MIDWAY-PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE
REVISED FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
SCH #2015111013

Prepared for:

City of San Diego
Planning Department
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower
San Diego, California 92101

Prepared by:

AECOM
401 West A Street, Suite 1200
San Diego, California 92101
Phone: (619) 610-7600
Fax: (619) 610-7601

May 2018

The City of SAN DIEGO
Planning Department
Environmental & Policy Analysis Division

REVISED FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

Project No. 561546
SCH No. 2015111013

SUBJECT: MIDWAY-PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE

Applicant: City of San Diego Planning Department

REVISED FINAL DOCUMENT May 14, 2018:

Subsequent to distribution of the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) in April 2018, the air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions analysis required recalculation to ensure consistency with the project descriptions for the project, No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan), Alternative 1, and Alternative 2. As a result, minor revisions, clarifications, and/or additions have been made to the Final PEIR and technical studies as shown in ~~strikethrough~~/underline which do not change the conclusions of the environmental document. In accordance with CEQA Section 15088.5, the additional new information clarifies, amplifies, and makes insignificant modification which does not require recirculation prior to certification, in that no new significant impacts would result from the project or from new mitigation, a substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would not result from the new information, and no new feasible project alternatives were identified. The Revised Final PEIR has been redistributed to all agencies, groups, and individuals who submitted comments on the Draft PEIR prior to certification and approval of the project, and who received the original distribution of the Final PEIR.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update ("proposed CPU" or "project") provides detailed, community-specific policy direction to implement the General Plan with respect to the distribution and arrangement of land uses (public and private); the street, multimodal mobility, and transit network; provision of parks and public facilities; community-wide and site-specific urban design guidelines; and recommendations to preserve and enhance historic and cultural resources within the Midway-Pacific Highway community.

Implementation requires City Council approval and adoption of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update and other associated discretionary actions, including amendments to the General Plan to incorporate the proposed CPU as a component of the General Plan Land Use Element and incorporate the Mixed Commercial Residential land use designation, rezoning of land to be consistent with the proposed CPU, amendments to the City's certified Local Coastal Program to incorporate the proposed CPU, and amendments to

the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) related to the proposed CPU area to repeal existing CPIOZ areas and adopt new CPIOZ areas. The project also requires adoption of amendments to the San Diego Municipal Code to include a new Commercial-Office zone, a new Commercial-Neighborhood zone, corresponding parking requirements, and application of the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone to the community as a whole. A comprehensive update to the Impact Fee Study (formerly known as the Public Facilities Financing Plan) is also proposed for adoption in a subsequent discretionary action. Collectively, these actions together with the proposed CPU form the project analyzed in the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).

PROJECT LOCATION:

The project area encompasses roughly 1,324 acres of relatively flat area and is located in west-central San Diego, to the north of the San Diego International Airport, south of Mission Bay, between the north end of the Peninsula Community Plan area to the west, and the Old Town San Diego Community Plan area to the east. The community is composed of three main elements: the Midway area, which consists mainly of an urbanized commercial core; the narrow Pacific Highway corridor, which runs along I-5 from the southern end of the Midway area south to Laurel Street; and the Marine Corps Recruit Depot. The proposed CPU area is urbanized and generally characterized as a mix of commercial and industrial areas, with some residential areas.

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION:

The purpose of this document is to inform decision-makers, agencies, and the public of the significant environmental effects that could result if the project is approved and implemented, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project.

Based on the analysis conducted for the project described above, the City of San Diego has prepared the following Draft PEIR in accordance with CEQA. The analysis conducted identified that the project could result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of **Transportation and Circulation (Traffic Circulation)**, **Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources (Historical, Tribal Cultural, and Archaeological Resources)**, **Noise (Ambient Noise, Vehicular Noise, and Construction-Related Vibration)**, and **Paleontological Resources (Ministerial Projects)**. All other impacts analyzed in this Draft PEIR were found to be less than significant.

This document has been prepared by the City of San Diego's Planning Department and is based on the City's independent analysis and determinations made pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Section 128.0103(a) and (b) of the San Diego Municipal Code. *<u>As noted above, the Final PEIR and associated technical studies are being republished and will supersede the prior version of the Final PEIR and all appendices</u>.

RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

( ) No comments were received during the public input period.

( ) Comments were received but did not address the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document. No response is necessary and the letters are incorporated herein.

(X) Comments addressing the accuracy or completeness of the draft environmental document were received during the public input period. The letters and responses are incorporated herein.

Alyssa Muto, Deputy Director
Planning Department

May 14, 2018
Date of Revised Final PEIR Publication

Analyst: Susan Morrison, AICP, Planning Department

PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

The following individuals, organizations and agencies received a copy or notice of the Draft PEIR and were invited to comment on the sufficiency of the document in analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated (CEQA Guidelines Section 15204). Copies of the Draft and Revised Final PEIR and any technical appendices may be reviewed in the offices of the Planning Department, or purchased for the cost of reproduction.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
Federal Aviation Administration (1)
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, SW Division, Environmental Planning (12)
Marine Corps Recruit Depot Facilities Div. (14)
Environmental Protection Agency (19)
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (23)
Army Corps of Engineers (26)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Caltrans District 11 (31)
Department of Fish and Wildlife (32)
Cal Recycle (35)
California Environmental Protection Agency (37A)
California Highway Patrol (58)
Department of Toxic Substance Control (39)
Housing and Community Development (38)
Natural Resources Agency (43)
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 9 (44)
State Clearinghouse (46A)
California Coastal Commission (47)
California Air Resources Board (49)
California Transportation Commission (51)
California Department of Transportation (51A)
Native American Heritage Commission (56)
California Public Utilities Commission

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
Air Pollution Control Board (65)
Planning and Development Services (68)
Public Works (72)
Department of Environmental Health (76)

CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Office of the Mayor (91)
Council President Cole, District 4
Councilmember Bry, District 1
Councilmember Zapf, District 2
Councilmember Ward, District 3
Council President Pro Tem Kersey, District 5
Councilmember Cate, District 6
Councilmember Sherman, District 7
Councilmember Alvarez, District 8
Councilmember Gómez, District 9

Office of the City Attorney
Shannon Thomas, Deputy City Attorney

Planning Department
Mike Hansen, Director
Tom Tomlinson, Assistant Director
Alyssa Muto, Deputy Director
Laura Black, Deputy Director
Tait Galloway, Program Manager
Vickie White, Project Manager
Elizabeth Ocampo Vivero, Senior Planner
Myra Herrmann, Senior Planner
Susan Morrison, Associate Planner
Kristy Forburger, Senior Planner – MCSP
Rebecca Malone, Senior Planner
Samir Hajjiri, Senior Traffic Engineer
Christine Mercado, Associate Traffic Engineer
Meghan Cedeño, Assistant Traffic Engineer
Robin Shifflet, Development Project Manager III
Kelley Stanco, Senior Planner – Historic Resources
Benjamin Hafertepe, Facilities Financing
Angela Abeyta, Facilities Financing

Environmental Services Department
Lisa Wood, Senior Planner

Development Services Department
Helene Deisher, Development Project Manager II
Jim Quinn, Senior Engineering Geologist
Tamara Adams, Associate Engineer-Civil
Mehdi Rastakhiz, Associate Engineer-Civil
Bill Prinz, Program Manager, Local Enforcement

Public Utilities Department
Vic Bianes, Director
John Helminski, Assistant Director
Keli Balo, Project Officer II

Public Works Department
James Nagelvoort, Director

Park and Recreation Department
Herman Parker, Director
Andrew Field, Assistant Director

Fire-Rescue Department
Larry Trame, Assistant Fire Marshal

Police Department
Chief David Nisleit
Captain Paul Connelly
Lieutenant James Keck
Sergeant Mike Miranda

Transportation & Storm Water Department
Kris McFadden, Director
Andrew Kleis, Deputy Director
Linda Marabian, Deputy Director
Ruth Kolb, Program Manager
Mark G. Stephens, Associate Planner

Real Estate Assets Department
Cybele Thompson, Director

Economic Development Department
Cody Hooven, Director

City Government
San Diego Housing Commission (88)

City Advisory Boards or Committees
Park and Recreation Board (83)
Community Forest Advisory Board (90)
Historical Resources Board (87)

Libraries
Central Library, Government Documents (81 & 81A)
Mission Hills Branch Library (81Q)
Ocean Beach Branch Library (81V)
Point Loma/Hervey Branch Library (81Z)

Other City Governments
San Diego Association of Governments (108)
San Diego Unified Port District (109)
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (110)
Metropolitan Transit System (112/115)
San Diego Gas & Electric (114)

