



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

## REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE ISSUED: October 6, 2005 REPORT NO. PC-05-304

ATTENTION: Planning Commission  
Agenda of October 13, 2005

SUBJECT: Workshop on the General Plan Update – Revised Outline and Timeline

REFERENCE: Manager's Report Nos. 03-019, 03-115, 03-204, 03-205, 03-206, 04-149, 05-038, 05-161  
Planning Report Nos. P-03-183, P-03-227, P-03-333, PC-04-220, PC-05-070, PC-05-183, PC-05-261

### SUMMARY

THIS REPORT PRESENTS A REVISED ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE FOR THE DRAFT GENERAL PLAN AS A MEANS TO RESPOND TO COMMISSION AND PUBLIC COMMENTS. IN ADDITION, STAFF WILL REPORT ON PUBLIC INPUT RECEIVED TO DATE, PRESENT AN UPDATED TIMELINE FOR GENERAL PLAN ADOPTION, AND INTRODUCE A PARTIAL DRAFT OF THE MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT. NO ACTION IS REQUIRED ON THE PART OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AT THIS TIME.

### BACKGROUND

On July 14, 2005 the Planning Commission held a workshop covering the entire July 2005 Draft General Plan (document available online at <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/gpupdate.shtml>). Commissioners had extensive comments, and asked staff to return for an additional workshop, which was held on September 22, 2005. The City Council's Committee on Land Use and Housing (LU&H) also reviewed the July 2005 Draft General Plan at their meeting of July 27, 2005, and the Community Planners Committee (CPC) discussed the draft document at their meetings of August 23, 2005 and September 27, 2005. Notes from the August 23, 2005 CPC meeting are included as Attachment 1. A list of public comment letters received is shown as Attachment 2. A binder containing public comment letters received is available for review in the offices of the Planning Department.

### DISCUSSION

#### **Revised General Plan Outline**

Staff is recommending a revised outline for the General Plan to improve the document and to be responsive to Planning Commission and public comments (see Attachment 3). Key changes include:

- Purpose and Intent, and Plan Issues sections will be added to each element.
- A new “Foundation for Planning” chapter is proposed that will tell the reader how the General Plan is organized and establish the General Plan’s relationship to the community plans.
- Portions of the Strategic Framework Element will be maintained as a distinct element of the General Plan, rather than being combined with the Land Use Element.
- The Land Use Element will be called the Land Use and Community Planning Element to highlight the importance of the community planning program. A discussion on existing conditions and growth projections will be added.
- The Urban Design Element is undergoing a major revision with input from stakeholders.

Revisions throughout the draft document are underway to improve clarity, eliminate any inconsistencies and redundancies, and provide additional data/input to support the recommended policies. In addition, staff is considering removing the City of Villages Transit/Land Use Connections Map from the General Plan (see the fold-out map in the July 2005 Draft General Plan, or follow the link provided above and click on “COV/Land Use Map”). Many planning groups have opposed inclusion of the map because it identifies some potential village sites that are not a part of adopted community plans. The village sites shown on the map are the same areas that are identified on the “City of Villages Opportunity Areas Map,” which was approved as Appendix A of the Strategic Framework Element Action Plan. While staff believes that the map offers a valuable illustrative view of the City of Villages strategy, we acknowledge that the map carries no legal land use authority and may be a source of confusion to the public. An alternative to the existing draft map would be to create one that includes transit and land use information, but does not identify potential village sites.

### **Community Planners Committee**

The CPC discussed the July 2005 Draft General Plan at their meeting of August 23, 2005 (see Attachment 1), and had a follow-up discussion at their meeting of September 27, 2005. They have committed to reviewing each element of the General Plan, and have initiated a series of subcommittee meetings where in-depth review of the General Plan will occur. Staff and CPC have agreed to discuss two elements per month at subcommittee and regular CPC meetings, from October 2005 through January 2006. The CPC will be discussing the City of Villages Transit/Land Use Connections Map during their discussions on the Land Use and Mobility Elements; the initial CPC response to removing the map was positive.

