS58.pdf>
- City of San Diego. 2008a. *Seismic Safety Study: Geologic Hazards and Faults*. Development Services Department. Available: <https://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/hazards/>. Accessed: March 15, 2017.
- City of San Diego. 2008b. *San Diego General Plan, Conservation Element*.
- City of San Diego. 2015. *Neighborhood Divisions, Central Division*. San Diego Police Department. Available: <http://www.sandiego.gov/police/services/divisions/central/index.shtml>. Accessed: February 4, 2015.
- County of San Diego. 2009. *Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning*. Available: http://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geologic_hazards/Tsunami/Inundation_Maps/SanDiego/Documents/Tsunami_Inundation_PointLoma_Quad_SanDiego.pdf.
- County of San Diego, 2010. *Liquefaction*. County of San Diego Hazard Mitigation Planning. Available: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/oes/docs/DRAFT_COSD_Liquefaction1.pdf.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2012. *Flood Insurance Rate Map*. Map number 06073C1885G. Revised: May 16, 2012.
- KPBS. 2017. "Otay Reservoir Spills Over Its Dam for the First Time Since 2011." <http://www.kpbs.org/news/2017/mar/01/san-diego-officials-expect-no-danger-after-otay/>. Accessed: March 17.

San Diego County Office of Emergency Services. 2015. Dam inundation GIS data accessed from SANGIS website. GIS data developed by California Office of Emergency Services and County of San Diego, Department of Public Works.

San Diego International Airport. 2014. *Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan*. May. Available: http://www.san.org/documents/aluc/SDIA_ALUCP_2014.pdf. Accessed: February 4, 2015.

San Diego Unified Port District. 2017a. San Diego Bay and Imperial Beach Oceanfront Fireworks Display Events Draft Environmental Impact Report. March 2017.

San Diego Unified Port District. 2017b. *Functions of the Harbor Police Department*. Available: <https://www.portofsandiego.org/harbor-police/harbor-police-functions.html>. Accessed: March 2017.

San Diego Union Tribune. 2017. "Sweetwater Authority Readies Dam for 'Worst-Case Storm.'" Available: <http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/communities/south-county/sd-se-sweetwater-dam-0302-story.html> . Accessed: March 17