School Districts
San Diego Unified School District (125)
San Diego Community College District (133)

Community Planning Groups or Committees
Midway/Pacific Highway Community Planning Group (307)
Old Town Community Planning Committee (368)
Peninsula Community Planning Board (390)

Other Agencies, Organizations and Individuals

Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association
Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne Holdings (Land Solutions, Inc.)
Old Town Chamber of Commerce (369)
San Diego Chamber of Commerce (157)
Briggs Law Corporation
Building Industry Association (158)
San Diego River Park Foundation (163)
San Diego River Coalition (164)
Sierra Club (165)
San Diego Canyonlands (165A)
San Diego Natural History Museum (166)
San Diego Audubon Society (167)
Jim Peugh (167A)
San Diego River Conservancy (168)
Environmental Health Coalition (169)
California Native Plant Society (170)
San Diego Coastkeeper (173)
Citizens Coordinate for Century 3 (179)
Endangered Habitats League (182 & 182A)
League of Women Voters (192)
Carmen Lucas (206)
South Coastal Information Center (210)
San Diego Historical Society (211)
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
Save Our Heritage Organisation (214)
Ron Christman (215)
Clint Linton (215B)
Frank Brown - Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Council (216)
Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)
San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (218)
Kuumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)
Kuumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)
Native American Distribution
- Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (225A)
- Campo Band of Mission Indians (225B)
- Ewiiaapaayp Band of Mission Indians (225C)
- Inaja Band of Mission Indians (225D)
- Jamul Indian Village (225E)
- La Posta Band of Mission Indians (225F)
- Manzanita Band of Mission Indians (225G)
- Sycuan Band of Mission Indians (225H)
- Viejas Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (225I)
- Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians (225J)
- San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians (225K)
- Ipai Nation of Santa Ysabel (225L)
- La Jolla Band of Mission Indians (225M)
- Pala Band of Mission Indians (225N)
- Pauma Band of Mission Indians (225O)
- Pechanga Band of Mission Indians (225P)
- Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians (225Q)
- San Luis Rey Band of Luiseno Indians (225R)

Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians (225S)
Patti Adams
Kim Adler
Amber Alexander
Guy Allen
Karl Anderson
Stephanie Anderson
Ysabelle Anzures
Carlo Aranda
Ruth Aranda
Kara Arnaudy
Betty Arsenault
Max Atkins
Hector Baca
Megan Ballow
Jaime Barton
Marliese Bartz
Jessica Bash
Murtaza Baxamusa
Shane Baxter
Bryan Bebb
Carly Bell
Bryce Belshin
Dorothy Benavides
Jon Benko
Dylan Bier
Alex Blackbird
Fred Blecksmith
Joy Boe
Jack Borgos
Dorothy Borzsak
Emily Bosworth
Walter Bradfield
Ashley Branum
Lydia Brizendine
Kathy Brown
Angie Bunch
Adam Burcombe
Arianne Burcombe
Michelle Camaya
Bill Cardenas
Antonio Carignan
Jo-Ann Carini
Carolina Carvajal
Robert Chakarian
Monique Chausse
Alara Chilton
Honyin Chiu
Gena Clark
Trevor Clarke
Chris Clifford
Neva Cobian

Philip Conard
Pamela Cook
Ian Crano
Michelina D'Amore
Tyler Dandurand
Mal & Saundra Daniel
Jennifer Danzig
Jonathan Dashe
Melodie Davis
Robert DeAnthony
Tanisha Denham
Jessica Denson
Darren Denyer
Sheila Deuchars
Anthony DiMarco
Sheila Donovan
Jennifer Duarte
Christian Duyao
Joel Duyao
Elizabeth Eager
Gabriel Easterling
Otto Emme
Ed Farley
Noah Fasbinder
Jeannie Ferrell
Walter Fiedler
Krista Fierro
Shane Finnerty
Troy Finnigan
Graham Forbes
Amy Fourounjian
Michael Freedman
Charles Freeman, PhD
Victoria Freeman
Beth Gallagher
Jim Gallagher
Phoebe Gao
Karey Garcia
Maureena Garcia
Elaine Garrett
Alexa Gatti
Tom Gawronski
Judy Gervais
Joe Ghio
Amanda Gilbert
Luke Gilson
Gabrielle Ginter
Edwina Goddard
Laura Gonzalez
Jennifer Goudeau
Arden Graupp
Devra Gregory

Glen Gundert
William Haifley
Ben Harvey
Matthew Connor Hayden
Joe Herrmann
Jeremy Heuberger
Kirk Hinkelman
Jesse Hodge
Gudrun Hoffmeister
Sean Hovda
Tom Hoyt
Bronwyn Huddleson
Ed Huggin
Bridget Hurst
Rob Hutsel
Jeff Iwami
Kenneth Jackson
Felicitas Jaima, PhD
Sammy Jarnot
Richard Jensen
Sarah Jimenez
Robert Johnson
Roy Johnson
Nic Josephs
Yadira Juarez
Erin Kaese
Jim Kallett
Rebecca Karpinski
Bob Kennedy
William Kenton
Maureen King
Danielle Kobeissi
Robin Kole
Marti Kranzberg
Kaushal Kulkarni
Michelle Landry
Judi Yeager Lang
Victoria Lannen
Francis Larocque
Jerilyn Larson
Marc Laurent
Fong-Ping Lee
Sheryl Lehmkluhl
Sara Leibelshon
Steve Lenox
David Leung
Rebecca Lewison, PhD
Doug Livingston
Lexan Lomibao
Brian Longmore
Lesli Lounsbury
Nora Lovejoy

Carmela Lurie
Judy Maddox
Joe Mannino
Alan Marshall
Jean-Luc Martin
Mara Martin
Ward Martin
Vivian McAnally
Noelle McDaniel
Nancy McGehee
Ann Merritt
Douglas Metzger
Kaori Mizuno
Omar Mobayed
Princess Mora
Kristy Morgan
Lisa Mortensen
Russell Murfey
Susan Nath
Jerry Navarra
Allison Ohle
Ignacio Orduno
Robert Orphey
Rose Ortiz
Donal O'Sullivan
Armando Osuna
Samantha Padilla
Yesenia Padilla
Mikaela Pearson
John Pedersen
Mike Perry
David Pettigrew
Will Pham
Lauren Phonxaya
Elisha Pingleton
Christine Powell, PhD
Guy Preuss
Nathan Scott Prins
Brad Pruitt
Gary Pryor
Dale Pursel
Christopher Puzio
Benjamin Rademacher
Patti Rank
Jorgen Rasmussen
John Rickards
Jennifer Rivera
Julia Robar
Steve Roberts
Christine Robinson
David Rogel
Bianca Romani

Alisha Stephanie Rompre
Nathan Rossman
Donald Rudesill
Dakota Ruiz
Katie Russ
Rita S.
Caroline St. Clair
Elizabeth Samford
Omar Santana
Dana Sather
Bridget Savant
Mignon Scherer
Steven Schillings
Susan Schroeder
Talia Seider
Richard Sells
Jim Seman
Dennis Sharp
T. Sheldon
Matthew Shepard
Vera Shepard
Michelle Shoemaker
Sarah Shores
Dorian Siemens
Betty Slater
Arlette Smith
Gregory Smith
R. Smith
Laura Stacy
Dean Stratton
Michael Stutts
Corby Stutzman
Averie Sunshine
Cayla Surovsky
Timothy Sweet
Anne Terhune
Jennifer Terry
Paul Teyssier
Dyllan Edward Thweatt
Barb Tilson
Kassandra Timm
Michael Timm
Kiyo Tokunaga
Vince Ton
Christian Torres
Margaret Townsend
Mimi Tran
Sharon Tran
Thomas Traver
Mia Tuites
Ken Twomey
Min Upton

Debra Valentine
Jonathan Perez Vargas
Lily Vazquez
Mary Vidal
Albert Vintayen
Lily Voon
Kim Wallace
Brian Wang
Kevin Wang
Richard Warner
Lindsey Warnock
Allison Watelet
Clifford Weiler
Stephanie Wilson
Lee Winslett
Diana Woodside
Sarah Woodward
Tamsin Woolley-Barker
Simeng Zeng

Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Amendment
Program Environmental Impact Report
Comment Letters and Responses

According to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15088(a), "the lead agency shall evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR and shall prepare a written response." This section provides responses to written environmental comments received during the 60-day public review period for the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (Draft PEIR) that started December 20, 2017 and ended February 20, 2018. A total of 192 comment letters were received during the review period. Letters received after the end of the comment period are included as a courtesy.