### **Revised Timeline**

The timeline for adoption of the updated General Plan is now anticipated for June of 2006. This extension in the schedule is necessary in part due to the City Council and Mayor vacancies, and also to allow more time to edit the document, as requested by the Land Use and Housing Committee, Planning Commission, Community Planners Committee, and other members of the public. Key dates leading to the June adoption date are shown on Attachment 4.

### **Master Environmental Assessment (MEA)**

The Planning Department is in the process of preparing a Master Environmental Assessment for the City of San Diego. The MEA, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15169, will be an inventory of the physical and biological characteristics of the City. Wherever

possible, the inventoried characteristics and information are depicted on a series of maps; in addition, lists will contain certain collected information. The MEA builds upon the Existing Conditions Data Collection effort that was completed in July 2004. The Existing Conditions effort involved collecting data from other departments, working with community groups to verify accuracy, and improving a GIS database. The existing conditions maps are available online, by community, at <http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/existing.shtml>.

The MEA contains valuable information that has been useful in drafting the General Plan. It is anticipated that the MEA will also serve as a resource for future community plan updates and amendments, preparation of a financing strategy for public facilities, and preparation of environmental documents. The MEA is being prepared concurrently with the General Plan, but is not a requirement for General Plan adoption.

The MEA Draft Outline and Introduction is included as Attachment 5. Due to the length and preliminary nature of the complete working draft document, a limited number of copies have been printed and are being distributed to the Planning Commission under separate cover. Copies of the working draft are available for public review in the Offices of the Planning Department, and will be made available online and on compact discs after additional refinements have been made.

## CONCLUSION

Staff is seeking Planning Commission review and comment on: the revised General Plan outline and timeline, the purpose of the City of Villages Transit/Land Use Connections Map, and the approach underway for the Master Environmental Assessment. We will continue to work on document edits and plan to return for an additional Planning Commission Workshop in November. Strike-out/ underline revisions to portions of the July 2005 Draft General Plan will be brought forward at that time.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Nancy S. Bragado  
Acting Program Manager  
Planning Department

---

S. Gail Goldberg, AICP  
Director  
Planning Department

Attachments:

1. Community Planners Committee General Plan Comments, August 23, 2005
2. List of Public Comment Letters/E-Mails on the July 2005 Draft General Plan
3. General Plan Outline 10/06/05 Draft
4. General Plan Update Proposed Timeline
5. Preliminary Draft Master Environmental Assessment Outline and Introduction (Due to the length and preliminary nature of the complete working draft document, a limited number of copies have been printed and are being distributed to the Planning Commission under separate cover. Copies are available for public review in the Offices of the Planning Department, located at 202 C Street, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, and will be made available online after additional refinements have been made.)

**COMMUNITY PLANNERS COMMITTEE (CPC)  
AUGUST 23, 2005  
GENERAL PLAN WORKSHOP**

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Tom Mullaney- Wave analogy that growth is inevitable. Other cities reached build- out and stopped growing. Discussed problems with growth including traffic congestion, existing facilities deficiencies, and lower park standards.

Brian Martin- Questioned an industrial land use designation in San Ysidro.

CPC COMMENTS

Jim Denton- Rancho Bernardo  
Happy with general flavor.  
Maps do not reflect the look of the community in 20 years.

Tom Traver- Midway  
P.145. A “no net loss” (of industrial lands) policy wouldn’t work for Midway. Would eliminate what they want to do. Industrial only development would not correct facility deficiencies.

Buzz Gibbs- Kearny Mesa  
No net loss should be a goal not a policy. People are generally happy with the Economic Prosperity Element. EP-A.1-should be more flexible.  
Development shouldn’t have to wait for transit.  
EP-A.9-should say “may” be identified.  
EP B.2- note that Kearny Mesa is an auto-oriented urban area, should not discourage auto-oriented commercial.  
EP C-9-do not encourage multi-family.  
Correct representation of base sector uses near Montgomery Field.

Leo Wilson- Uptown Planners  
Glad to see the Noise Element. Uptown is being turned into a suburb. They enjoy commercial and entertainment uses. Need tight insulation standards. Need a more stable population policy.  
Likes the distinctive neighborhoods section (of the Urban Design Element). He heard a one-hour General Plan presentation at their planning group. We need to think about build-out – the coastal strip has 1% of land, and 10% of population.  
It will be difficult to change San Diego into an urban city.

- Pat Shields- Golden Hill  
 Supports City staff, but sees the GP document as useless. Golden Hill Elementary example. The school district went through the back door to build in a canyon. Historic district-county staff tried to bend the rules. Need a “community bill of rights.” Will not tolerate city corruption. Need an element to empower community planning groups (CPGs).
- Laura Riebau- Eastern Area  
 Still reviewing the GP document. Balanced communities has been a goal for many years. Would like to see enforcement.  
 Why not have a 2<sup>nd</sup> water treatment plant? Want desalination, reclamation.  
 Urban Design Element calls for harmony, but in reality there is not harmony in the built environment (re: housing).
- Cynthia Conger- Peninsula  
 Upset with 20 year planning horizon. Airport LUCP – school siting issue. City makes decisions.  
 Role in existing needs. Redevelopment takes money away from general fund-should go back to the community. Deferring amendments to planning boards is awful. Bonds can pay for airport. Cannot keep densifying.
- Jeff Stevens- Mira Mesa  
 Too much fluff in the GP-childhood obesity example.  
 Nice words that don’t link with housing.  
 Camino Ruiz village example – site wasn’t recommended by the group.  
 Now a proposal is in without facilities/transit.  
 City of Villages should be considered “experimental.”
- Jim Varnadore- City Heights  
 Transit issues  
 - Not much about role of planning groups  
 - Wants to assign veto power to CPGs  
 - Strategic Framework Element City of Villages map was flawed.  
 Implementation focus is on poorer communities.
- Guy Pruess- Skyline Paradise Hills  
 Parking Management section - footnotes do not validate. Parking is worth the cost. Parking is needed.  
 In-lieu fees are worthless, see ME-74.
- Judy Elliot- Normal Heights – Facilities  
 They lack infrastructure, same as past 30 years. Impact of infill on facilities. How do we get out of deficit? Doesn’t see how we can get out of deficit, let alone add density. Politicians don’t support taxes. Will not support plan. CPGs want a greater role, need veto power.

- Mel Ingalls- Otay Mesa  
EPE, pg. 10 goes with new ideas about Otay Mesa. Comments on history of Otay Mesa.  
Brown field property is a detriment to the City, but could be potential asset/financial solution to the City with office and residential.
- Eric Germain- Tierrasanta  
Too much fluff and repetition, social engineering.  
Will suggest proposed wording to protect communities from interpretations of the GP that conflict with community interests or that change the essential character of a community.  
Need a procedure to convert designated open space into dedicated open space.  
Need a procedure to raise FBA fees.  
GP Mobility Element is a “jihad” against the automobile (ME D3); there is no policy to mandate the maintenance of roads to a measurable “level of service.”  
Insane to emphasize walkability over cars across the board, particularly in neighborhoods with significant changes in elevation.  
Questioned the 2.4 usable acres park standard.  
P.168 – direct lift from CPI report totally unacceptable, the GP should not be used as a medium to propose tax increases and it should not be used as a vehicle to require increasing the size of City government.  
CPG Bill of Rights is a possible solution to the GP’s overreaching: to protect communities from City staff mandates that are contrary to community desires or that would change the essential character of a community.
- Jan Johnson- Otay Mesa/Nestor  
Don’t continue to override CPG recommendations.  
Too much subsidized housing.
- Cindy Moore- Serra Mesa  
Infrastructure and facilities are inadequate.  
Parking studies not adequately done.  
Community plans not updated.  
CPGs need more input.  
Lots of good things too.
- Vicky Granowitz- Greater North Park  
Brush management discussion needed. Noise impacts on regional parks and communities. Example: special events noise impacts, too many parades in regional parks.  
Historic preservation - surveys need to be completed. Want to see demolition permits.  
Apartment to condo process a problem.  
Consider compost toilets as a conservation measure.