Comment letters for the Draft PEIR were received from the following public agencies, organizations, and individuals that provided comments during the review period (Table 1). Several comment letters received during the DEIR public review period contained accepted revisions that resulted in changes to the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final PEIR) text. These changes to the text are indicated by strike-out (deleted) and underline (inserted) markings. The letters of comment and responses follow.

Table 1: List of Commenting Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals

Letter	*Commenter*	*Letter Date*
Agencies		
A1	State Clearinghouse	2/21/2018
A2	Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD)	1/16/2018
A3	Caltrans	2/20/2018
A4	California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)	2/20/2018
A5	Port of San Diego	2/20/2018
A6	SANDAG	2/16/2018
Organizations		
B1	Midway/Pacific Highway Community Planning Group	2/20/2018
B2	Peninsula Community Planning Board	2/15/2018
B3	Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office	12/29/2017
B4	Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians	1/3/2018
B5	Viejas Tribal Government	1/8/2018
B6	San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.	2/17/2018
B7	Save Our Heritage Organisation	2/20/2018
B8	Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne Holdings (Land Solutions, Inc.)	2/20/2018
B9	Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association	1/19/2018
B10	Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association (Petition)	2/20/2018
Individuals		
C1	Alexander, Amber	2/4/2018
C2	Allen, Guy	2/20/2018
C3	Anderson, Stephanie	1/24/2018
C4	Anzures, Ysabelle	2/13/2018

C5	Aranda, Carlo and Ruth	2/20/2018
C6	Aranda, Ruth	2/20/2018
C7	Arnaudy, Kara	1/30/2018
C8	Atkins, Max	2/8/2018
C9	Ballow, Megan	2/17/2018
C10	Bartz, Marliese	1/30/2018
C11	Bash, Jessica	2/13/2018
C12	Baxter, Shane	2/15/2018
C13	Bell, Carly	1/30/2018
C14	Belshin, Bryce	2/20/2018
C15	Benko, Jon	2/13/2018
C16	Bier, Dylan	2/13/2018
C17	Blackbird, Alex	2/19/2018
C18	Boe, Joy	2/8/2018
C19	Borzsak, Dorothy	2/17/2018
C20	Bosworth, Emily	2/15/2018
C21	Branum, Ashley	2/13/2018
C22	Brizendine, Lydia	2/2/2018
C23	Brown, Kathy	1/30/2018
C24	Bunch, Angie	2/20/2018
C25	Burcombe, Adam	2/16/2018
C26	Burcombe, Arianne	2/15/2018
C27	Camaya, Michelle	1/27/2018
C28	Carignan, Antonio	2/19/2018
C29	Carvajal, Carolina	1/24/2018
C30	Chilton, Alara	1/24/2018
C31	Chiu, Honyin and Wang, Brian	2/13/2018
C32	Clark, Gena	1/30/2018
C33	Cook, Pamela	1/31/2018
C34	Crano, Ian	2/20/2018
C35	D'Amore, Michelina	2/20/2018
C36	Dandurand, Tyler	2/12/2018
C37	Danzig, Jennifer	2/16/2018
C38	Dashe, Jonathan	2/12/2018
C39	Davis, Melodie	1/23/2018
C40	Denham, Tanisha	2/18/2018
C41	Denson, Jessica	2/20/2018
C42	Denyer, Darren	2/13/2018
C43	DiMarco, Anthony	2/13/2018
C44	Duarte, Jennifer	2/2/2018
C45	Duyao, Christian	2/13/2018
C46	Duyao, Joel	2/20/2018
C47	Eager, Elizabeth	2/18/2018
C48	Easterling, Gabriel	2/13/2018
C49	Fasbinder, Noah	2/16/2018

C50	Fierro, Krista	2/20/2018
C51	Finnerty, Shane	2/20/2018
C52	Finnigan, Troy	2/15/2018
C53	Fourounjian, Amy	2/13/2018
C54	Freeman, PhD, Charles	2/2/2018
C55	Freeman, Victoria	2/2/2018
C56	Gallagher, Beth	2/9/2018
C57	Gao, Phoebe	2/14/2018
C58	Garcia, Karey	2/20/2018
C59	Garcia, Maureena	2/22/2018
C60	Gatti, Alexa	2/12/2018
C61	Gilbert, Amanda	1/28/2018
C62	Gilson, Luke	1/25/2018
C63	Ginter, Gabrielle	1/25/2018
C64	Gonzalez, Laura	2/15/2018
C65	Graupp, Arden	1/30/2018
C66	Gregory, Devra	2/1/2018
C67	Harvey, Ben	1/26/2018
C68	Hayden, Matthew Connor	1/24/2018
C68A	Hayden, Matthew Connor	2/19/2018
C69	Herrmann, Joe	2/20/2018
C70	Heuberger, Jeremy	1/23/2018
C71	Hinkelman, Kirk	2/9/2018
C72	Hodge, Jesse	1/30/2018
C73	Hovda, Sean	2/2/2018
C74	Huddleson, Bronwyn	1/24/2018
C75	Hurst, Bridget	1/30/2018
C76	Iwami, Jeff	2/20/2018
C77	Jackson, Kenneth	2/15/2018
C78	Jaima, PhD, Felicitas	1/25/2018
C79	Jarnot, Sammy	1/31/2018
C80	Jimenez, Sarah	1/30/2018
C81	Josephs, Nic	2/12/2018
C82	Juarez, Yadira	2/13/2018
C83	Kaese, Erin	1/23/2018
C84	Karpinski, Rebecca	2/16/2018
C85	Kobeissi, Danielle	2/13/2018
C86	Kulkarni, Kaushal	1/24/2018
C87	Landry, Michelle	1/30/2018
C88	Lang, Judi Yeager	1/30/2018
C89	Lannen, Victoria	2/16/2018
C90	Larocque, Francis	2/19/2018
C91	Larson, Jerilyn	2/20/2018
C92	Laurent, Marc	2/21/2018
C93	Lehmkluhl, Sheryl	2/20/2018

C94	Leibelshon, Sara	2/3/2018
C95	Lenox, Steve	2/13/2018
C96	Leung, David	2/18/2018
C97	Lewison, PhD, Rebecca	2/6/2018
C98	Lewison, PhD, Rebecca	2/6/2018
C99	Lomibao, Lexan	2/13/2018
C100	Lounsbury, Lesli	1/26/2018
C101	Martin, Jean-Luc and Mara	2/3/2018
C102	McAnally, Vivian	1/30/2018
C103	McDaniel, Noelle	2/13/2018
C104	Metzger, Douglas	1/24/2018
C105	Mizuno, Kaori	1/30/2018
C106	Mora, Princess	2/16/2018
C107	Morgan, Kristy	2/16/2018
C108	Nath, Susan	2/8/2018
C109	Ortiz, Rose	2/10/2018
C110	Osuna, Armando	2/8/2018
C111	Padilla, Samantha	1/30/2018
C112	Padilla, Yesenia	1/25/2018
C113	Pearson, Mikaela	1/24/2018
C114	Perry, Mike	2/20/2018
C115	Pham, Will	2/21/2018
C116	Phonxaya, Lauren	2/20/2018
C117	Pingleton, Elisha	1/31/2018
C118	Powell, PhD, Christine	1/24/2018
C119	Prins, Nathan Scott	2/13/2018
C120	Pruitt, Brad	1/26/2018
C121	Puzio, Christopher	1/25/2018
C122	Rademacher, Benjamin	2/9/2018
C123	Rivera, Jennifer	2/16/2018
C124	Robar, Julia	1/25/2018
C125	Roberts, Steve	2/15/2018
C126	Rogel, David	2/12/2018
C127	Rompre, Alisha Stephanie	1/28/2018
C128	Rossman, Nathan	2/12/2018
C129	Ruiz, Dakota	2/13/2018
C130	Russ, Katie	2/9/2018
C131	S, Rita	2/17/2018
C132	Samford, Elizabeth	2/14/2018
C133	Santana, Omar	2/13/2018
C134	Sather, Dana	1/24/2019
C135	Savant, Bridget	2/20/2018
C136	Schillings, Steven	2/13/2018
C137	Schroeder, Susan	1/25/2018
C138	Seider, Talia	2/5/2018