- M. Freedman- San Ysidro  
CPC comments should be compiled and distributed.
- John Pilch- Navajo  
What impact does GP have on community plan updates?
- Tamara Silverstein- Scripps Ranch  
There are sites on the map which the group does not want. Questioned the meaning of the City of Villages map.
- Paul Robinson- Centre City  
Age of the EIR question (adopted in 2002).  
Status of Housing Element question.
- Steve Laub- College Area  
Social engineering and science fiction.  
Restrictions on commercial development are not healthy regarding the draft policy to protect viable commercial and industries.  
Need coordinated planning with housing and infrastructure, and with state and federal institutions - military housing is one example.  
Encourage and applaud flexibility in park standards.  
Industrial - where is shortage of industrial land, need a study on shortage.  
How do we compete with other cities/states for good jobs?
- Lee Ritnor- Eastern Area /Rolando  
Commercial and industrial corridors need redevelopment.  
Walkability doesn't always work.  
Need more roads, need to determine where lights are and are not needed.  
Need prioritization.
- Lee Campbell- Tierrasanta  
Read Friends of San Diego handout regarding deficiencies.  
Caltrans reference not found.  
Like Yuba City general plan, good example for a community plan.  
Add level of service standards.
- Reynaldo Pisano- Southeastern  
Noise standards needs to be reduced by use of abatement materials.  
Public facility updates should have input of CPGs.  
Park standards.
- Jim Varnadore- Do not send PDF files. He cannot open them.

**General Plan July 2005 Draft  
Public Comment Letters/E-mails\***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Generalized Topics Addressed</b>
City of Coronado, Tony Pena	Letter	Consider addressing detachment of lands from the City of San Diego (Navy Air Station North Island)
City Heights Area Planning Committee	Letters	Multiple letters address several elements
Environmental Health Coalition, Paula Forbis	Letter	Letter addressed to the Planning Commission in support of the draft collocation policy
Friends of San Diego, Tom Mullaney	Letter	Critical of smart growth and higher densities
Hanson Aggregates, Marvin Howell	Letter	Questioned designation of a site as “Park and Open Space” in Otay-Nestor
Hoegemeier, John	Email	Freight/rail
Johnson, Mary and Cindy Moore	Letter	Community planning group (CPG) role, glossary, big box retail
Kearny Mesa CPG, Buzz Gibbs	Letter	Economic Prosperity Element
Otay Coalition, MNA Consulting	Letter	Primarily addresses how Economic Prosperity policies affect Otay Mesa
Quiroz, Theresa	E-mail	Land Use Element- environmental justice
R.S. Robinson Company, Rebecca Robinson-Wood	Letter	University City – site specific issue related to land use and MHPA designation
San Diego City Firefighters	Letter	Collocation, jobs/housing balance, loss of industrial land
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority	Letter	Coordination needed between the General Plan and Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans
Scripps Ranch CPG, Robert Ilko	Letter	Opposed to Neighborhood Village designations in Scripps Ranch
US Marine Corp, Colonel P.S. Parkhurst	Letter	Development potential within Accident Potential Zone
Westfield, Greg Fitchitt,	Letter	Implications for regional shopping centers

\* Please note that additional public comments have been received through public meetings, phone calls, and stakeholder discussions.



## DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION GENERAL PLAN OUTLINE – 10/6/05

### I. VISION AND CORE VALUES

- Vision Statement
- Core Values (*These should tie through all the elements*)

Is this a change from the July Draft? Yes

Staff Discussion: This is primarily a text revision not a new addition. Staff is recommending that this section serve as a citywide preamble to the General Plan. The General Plan should begin with a clear direction and focus. That direction is provided by the Strategic Framework Element's Vision Statement and Core Values. Staff recommends that the Strategic Framework Element continue to serve as the portion of the General Plan that would bridge the other elements and would present the overall direction for planning of the City.

### II. FOUNDATION FOR PLANNING

- Background/History
- Role and Purpose of the General Plan
  - Regional in Context/Inter-jurisdictional Coordination
  - Identify Major Policy Changes from adopted General Plan
- San Diego Planning Area/Sphere of Influence
  - Reorganization/Annexation Discussion
- Plan Organization: Elements/Topics/Focus
- Relationship to Community Plans
- Relationship to Other Policy/Plan Documents
- Environment Justice
- Equitable Development
- Plan Amendment Process

Is this a change from the July Draft? Yes.

Staff Discussion: This chapter is new and is intended to fulfill several California Government Code requirements. This chapter will tell the reader how the General Plan is organized and establish the General Plan's relationship to the community plans as well as other adopted policy documents. Staff is also suggesting that this chapter would be the most appropriate location for the Environmental Justice and the Equitable Development discussions since those topics relate to all of the elements and not just one.

### III. STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

- Purpose and Intent
- Plan Issues - Behind the Strategy: Trends and Challenges
- Goals/Guiding Principles
- City of Villages Citywide Policies
  - Urban Form
  - Neighborhood Quality

- Public Facilities and Services
- Conservation and the Environment
- Mobility
- Housing Affordability
- Economic Prosperity and Regionalism
- Beyond 2020

Is this a change from the July Draft? Yes

Staff Discussion: The Strategic Framework Element is the most recently adopted element of the General Plan and it sets the framework for the other elements of the General Plan. The policies should be updated where necessary but most of the document should remain as a separate element since it addresses much more than just land use planning. Staff is recommending that the vision and core values be moved to Chapter I of the General Plan. Staff is also recommending that the village strategies be moved to Chapter IV, the Land Use and Community Planning Element.

#### **IV. LAND USE AND COMMUNITY PLANNING**

- Purpose and Intent
- Plan Issues
- Goals/Guiding Principles
- Existing Conditions and Growth Projections
- City of Villages Strategies
  - Village Locational Criteria
  - Policies
- Evaluation of New Growth
  - Factors for Evaluating New Development
  - Proposition “A”: The Managed Growth Initiative
  - Proposition “A” Lands
- General Plan Land Use Categories
  - Parks and Open Space
  - Agriculture
  - Residential
  - Commercial Employment, Retail, and Services
  - Industrial
  - Institutional/Public and Semi-Public
  - Multiple Use
- Community Planning
  - Roles and Relationships with Community Plans
    - Preparation of Community Plans
    - Form and Content
    - Land Use Designations
    - Planning for Coastal Resources
  - Consistency

Is this a Change from the July Draft? Yes

Staff Discussion: Staff intends to work closely with the Community Planners Committee (CPC) to refine the policy recommendations relating to community plans. We will also be

working with the CPC to develop two companion manuals to the General Plan that will address: 1) Guidelines for Community Plan Preparation, and 2) Guidelines for General Plan Amendments. A future workshop(s) with the Planning Commission will focus on any General Plan revisions coming out of that coordination. The other revision to this chapter will be to incorporate the land use categories of the villages into this element (those will be moved from the Economic Prosperity Element).