C139	Shepard, Matthew	1/24/2018
C140	Shoemaker, Michelle	1/24/2018
C141	Shores, Sarah	2/13/2018
C142	Stacy, Laura	1/30/2018
C143	Stutts, Michael	1/30/2018
C144	Stutzman, Corby	2/18/2018
C145	Sunshine, Averie	1/31/2018
C146	Surovsky, Cayla	2/19/2018
C147	Sweet, Timothy	2/12/2018
C148	Terry, Jennifer	1/30/2018
C149	Teyssier, Paul	2/21/2018
C150	Thweatt, Dyllan Edward	2/5/2018
C151	Tillson, Barb	1/30/2018
C152	Timm, Kassandra	1/25/2018
C153	Timm, Michael	1/25/2018
C154	Tokunaga, Kiyo	2/12/2018
C155	Ton, Vince	2/12/2018
C156	Torres, Christian	2/12/2018
C157	Tran, Mimi	2/12/2018
C158	Tran, Sharon	2/18/2018
C159	Tuites, Mia	2/9/2018
C160	Twomey, Ken	2/15/2018
C161	Upton, Min	1/28/2018
C162	Valentine, Debra	2/16/2018
C163	Vargas, Jonathan Perez	2/13/2018
C164	Vazquez, Lily	2/20/2018
C165	Vidal, Mary	2/13/2018
C166	Vintayen, Albert	1/23/2018
C167	Voon, Lily	2/12/2018
C168	Wang, Kevin	2/13/2018
C169	Warnock, Lindsey	1/29/2018
C170	Watelet, Allison	1/30/2018
C171	Wilson, Stephanie	2/5/2018
C172	Woodward, Sarah	1/24/2018
C173	Woolley-Barker, Tamsin	2/20/2018
C174	Zeng, Simeng	2/12/2018
C175	Lurie, Carmela*	3/19/2018

*This letter was received after the close of the public comment period; however, it has been included for the administrative record.

Letter A1

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

Ken Alex
Director

February 21, 2018

Susan Morrison
City of San Diego
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1400, MS 614C
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update
SCH#: 2015111013

Dear Susan Morrison:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on February 20, 2018, and the comments from the responding agency (ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

A1-1

> "A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
TEL 1-916-445-0613 FAX 1-916-558-3164 www.opr.ca.gov

Letter A1 - State Clearinghouse (2/21/2018)

A1-1: Comment noted. The City appreciates the Office of Planning and Research's coordination of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). As indicated, two comment letters were received by the State Clearinghouse. The responses to these individual comment letters are provided under Comment Letter A3 (Caltrans) and Comment Letter A4 (CPUC).

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

SCH# 2015111013
Project Title Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update
Lead Agency San Diego, City of

Type EIR Draft EIR
Description Note: Review Per Lead

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update includes the comprehensive update to the 1991 Midway/Pacific Highway corridor community plan, which is intended to guide development through 2035. For facility planning, technical evaluation, and environmental review purposes, build-out is assumed to occur in 2035. The land use is analyzed at build out using a total dwelling unit yield for a max projection. This is based on the assumption that some properties would not redevelop at the greater density while others will be developed with a higher density as permitted under state and local density bonus regulations, as discussed in greater detail in appendix N. The max projection for residential density is utilized b/c the required infrastructure is in place and documented development reflects max development potential due to the cost of land and the demand for housing.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Susan Morrison
Agency City of San Diego
Phone 619 533 6492 **Fax**
email
Address 1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1400, MS 614C
City San Diego **State** CA **Zip** 92101

Project Location

County San Diego
City
Region
Lat / Long
Cross Streets MidWay Dr/Sports Arena Blvd, Sports Arena/Rosecrans, Pacific Hwy/Barnett Ave, Pacific Hwy/Laurel
Parcel No.
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways I-5, I-8
Airports Lindbergh Field
Railways San Diego Trolley
Waterways San Diego River, San Diego Bay
Schools Multiple
Land Use Mix of residential, commercial, light industrial, institutional, parks

Project Issues Air Quality; Archaeologic-Historic; Biological Resources; Coastal Zone; Drainage/Absorption; Geologic/Seismic; Noise; Population/Housing Balance; Public Services; Other Issues; Recreation/Parks; Sewer Capacity; Soil Erosion/Compaction/Grading; Solid Waste; Toxic/Hazardous; Traffic/Circulation; Vegetation; Water Quality; Water Supply; Growth Inducing; Landuse; Cumulative Effects; Aesthetic/Visual; Flood Plain/Flooding

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Department of Fish and Wildlife, Region 5; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 11; Office of Emergency Services, California; Department of Housing and Community Development; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 9; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Document Details Report
State Clearinghouse Data Base

Date Received 12/20/2017 ***Start of Review*** 12/20/2017 ***End of Review*** 02/20/2018

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 11
4050 TAYLOR STREET, MS-240
SAN DIEGO, CA 92110
PHONE (619) 688-3193
FAX (619) 688-4299
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Making Conservation a California Way of Life.

Governor's Office of Planning & Research
FEB 20 2018
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

February 20, 2018

11-SD-5, 8
PM VAR
Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update
DPEIR/SCH#2015111013

Ms. Susan Morrison
City of San Diego
9484 Aero Drive, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Ms. Morrison:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update located near Interstate 5 (I-5) and Interstate 8 (I-8). The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities.

Caltrans has the following comments:

Traffic Impact Study

A1-2

1. Caltrans previously reviewed the Midway Pacific Highway and Old Town Mobility Element Updates Draft Transportation Impact Study (Dated May 2017) and commented to please use the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) for signalized intersection analysis instead of the 2000 HCM in a letter dated August 16, 2017. However, the TIS dated December 2017 is still using the 2000 HCM.

2. The Draft TIS dated May 2017 identifies intersection #58 having a LOS E for the PM peak hour. The Draft TIS dated December 2017 shows it as having a LOS B. What changed since the traffic volumes used are the same in both studies?

3. Table 4-2 – Summary of Roadway Improvements, proposes roadway and intersection improvements at Sports Arena Boulevard between I-8 westbound ramps and I-8 eastbound ramps; as well as, Hancock Street between Old Town Avenue and Witherby Street (including Old Town Avenue/I-5 SB Off ramp/Hancock Street intersection). An Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) would need to be performed and be reviewed by Caltrans (Traffic Operation Policy Directive 13-02). Alternative

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability"

A1-2: This comment includes the letter submitted by Caltrans. The responses to this comment letter are provided under Comment Letter A3.

intersection design(s) will need to be considered in accordance with the ICE policy. Please refer to the policy for more information and requirements (http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/ice.html).

4. Table 4-3 – Roadway Segment Level of Service Results, identifies Camino Del Rio West from Rosecrans Street to I-5/I/8 Ramps as having a significant impact due to the Preferred Plan Conditions. Section 4.6.1 – Roadway Mitigation Measures states that "the proposed improvement would require grade separation at all intersections which is not consistent with the General Plan & Community Plan Update Goals and Policies for walkable neighborhoods. Therefore, this improvement project is not identified in the Midway Pacific Highway IFS." If this improvement is not identified, please explore mitigation options that will improve operations at Camino Del Rio West.

5. Table 4-3 – Roadway Segment Level of Service Results identifies Taylor Street, between Morena Boulevard and I-8 Ramps as having a significant impact due to the Preferred Plan Conditions. Section 4.6.1 – Roadway Mitigation Measures states that "widening of this roadway from a 2-Lane Collector to a 4-Lane Major Arterial would improve the operations to from LOS F to LOS B." However, it later states in the same section that "due to the historic nature of the Old Town Community, the Preferred Plan does not propose any road widenings or significant capacity improvements; therefore , widening this roadway would not be in conformance with the Community Plan Goals and Policies. Additionally, there is not enough right-of-way to accommodate two additional through lanes and a center median while maintaining a Class II bicycle facility. Therefore, this improvement is not identified in the Old Town IFS." If this improvement is not identified, please explore mitigation options that will improve operations on Taylor Street.

A1-2 (cont'd)

6. Intersection #2 Sports Arena Boulevard/West Mission Bay and I-8 WB Off-ramp has been identified as significantly impacted with the implementation of the preferred plan on Table 4-5 – Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service Results. Section 4.6.1 – Roadway Mitigation Measures mentions the addition of a third right turn lane which Caltrans does not permit or a free-right-turn movement which Caltrans does not prefer as it would affect non-motorized mode operations. Consider other alternatives to mitigate this impact as well as an ICE study.

7. Intersection #37 Moore Street and Old Town Avenue – The eastbound and westbound approaches along Old Town Avenue have been identified as having a significant impact with the implementation of the preferred plan on Table 4-5 – Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service Results. Section 4.6.1 – Roadway Mitigation Measures state that "implementation of an exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on the Old Town Avenue approaches of the intersection and converting the

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

eastbound/westbound signal phasing from permitted to protected phasing would fully mitigate the impact. However, the eastbound approach on the Old Town Avenue bridge is not wide enough to accommodate an eastbound left-turn lane. Therefore, this improvement is not identified in the Old Town IFS." If this improvement is not identified, please explore mitigation options that will improve operations on Moore Street and Old Town Avenue.