## V. MOBILITY

- Purpose and Intent
- Plan Issues
- Goals/Guiding Principles
- Land Use and Transportation
- Walkable Communities
- Transit First
- Street and Freeway System
- Intelligent Transportation System
- Transportation Demand Management
- Bicycling
- Parking Management
- Airports
- Passenger Rail
- Goods Movement/Freight
- Environmental Quality
- Financing Policies

Is this a change from the July Draft? No

Staff Discussion: The focus of any revisions to this element will be to improve clarity, eliminate any inconsistencies and redundancies, and provide additional data/input to support the recommended policies. In addition, we may propose changes to better link the draft Mobility Element with the proposed Pedestrian Master Plan.

## VI. URBAN DESIGN

- Purpose and Intent
- Plan Issues
- Goals/Guiding Principles
  - Include Historic and Cultural Resources in this Element
- Distinctive Neighborhoods
- Natural Base
- Historic and Cultural Resources
- Streets and Transit
- Public Spaces and Civic Architecture
- Public Art
- Landscape
- Parking
- Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design

Is this a change from the July Draft? Yes

Staff Discussion: This element is currently undergoing a major revision that will be the focus of future discussions. Staff will be addressing the Planning Commission's comments from the July workshop as well as internal proposals to provide better direction.

## **VII. ECONOMIC PROSPERITY**

- Purpose and Intent
- Goals/Guiding Principles
- Plan Issues
  - Context in the San Diego Region
- Existing Conditions, Growth, and Economic Forecast Goals/Guiding Principles
- Employment Land Use
  - Co-location Guidelines
- Employment Development
- Business Development
- Education and Workforce Development
- Economic Information and Monitoring
- Redevelopment
- International Trade, Maritime, and Border Relations
- Tourism

Is this a change from the July Draft? Yes

Staff Discussion: Many comments have been received from the Planning Commission, Land Use and Housing Committee, and the public on this element. Staff is continuing to work through those comments. Staff will revise the July Draft to include text on tourism, maritime activities, and a map specifying the location of prime industrial lands, at the request of the City Council's Land Use and Housing Committee.

## **VIII. PUBLIC FACILITIES, SERVICES, and SAFETY**

- Purpose and Intent
- Goals/Guiding Principles
- Plan Issues
- Public Facilities
  - Fire/Rescue
  - Police
  - Wastewater
  - Waste Management
  - Libraries
  - Schools
  - Information Infrastructure
- Seismic Safety/Seismic Hazards
- Flood Hazards/Fire Hazards/ Landslides
- Disaster Preparedness
- Public Facilities and Services Prioritization
- Public Facility and Service Strategy
- Public Facility Financing

Is this a change from the July Draft? No

Staff Discussion: The focus of any revisions to this element will be to improve clarity, eliminate any inconsistencies and redundancies, and provide additional data/input to support the recommended policies. Staff will also propose edits to policies addressing the prioritization and provision of public facilities.

## **IX. RECREATION**

- Purpose and Intent
- Goals/Guiding Principles
- Plan Issues
- Diversity
- Accessibility
- Joint Use and Cooperative Partnerships
- Open Space Lands and Resource Based Parks
- Park and Recreation Guidelines

Is this a change from the July Draft? Yes

Staff Discussion: Staff is working with the Park and Recreation department to respond to Planning Commission comments. The focus of any revisions to this element will be to improve clarity, eliminate any inconsistencies and redundancies, and provide additional data/input to support the recommended policies.

## **X. NOISE**

- Purpose and Intent
- Goals/Guiding Principles
- Plan Issues
- Noise and Land Use Compatibility
- Motor Vehicle Traffic
- Trolley and Train
- Aircraft
- Commercial and Mixed Use
- Industrial Activity
- Construction/Refuse Vehicles and Parking Lot Sweepers
- Typical Noise Attenuation Methods

Is this a change from the July Draft? No

Staff Discussion: The focus of any revisions to this element will be to improve clarity, eliminate any inconsistencies and redundancies, and provide additional data/input to support the recommended policies.

## **XI. CONSERVATION**

- Purpose and Intent
- Goals/Guiding Principles
- Plan Issues

- Open Space and Landform Preservation
- Water Supply
- Urban Runoff management
- Air Quality
- Biological Diversity
- Wetlands
- Energy Independence
- Sustainable Development and Urban Forestry
- Mineral Production
- Border/International Conservation
- Environmental Education
- Historic and Cultural Resources (may move to another element more closely related to historic preservation like the Land Use or the Urban Design Element)

Is this a Change from the July Draft? No

Staff Discussion: The focus of any revisions to this element will be to improve clarity, eliminate any inconsistencies and redundancies, and provide additional data/input to support the recommended policies.

## **GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND DEFINITIONS**

**General Plan Update  
Proposed Timeline\* (10/06/05)**

<b>KEY TASK</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>DATE</b>
PC Workshop	Revised outline	Oct. 13, 2005
CPC and CPC Subcommittee	Focused element discussions	Oct. 05-Jan. 06
PC Workshop	Element discussions with strike-out/underline or other type of track changes (partial draft)	Nov. 2005
CPC Meeting	Element discussions with strike-out/underline or other type of track changes (partial draft)	Nov. 22, 2005
LU&H	Policy input on any unresolved issues. Review draft document with strike-out/underline or other type of track changes (partial draft)	Nov. 30, 2005
PC Workshop	Draft document with strike-out/underline or other type of track changes (partial draft)	Dec. 2005
CPC Meeting	Discuss complete draft GP Word document (no figures, without final formatting)	Feb. 2006
PC Workshop	Discuss complete draft GP Word document (no figures, without final formatting)	Feb. 2006
City Council Committee recommendation	Recommendation on complete Word draft	March 2006
Release adoption draft GP and environmental document		April 2006
CPG/CPC votes	Adoption Draft & Environmental Document	April/May 2006
PC Hearing	Adoption Draft & Environmental Document	May 2006
City Council Committee	Adoption Draft & Environmental Document	May/June 2006
City Council	Adoption Draft & Environmental Document	June 2006

\* Addresses anticipated meetings with the Community Planners Committee (CPC), the Planning Commission (PC), the Land Use and Housing Committee (LU&H), and the City Council only. Additional meetings and consultations with other stakeholders and agencies will also occur during this timeframe.

*PRELIMINARY DRAFT*

**MASTER  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
ASSESSMENT**

September, 2005



**MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (MEA)**  
(DRAFT OUTLINE – September, 2005)

- I. TABLE OF CONTENTS
- II. TABLE OF MAPS AND FIGURES
- III. INTRODUCTION - CEQA Sect.15169  
BACKGROUND/ PURPOSE AND NEED/POSSIBLE USE
- IV. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES
  - A. Land Use
    - Existing residential - map
    - Existing commercial - map
    - Existing employment - map
  - B. Transportation
    - Circulation Element Map
    - Existing traffic counts – table/listing
    - Existing roadway widths and classifications
    - Existing transit lines - map
    - Existing bike lanes - map/miles of bike lanes
    - Daily Traffic Counts - listing
  - C. Biological Resources (GIS; annual monitoring report)
    - Remaining habitat (type and size) - map
    - Planned habitat (type and size) in MSCP preserve - map
    - Current need to complete MHPA - table (annual report)
  - D. Historical Resources
    - Existing historic districts - map
    - Existing designated structures - listing/map
    - Existing preservation efforts - description
  - E. Parks/Open Space
    - Existing Parks - park inventory maps
    - Existing Open Space - map
    - Existing Rec Centers - map/listing
    - Planned facilities - listing

## F. Public Services and Utilities

- Current fire/police response times
- Existing fire/police stations - map
- Existing libraries - map
- Existing schools - map
- Existing conveyances - Group water & sewer jobs- map
- Current needs – *analysis*