8. Section 4.4 – Freeway Segment Analysis identifies the following freeway segments as having a significant impact with the implementation of the Preferred Plan:
    - I-5 NB, between Clairemont Drive and Sea World Drive (LOS E: AM & PM Peak Hours)
    - I-5 SB, between Clairemont Drive and Sea World Drive (LOS E: PM Peak Hour)
    - I-5 NB, between Sea World Drive and I-8 (LOS E: AM Peak Hour & LOS F PM Peak Hour)
    - I-5 SB, between I-8 and Old Town Avenue (LOS F: PM Peak Hour)
    - I-5 NB, between Old Town Avenue and Washington Street (LOS E: AM Peak Hour and LOS F: PM Peak Hour)
    - I-5 SB, between Washington Street and Pacific Highway (LOS F: PM Peak Hour)
    - I-5 SB, between Laurel Street and Hawthorne Avenue (LOS E: PM Peak Hour)

A1-2 (cont'd)

Section 4.6.3 – Freeway Segment Mitigation Measures states that a Managed Lane project on I-5 along the mentioned segments above is planned in SANDAG's 2050 San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RTP). This is inaccurate, as neither SANDAG or any Caltrans long-range planning documents propose a Managed Lane project within any of the above mentioned limits. Please explore other mitigation options that will improve operations on I-5.

9. Section 4.5 – Ramp Meter Analysis identifies the I-5 SB/Sea World Drive Ramp (PM Peak Hour) as having a significant impact with the implementation of the preferred plan. Section 4.6.4 – Ramp Meter Mitigation Measures state that in order "to decrease delays, the ramp meter flow rate needs to be increased from 444 cars per hour to 555 cars per hour." Caltrans uses ramp metering system as part of Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSM&O) to operate the highway system at full potential. By controlling the rate of the ramp meter, Caltrans can manage the demand at a level near freeway capacity and still keep traffic from breakdowns. By just increasing the ramp release rate from 444 vehicles per hour to 555 vehicles per hour without an evaluation of the whole system, more vehicles will merge into the mainlines and the demand passing the critical operation threshold.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Thus, creating a stop and go condition on both the mainline and the ramp. This is an increase in congestion, not appropriate traffic mitigation. Please consider other forms of mitigation at this location; such as, adding an additional storage to the ramp.

Complete Streets and Mobility Network

10. Caltrans views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access and mobility for all travelers in California and recognizes bicycle, pedestrian and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system. Caltrans supports improved transit accommodation through the provision of Park and Ride facilities, improved bicycle and pedestrian access and safety improvements, signal prioritization for transit, bus on shoulders, ramp improvements, or other enhancements that promotes a complete and integrated transportation system. Early coordination with Caltrans, in locations that may affect both Caltrans and the City of San Diego, is encouraged.

    To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and achieve California's Climate Change target, Caltrans is implementing Complete Streets and Climate Change policies into State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects to meet multi-modal mobility needs. Caltrans looks forward to working with the City to evaluate potential Complete Streets projects.

A1-2 (cont'd)

Land Use and Smart Growth

11. Caltrans recognizes there is a strong link between transportation and land use. Development can have a significant impact on traffic and congestion on State transportation facilities. In particular, the pattern of land use can affect both local vehicle miles traveled and the number of trips. Caltrans supports collaboration with local agencies to work towards a safe, functional, interconnected, multi-modal transportation system integrated through applicable "smart growth" type land use planning and policies.

    The City should continue to coordinate with Caltrans to implement necessary improvements at intersections and interchanges where the agencies have joint jurisdiction, as well as coordinate with Caltrans as development proceeds and funds become available to ensure that the capacity of on/off-ramps are adequate.

Mitigation

12. Pages S-9 and 5.2-34 of the DPEIR reference Mitigation Measure TRANS 5.2-24 state "Improvements could include reducing the ramp meter cycle length or providing

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

additional travel lanes; however, specific capacity improvements are still undetermined as these are future improvements that must be defined more over time." Mitigation identified for freeway entrance ramps, includes adjusting ramp meter rates. Freeway flow is a major concern for Caltrans, and ramp meters are adjusted to maintain acceptable levels of freeway flow. If additional traffic is anticipated on local roads, then it is recommended to increase storage on freeway on-ramps. The mitigation needs to be revised to exclude "ramp meter cycle length" as it cannot be an improvement used for mitigation. Mitigation Measures should identify other alternatives for TRANS 5.2-24.

13. Caltrans endeavors that any direct and cumulative impacts to the State Highway System be eliminated or reduced to a level of insignificance pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) standards.

14. Caltrans recommends consideration of "fair share" funds towards future improvements associated with I-5 and I-8 corridors. Impacts that are significant and unmitigated/unavoidable need to have an alternative mitigation identified in the DPEIR TIS. Page 5.2-35 states that Caltrans facilities impacts "would remain significant and unavoidable". Recommended feasible mitigation measures include "fair share" contribution towards ramp widening and/or auxiliary lanes.

A1-2 (cont'd)

15. Mitigation conditioned as part of a local agency's development approval for improvements to State facilities can be implemented either through a Cooperative Agreement between Caltrans and the lead agency, or by the project proponent entering into an agreement directly with Caltrans for the mitigation. When that occurs, Caltrans will negotiate and execute a Traffic Mitigation Agreement.

Right-of-Way

16. Any work performed within Caltrans right-of-way (R/W) will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and an encroachment permit will be required for any work within the Caltrans R/W prior to construction. As part of the encroachment permit process, the applicant must provide an approved final environmental document including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determination addressing any environmental impacts within the Caltrans's R/W, and any corresponding technical studies.

17. Pages 5.11-5 to 5.11-6 (Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities) proposes parks in Caltrans Right-of-Way (R/W). For any proposed parks/park equivalencies on State R/W, further coordination is needed between Caltrans and the City to

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

determine if the R/W can be declared excess and sold to a third party. If not, it may be possible to pursue an airspace lease. Caltrans policy allows for transportation compatible uses within the airspace defined as "any property within right of way limits of an existing highway… that is capable of other development without undue interference with the operation and foreseeable future expansion of the transportation corridor" and includes "area in cut or fill slopes" (Caltrans Right-of-Way Manual, Section 15.01.01.01). Furthermore, Marler-Johnson Park Agreements (Section 15.04.01.05) allows a local agency to request use of Caltrans airspace for park or recreational purposes; Marler-Johnson agreements may be offered for a period of ten years with five-year extensions.

A1-2 (cont'd)

If you have any questions, please contact Kimberly Dodson, of the Caltrans Development Review Branch, at (619) 688-2510 or Brandon Tobias of the Community Planning Branch, at (619) 688-2503.

Sincerely,

SETH CUTTER, Branch Chief
Community Planning and Multimodal Programs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor

Ken Alex
Director

February 21, 2018

Susan Morrison
City of San Diego
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1400, MS 614C
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update
SCH#: 2015111013

Dear Susan Morrison:

The enclosed comment (s) on your Draft EIR was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on February 20, 2018. We are forwarding these comments to you because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document.

A1-3

The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2015111013) when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044
TEL 1-916-445-0613 FAX 1-916-558-3164 www.opr.ca.gov

A1-3: Comment noted.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA — EDMUND G. BROWN JR., *Governor*

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
320 WEST 4TH STREET, SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

February 20, 2018

late 2/20/18 E

Governor's Office of Planning & Research
FEB 21 2018
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Susan Morrison
City of San Diego
1010 Second Ave, Suite 1200, east tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

SENT VIA EMAIL

Re: Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town San Diego Community Plan Updates
SCH# 2015111013 and SCH# 2018011022

Dear Ms. Morrison:

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission) has jurisdiction over the safety of rail crossings in California. The California Public Utilities Code requires Commission approval for the construction or alteration of crossings and grants the Commission exclusive power on the design, alteration and closure of rail crossings. The Commission's Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch (RCEB) reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Reports (DEIR) for the *Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town San Diego Community Plan Updates* (SCH# 2015111013 and SCH# 2018011022). The City of San Diego is the lead agency.

In the Community Plan Updates, there are proposed policies that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. There is discussion of improving "pedestrian and bicycle facilities that provide connections to transit stops, stations, and the Old Town Transit Center". The policy should recognize that a number of the pedestrian and bicycle routes must cross the railroad and/or transit tracks to get to a station or transit center.

A1-4

For the current community plan updates, a policy addressing the safety of at-grade rail crossings should be clearly identified. RCEB suggests the following policy in Mobility Element of both community plans:

> "Coordinate with MTS, North County Transit District, CPUC and other agencies as appropriate to construct vehicular and pedestrian safety improvements at existing rail crossings. Specific rail crossings that should be targeted for improvements are identified below."