## G. Noise

- Aircraft noise contours - map
- Current standards/available abatement
- Traffic noise contours – *analysis/PC modeling*

## H. Air Quality/Toxics/HazMat

- Current permitted uses - list
- Landfills - map
- Potential existing CO hot spots – *analysis/PC modeling*

## I. Visual Quality/Aesthetics

- Identified/designated view corridors- listing
- Significant topography – map (steep slopes)
- Preservation efforts

## J. Aggregate Resources

- Existing extractive operations - map
- Remaining resources – state maps
- Recycling – construction/demolition debris

## K. Geologic Hazards

- Known hazards – map
- Current protection standards

## L. Paleontological Resources

- Geologic Formations - descriptions

## M. Stormwater/Water Quality

- Available monitoring data – water quality data
- Existing stormwater facilities
- Planned/adopted standards

# INTRODUCTION

## STATE CEQA GUIDELINES DEFINITION

### 15169. Master Environmental Assessment

(a) General. A public agency may prepare a Master Environmental Assessment, inventory, or data base for all, or a portion of, the territory subject to its control in order to provide information which may be used or referenced in EIRs or Negative Declarations. Neither the content, the format, nor the procedures to be used to develop a Master Environmental Assessment are prescribed by these Guidelines. The descriptions contained in this section are advisory. A Master Environmental Assessment is suggested solely as an approach to identify and organize environmental information for a region or area of the state.

(b) Contents. A Master Environmental Assessment may contain an inventory of the physical and biological characteristics of the area for which it is prepared and may contain such additional data and information as the public agency determines is useful or necessary to describe environmental characteristics of the area. It may include identification of existing levels of quality and supply of air and water, capacities and levels of use of existing services and facilities, and generalized incremental effects of different categories of development projects by type, scale, and location.

(c) Preparation.

(1) A Master Environmental Assessment or inventory may be prepared in many possible ways. For example, a Master Environmental Assessment may be prepared as a special, comprehensive study of the area involved, as part of the EIR on a general plan, or as a data base accumulated by indexing EIRs prepared for individual projects or programs in the area involved.

(2) The information contained in a Master Environmental Assessment should be reviewed periodically and revised as needed so that it is accurate and current.

(3) When advantageous to do so, Master Environmental Assessments may be prepared through a joint exercise of powers agreement with neighboring local agencies or with the assistance of the appropriate Council of Governments.

(d) Uses.

(1) A Master Environmental Assessment can identify the environmental characteristics and constraints of an area. This information can be used to influence the design and location of individual projects.

(2) A Master Environmental Assessment may provide information agencies can use in initial studies to decide whether certain environmental effects are likely to occur and whether certain effects will be significant.

(3) A Master Environmental Assessment can provide a central source of current information for use in preparing individual EIRs and Negative Declarations.

(4) Relevant portions of a Master Environmental Assessment can be referenced and summarized in EIRs and Negative Declarations.

(5) A Master Environmental Assessment can assist in identifying long range, areawide, and cumulative impacts of individual projects proposed in the area covered by the assessment.

(6) A Master Environmental Assessment can assist a city or county in formulating a general plan or any element of such a plan by identifying environmental characteristics and constraints that need to be addressed in the general plan.

(7) A Master Environmental Assessment can serve as a reference document to assist public agencies which review other environmental documents dealing with activities in the area covered by the assessment. The public agency preparing the assessment should forward a completed copy to each agency which will review projects in the area.

**Note:** Authority cited: Sections 21083 and 21087, Public Resources Code; Reference: Section 21003, Public Resources Code.

**Discussion:** The Master Environmental Assessment was developed as a way of providing a data base for use with later EIRs. If an agency prepared a Master Environmental Assessment, the agency could reduce the amount of work necessary to prepare later EIRs. The environmental setting would have been fully analyzed, and the likely environmental effects in the area could be anticipated. Thus, the Master Environmental Assessment could help focus initial studies as well as EIRs.