There are at least five rail crossings, including both railroad and light rail transit tracks, in the area covered by the Community Plan Updates. The tracks are near the eastern edge of the 'Midway-Pacific Highway' community and the western edge of the 'Old Town San Diego' community. Pedestrian, vehicular, and rail safety should be considered near the tracks. Development near the railroad and rail transit right-of-way should be planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind.


The five railroad crossings listed below have an unusual combination of factors that may justify particular attention to rail crossing safety during the community planning process. These factors include the high number of trains and trolleys, projected increases in train volumes, presence of four tracks at each crossing, concurrent operation of mainline railroad and adjacent trolley tracks,

A1-4: This comment includes the letter submitted by the CPUC. The responses to this comment letter are provided under Comment Letter A4.

significant volumes of roadway users, higher train speeds than the downtown area, and the presence of nearby intersections.

There are five at-grade rail crossings that have both railroad and transit tracks in this area.

DOT#	Street Name	Adjacent Station
026852D	Taylor Street	Old Town Transit Center
026856F	Noell Street	
026857M	Washington Street	Washington Street Station
026859B	Sassafras Street	
026861C	Palm Street	Middletown Station



A1-4 (cont'd)

Figure 1 (above): Map of rail crossings

Grade separation

Consistent with policy stated in Commission General Order 75-D, CPUC staff supports grade separation at rail crossings. Such projects may reduce or eliminate conflicts between trains and roadway users. However, due to a variety of constraints discussed in the Community Plan Updates, it seems likely that the at-grade rail crossings will remain for many years.

Safety of At-Grade Rail Crossings

The safety of the rail crossings can be improved through traffic signal modifications (such as construction of pre-signals), railroad crossing warning devices (such as construction of gates for pedestrians), and other treatments. There is funding available for construction of safety improvements at railroad crossings. However, to accomplish such improvements would require that the City coordinate with a number of organizations including San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District, and CPUC. Other agencies may also have a role in such

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

projects, including the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.

These crossings have automatic warning devices which are maintained in generally the same configuration as constructed approximately 20 years ago, when trolley tracks were extended to Old Town Transit Center. However, the City should consider that there has been and continues to be further development in San Diego since that time, and an increasing number of trains is expected along this corridor in the future. These five rail crossings could benefit from further safety improvements.

There have been incidents at these crossings in which a person along the sidewalk has been struck by a train, or in which a vehicle stopped on the tracks has been struck by a train. Most of those incidents have occurred at the railroad tracks, not the transit tracks, but adjacent to the transit stations. Because of the close proximity of the transit stations to the railroad tracks, safety improvements for the railroad crossing may require modifications at the railroad tracks, as well as modifications at the transit tracks and platforms.

Safety Improvement Costs

Regarding implementation, the Old Town Community Plan, Section 11.2 states:

> "Grants and other sources of funding should be pursued wherever possible. A complete list of public infrastructure and facilities needs identified during the preparation of this Community Plan is included in the Impact Fee Study."

A1-4 (cont'd)

The City should consider the costs to initiate and develop safety improvement projects at rail crossings. There is federal funding, administered by the state, for construction of rail crossing safety improvements. For additional information, please refer to the 'Funding Programs' link on the CPUC website at http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/crossings . The planning for such improvements should consider that some costs, such as project management, preliminary design, or right-of-way acquisition, may need alternate sources of funding as part of such a project.

Rail Safety Considerations

A report[1] published in 2017 by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) provided a number of insights regarding rail crossing accidents. The top four items identified in the report are directly relevant to the rail crossings listed above.

> The results of the in-depth data analysis provided the following insights into grade crossing accidents:
>
> 1. Rail and highway traffic volumes have the largest influence on accidents.
> 2. Train speed has a significant effect on the injury and fatality rate of vehicle drivers.
> 3. Higher volume of main tracks and highway lanes lead to more accidents.
> 4. Having a highway intersection near a grade crossing nearly doubles the risk for accidents.

Figure 2 (above): Excerpt from 2017 FRA report

[1] "In-Depth Data Analysis of Grade Crossing Accidents Resulting in Injuries and Fatalities", Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), May 2017.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

1. Traffic Volumes

   a. Rail Traffic Volumes:
      - *Rail traffic (railroad and trolley) volumes are high along this rail corridor, and are projected to increase.*
      - The crossings between Old Town Transit Center and the downtown Santa Fe Depot Station are projected to have the highest rail traffic volumes of any rail corridor in San Diego County.
      - Along the railroad tracks, there are currently approximately 50 trains per day. However, projections for year 2030 show nearly twice as many trains--98 trains per day[2].
      - Along the trolley tracks (MTS/SDTI Green Line as of 2016), there are approximately 177 trolley trips per day. The frequency of trips (headway) along this line is one trolley in each direction approximately every 15 minutes. However, projections for year 2030[3] show headway of 7.5 minutes. With a shorter headway, there may be near 300 trolley trips per day through these crossings.

   b. Motorist Traffic Volumes:
      - Past traffic counts have identified relatively high volumes of traffic that that cross the tracks at the major arterials: Taylor Street and Washington Street. In 2016, Sassafras Street traffic volumes may have increased upon the opening of the new rental car center at the airport.

A1-4 (cont'd)

   c. Pedestrian traffic volumes:
      - Pedestrians have been observed at all of these crossings, with the highest volumes where there is an adjacent or nearby station, including Taylor Street, Washington Street, and Palm Street. Policies and goals stated in the Community Plan Update would encourage higher numbers of pedestrians at locations near the rail transit corridor, particularly in the vicinity of those stations.

2. Train speed:
   a. *Rail speeds (railroad and trolley) speeds are higher than in the downtown area.*
   b. *Railroad speed.* Currently train speeds are allowed at up to 65 MPH at Noell Street and Washington Street, and up to 50 MPH as Sassafras Street and Palm Street. At Taylor Street the maximum train speed is currently 40 MPH, however, in the past there were severe incidents involving trains at higher speeds.
   c. *Trolley speed.* Typical trolley speeds are highest at Sassafras Street and Noell Street (up to 55 MPH). At crossings adjacent to stations, trolleys are typically traveling around 20 MPH or less.

3. Multiple tracks and multiple lanes
   a. Multiple tracks
      - All of the crossings above have 4 tracks, including 2 light rail transit tracks and 2 mainline railroad tracks.

[2] "Table 6.1.12: Oceanside to San Diego Total Train Trips", LOSSAN Corridorwide Strategic Implementation Plan, LOSSAN, 2012.
[3] "Table 3-20. Summary of Transit Performance - 2010 and 2030", Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, SANDAG, September 2014

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

- Multiple tracks result in a long distance for pedestrians or vehicles to move across all the tracks. For example, at Washington Street, a pedestrian must travel approximately 80 feet to move across all 4 tracks. At 3.5 feet per second, this would take approximately 23 seconds.
- There is potential for confusion about why warning devices remain activated. A pedestrian may believe that warning devices are activated for a train that has just passed, or a trolley that can be seen approaching the station. The pedestrian may casually walk past the flashing light signals. However, the pedestrian may not recognize that the warning devices are activated due to an approaching train traveling 65 MPH along railroad track adjacent to the trolley station.

b. Multiple Lanes
   - At Taylor Street, Washington Street, and Sassafras Street, there are multiple lanes of traffic in each direction.

4. Nearby Intersections
   a. All of the crossings have a nearby intersection on both sides of the tracks.
   b. Traffic queues can extend from nearby intersections, resulting in vehicles stopping on the tracks.
   c. There are a variety of measures that should be considered, including the installation of pre-signals and/or queue cutters, which are traffic signals intended to stop vehicles prior to the tracks.

Based on the FRA's Web-Based Accident Prediction System[4] the crossings of Washington Street, Palm Street and Sassafras Street currently have the second, third and seventh highest accident prediction rates of the 142 crossings that are listed by FRA within the City of San Diego.

A1-4 (cont'd)

Truck Access

In the Midway-Pacific Highway plan, there is a proposed policy regarding truck access:

> ME-9.4 Coordinate with Caltrans, the San Diego Unified Port District, and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority to improve truck access to and from the San Diego International Airport and I-5.

Trucks can present a concern at the rail crossings, such as Sassafras Street and Washington Street, due to the limited distance between the tracks and nearby intersections. If trucks are directed to use particular at-grade rail crossings, additional safety measures may need consideration at those locations.

Conclusion

Modification to an existing public rail crossing requires authorization from the Commission. RCEB is available to discuss the safety of crossings. More information can be found at: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/crossings/

[4] Reviewed on February 1, 2018, FRA Web Accident Prediction System (WBAPS), http://safetydata.fra.dot.gov/webaps/

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

A1-4 (cont'd)

If you have any questions, please contact me at kevin.schumacher@cpuc.ca.gov or (415) 310-9807.

Sincerely,

KS

Kevin Schumacher
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch
Safety and Enforcement Division

CC: State Clearinghouse, P.O Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter A2

Morrison, Susan

From: Huenefeld CIV Carl F II <carl.huenefeld@usmc.mil>
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 12:30 PM
To: Morrison, Susan
Cc: Galloway, Tait; Gruny Col Jim G; Pitman Col William B
Subject: RE: Draft PEIR - Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update / Project No. 561546

Susan We at MCRD appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Midway/PCH PEIR.

We have no substantive concerns. A few minor points.

A2-1 Page xiii (Acronyms) shows MCRD as 'Marine Corps Recruitment Depot' - that is wrong. It is the 'Marine Corps Recruit Depot'.

Pg 3-12 (the statement of intent with regard to MCRD) is outstanding and we very much appreciate the supportive language!

Marine Corps Recruit Depot
The Community Plan envisions maintaining MCRD San Diego as an active military installation and an
iconic landmark of San Diego's military history. The proposed CPU incorporates the MCRD area into the
A2-2 Community Plan boundaries, which is a change from the current 1991 Community Plan. MCRD is
identified as Military use to maintain its land use importance for national defense. The proposed CPU
contains a policy to prepare a specific plan to address the reuse of the property should MCRD close and
the federal government determine that the property is not needed for another military use.

The same comment applies to the Land Use language in 5.1-6 - Thank You.

LU-4.85 Support and retain the U.S. Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego as a recruit training installation
for national defense.
LU-4.86 Consult and coordinate with the U.S. Marine Corps regarding any proposed development projects
or public improvements adjacent to the U.S. Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego.
A2-3 LU-4.87 Assure continuity and compatibility between the City and the U.S. Marine Corps through the
coordination of planning efforts.
LU-4.88 Prepare a specific plan to address the reuse of the property should the U.S. Marine Corps Recruit
Depot San Diego close and the federal government determines that the property is not needed for
another military use.

1

Letter A2 - Marine Corps Recruit Depot ([MCRD] 1/16/2018)

A2-1: On page xiii (Acronyms) of the Draft PEIR, "Marine Corps Recruitment Depot" has been corrected to read "Marine Corps Recruit Depot."

A2-2: Comment noted.

A2-3: Comment noted.

A2-4 Figure 5.3-2 indicates that the entire MCRD is a Historic Resource. While we agree that it is all special, fair disclosure - our historic district is only 25 buildings on about 100 acres in the central portion of the base.

A2-5 On Page 8-3 (Table 8-1) and again on page 8-9 (Table 8-5) you show under the 'No Project' alternative a value of 46.4 acres rather than the 447 acres show elsewhere. Sq Ft of non res floorspace is the same at 2.3+ mil Sft Ft, so I think the 46.4 acres value is a simple mistake.

r/
Rick

Carl F. Huenefeld II
Colonel, USMC (Ret)
Community Liaison Officer
MCRD, San Diego
619-524-8803

-----Original Message-----
From: Morrison, Susan [mailto:SIMorrison@sandiego.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 12:10 PM
To: Morrison, Susan <SIMorrison@sandiego.gov>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Draft PEIR - Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update / Project No. 561546

DRAFT PEIR

Please see the link below for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Draft PEIR and Appendices, Project No. 561546, which was distributed for public review starting today, December 20, 2017, and ending February 20, 2018.

See under "Draft CEQA Documents", December 20, 2017:
https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/ceqa#
<https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/ceqa>

Susan I. Morrison, AICP

Associate Planner

City of San Diego

A2-4: Language has been added to Figure 5.3-2 of the Draft PEIR to clarify that the MCRD National Register Historic District includes only 25 buildings on about 100 acres in the central portion of the base.

A2-5: The No Project Alternative military acreage of 46.4 is accurate, as the 1991 Community Plan (which would remain in place under the No Project Alternative) does not include MCRD or its land area of 400.66 acres. However, Tables 8-1 and 8-5 of the Draft PEIR have been changed to add an additional 400.66 acres under the No Project Alternative to reflect 447.1 total acres for Military/MCRD rather than 46.4 acres for comparison purposes with the proposed Community Plan Update (CPU). A footnote as also been added to both tables with this explanation.

Planning Department

T (619) 533-6492

www.sandiego.gov <http://www.sandiego.gov>

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter A3

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—CALIFORNIA STATE TRANSPORTATION AGENCY EDMUND G. BROWN Jr., Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DISTRICT 11
4050 TAYLOR STREET, MS-240
SAN DIEGO, CA 92110
PHONE (619) 688-3193
FAX (619) 688-4299
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov

Making Conservation a California Way of Life.

February 20, 2018

11-SD-5, 8
PM VAR
Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update
DPEIR/SCH#2015111013

Ms. Susan Morrison
City of San Diego
9484 Aero Drive, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92123

Dear Ms. Morrison:

A3-1 Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update located near Interstate 5 (I-5) and Interstate 8 (I-8). The mission of Caltrans is to provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. The Local Development-Intergovernmental Review (LD-IGR) Program reviews land use projects and plans to ensure consistency with our mission and state planning priorities.

Caltrans has the following comments:

Traffic Impact Study

A3-2 1. Caltrans previously reviewed the Midway Pacific Highway and Old Town Mobility Element Updates Draft Transportation Impact Study (Dated May 2017) and commented to please use the 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) for signalized intersection analysis instead of the 2000 HCM in a letter dated August 16, 2017. However, the TIS dated December 2017 is still using the 2000 HCM.

A3-3 2. The Draft TIS dated May 2017 identifies intersection #58 having a LOS E for the PM peak hour. The Draft TIS dated December 2017 shows it as having a LOS B. What changed since the traffic volumes used are the same in both studies?

A3-4 3. Table 4-2 – Summary of Roadway Improvements, proposes roadway and intersection improvements at Sports Arena Boulevard between I-8 westbound ramps and I-8 eastbound ramps; as well as, Hancock Street between Old Town Avenue and Witherby Street (including Old Town Avenue/I-5 SB Off ramp/Hancock Street intersection). An Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) would need to be performed and be reviewed by Caltrans (Traffic Operation Policy Directive 13-02). Alternative

Letter A3 - California Department of Transportation (Caltrans [2/20/2018])

A3-1: Comment noted.

A3-2: The HCM 2000 methodology was utilized to maintain consistency with the analysis performed in both the Existing Conditions Report, which was completed in September 2012, and the Interstate 8 Corridor Study, a project that shares portions of the same study area. The analysis for the Existing Conditions Report was also performed prior to the release of SYNCHRO 8 which utilizes the HCM 2010 methodologies. For the reasons described above and per our coordination meeting with Caltrans staff on 10/24/2017, the City will proceed using HCM 2000 and commits on utilizing HCM 2010 methodology in all future City projects analyses.

A3-3: In the Draft TIS dated May 2017, the operations analysis for Intersection #58: I-5 Southbound Ramps and Sea World Drive erroneously did not analyze the southbound free-right movement under existing conditions. When the intersection control was updated, the Level of Service (LOS) was recalculated as LOS B for this intersection. The TIS dated December 2017 was updated to reflect this change.

A3-4: The recommended improvements at Sports Arena Boulevard between I-8 westbound ramps and I-8 eastbound ramps are based on the West Mission Bay Drive Bridge Replacement Project (Capital Improvement Project #S00871), which will replace the existing bridge with a 6-lane bridge. The project is currently in the final design phase and construction is estimated to start sometime in 2018. An ICE analysis is not needed since the West Mission Bay Drive Bridge Replacement Project has already been coordinated and approved by Caltrans and is commencing construction; therefore, the Midway Community Plan Update is not proposing these improvements, but incorporating them into the analysis.

A3-4 (cont.)

intersection design(s) will need to be considered in accordance with the ICE policy. Please refer to the policy for more information and requirements (http://www.dot.ca.gov/trafficops/ice.html).

A3-5

4. Table 4-3 – Roadway Segment Level of Service Results, identifies Camino Del Rio West from Rosecrans Street to I-5/I/8 Ramps as having a significant impact due to the Preferred Plan Conditions. Section 4.6.1 – Roadway Mitigation Measures states that "the proposed improvement would require grade separation at all intersections which is not consistent with the General Plan & Community Plan Update Goals and Policies for walkable neighborhoods. Therefore, this improvement project is not identified in the Midway Pacific Highway IFS." If this improvement is not identified, please explore mitigation options that will improve operations at Camino Del Rio West.

A3-6

5. Table 4-3 – Roadway Segment Level of Service Results identifies Taylor Street, between Morena Boulevard and I-8 Ramps as having a significant impact due to the Preferred Plan Conditions. Section 4.6.1 – Roadway Mitigation Measures states that "widening of this roadway from a 2-Lane Collector to a 4-Lane Major Arterial would improve the operations to from LOS F to LOS B." However, it later states in the same section that "due to the historic nature of the Old Town Community, the Preferred Plan does not propose any road widenings or significant capacity improvements; therefore , widening this roadway would not be in conformance with the Community Plan Goals and Policies. Additionally, there is not enough right-of-way to accommodate two additional through lanes and a center median while maintaining a Class II bicycle facility. Therefore, this improvement is not identified in the Old Town IFS." If this improvement is not identified, please explore mitigation options that will improve operations on Taylor Street.

A3-7

6. Intersection #2 Sports Arena Boulevard/West Mission Bay and I-8 WB Off-ramp has been identified as significantly impacted with the implementation of the preferred plan on Table 4-5 – Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service Results. Section 4.6.1 – Roadway Mitigation Measures mentions the addition of a third right turn lane which Caltrans does not permit or a free-right-turn movement which Caltrans does not prefer as it would affect non-motorized mode operations. Consider other alternatives to mitigate this impact as well as an ICE study.

A3-8

7. Intersection #37 Moore Street and Old Town Avenue – The eastbound and westbound approaches along Old Town Avenue have been identified as having a significant impact with the implementation of the preferred plan on Table 4-5 – Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service Results. Section 4.6.1 – Roadway Mitigation Measures state that "implementation of an exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes on the Old Town Avenue approaches of the intersection and converting the

A3-4 (cont.):

Hancock Street between Old Town Avenue and Witherby Street is currently a 2-Lane Collector and is recommended to be upgraded into a 4-Lane Collector classification under the Preferred Plan Conditions. An ICE analysis at the intersection of Hancock Street/Old Town Avenue/I-5 Southbound Off Ramp could be considered once the design process has begun for the project level review and approval process of this roadway improvement project.

A3-5: Camino Del Rio West provides regional access to the freeway from the nearby Midway-Pacific Highway and Peninsula Communities; thus improvements to this facility are beyond the scope of a community planning effort. Due to the heavy northbound / southbound traffic movements along Camino Del Rio West from Rosecrans Street to I-5/I-8 Ramps, numerous mitigation measures were considered. These measures included, but were not limited to, conversion of the roadway from an at-grade facility to an express way, and roadway widening to include additional though lanes or turn lanes at intersections to enhance roadway operations and traffic flow. However, these mitigation measures would require acquiring additional right-of-way to widen the roadway that is already built out to its ultimate classification. Thus, widening the roadway could result in secondary impacts such as acquisition of private right-of-way, removal or reduction of pedestrian facilities, reduction to private parking lots, and impacts to existing buildings. These secondary impacts were found to be in conflict with the vision and policies set by the CPU; therefore, it was found that no physical mitigation measures were feasible to reduce the impacts on Camino Del Rio West to less than significant. It should also be noted that the construction of the missing I-8 and I-5 connector ramps were also considered to help alleviate congestion on Camino Del Rio West; however, since these ramps are not included in the revenue constrained scenario of the RTP, they were only included in the plan at a policy level and not a physical improvement.

Additionally, implementation of transportation demand measures (TDM) measures that encourage carpooling and other alternate means of transportation could potentially reduce traffic along the

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

A3-5 (cont.):

corridor. However, future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify potential transportation impacts along Camino Del Rio West and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through project-specific mitigation, including, but not limited to physical improvements, fair share contribution, and TDM measures which may be more cost effective than alternative infrastructure improvements, or a combination of these measures.

A3-6: Comment noted. This comment is related to a roadway segment located in the Old Town Community, which completed public review of its Draft PEIR on March 15, 2018. The response to this comment will be included in the Old Town San Diego CPU Final PEIR, which is scheduled to be released to the public in May 2018.

A3-7: The TIS dated December 2017 mentions the addition of a third right-turn lane as a mitigation measure at Intersection #2: Sports Arena Boulevard / West Mission Bay Drive and I-8 Westbound Off-ramp; however, it does not mention a free right-turn improvement as a mitigation measure. Though the TIS identifies the third right-turn lane as a mitigation option to reduce the impact at the intersection to less than significant, the Preferred Plan does not ultimately propose recommending this improvement and this mitigation is not included in the proposed IFS. Therefore, an ICE analysis is not warranted since no improvement or change to the intersection is recommended by the Midway Community Plan Update.

Additionally, the West Mission Bay Drive Bridge Replacement Project (Capital Improvement Project #S00871) was modeled as part of the Preferred Plan in the SANDAG Series 12 travel forecast model. Similarly, this project was also included in the I-8 Corridor Study, as part of a collaborative effort between Caltrans and SANDAG, to study the multimodal transportation alternatives to address future regional and local travel demand within this area. As Caltrans was part of the review process for this bridge, which provides additional capacity in each direction, it was also aware of the impacts associated with capacity changes at this intersection.

A3-8 (cont.)

eastbound/westbound signal phasing from permitted to protected phasing would fully mitigate the impact. However, the eastbound approach on the Old Town Avenue bridge is not wide enough to accommodate an eastbound left-turn lane. Therefore, this improvement is not identified in the Old Town IFS." If this improvement is not identified, please explore mitigation options that will improve operations on Moore Street and Old Town Avenue.

A3-9

8. Section 4.4 – Freeway Segment Analysis identifies the following freeway segments as having a significant impact with the implementation of the Preferred Plan:
   - I-5 NB, between Clairemont Drive and Sea World Drive (LOS E: AM & PM Peak Hours)
   - I-5 SB, between Clairemont Drive and Sea World Drive (LOS E: PM Peak Hour)
   - I-5 NB, between Sea World Drive and I-8 (LOS E: AM Peak Hour & LOS F PM Peak Hour)
   - I-5 SB, between I-8 and Old Town Avenue (LOS F: PM Peak Hour)
   - I-5 NB, between Old Town Avenue and Washington Street (LOS E: AM Peak Hour and LOS F: PM Peak Hour)
   - I-5 SB, between Washington Street and Pacific Highway (LOS F: PM Peak Hour)
   - I-5 SB, between Laurel Street and Hawthorne Avenue (LOS E: PM Peak Hour)

   Section 4.6.3 – Freeway Segment Mitigation Measures states that a Managed Lane project on I-5 along the mentioned segments above is planned in SANDAG's 2050 San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RTP). This is inaccurate, as neither SANDAG or any Caltrans long-range planning documents propose a Managed Lane project within any of the above mentioned limits. Please explore other mitigation options that will improve operations on 1-5.

A3-10

9. Section 4.5 – Ramp Meter Analysis identifies the I-5 SB/Sea World Drive Ramp (PM Peak Hour) as having a significant impact with the implementation of the preferred plan. Section 4.6.4 – Ramp Meter Mitigation Measures state that in order "to decrease delays, the ramp meter flow rate needs to be increased from 444 cars per hour to 555 cars per hour." Caltrans uses ramp metering system as part of Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSM&O) to operate the highway system at full potential. By controlling the rate of the ramp meter, Caltrans can manage the demand at a level near freeway capacity and still keep traffic from breakdowns. By just increasing the ramp release rate from 444 vehicles per hour to 555 vehicles per hour without an evaluation of the whole system, more vehicles will merge into the mainlines and the demand passing the critical operation threshold.

A3-7 (cont.):

Construction of this Capital Improvement Project is anticipated to begin sometime in 2018.

A3-8: Additional mitigation measures were also considered for the intersection of Moore Street and Old Town Avenue; these mitigation measures include the implementation of a single-lane roundabout, and a double-lane roundabout at the intersection. However, due to the limited right-of-way at this intersection, and the short storage space on the Moore Street bridge, it could not be determined with full certainty that these improvements could reduce the impacts at the intersection to less than significant without causing secondary impacts to either private property or other freeway ramps. Therefore, the impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable.

A3-9: SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RTP) Revenue Constrained Managed Lanes and Highway Network proposes two managed lanes along the I-5 Freeway between the I-8 Freeway and La Jolla Village Drive. Therefore, the managed lane mitigation measure described at the following locations are still valid:

- I-5 northbound and southbound from Clairemont Drive to Sea World Drive (TRANS 5.2-17)
- I-5 northbound from Sea World Drive to I-8 (TRANS 5.2-18)

The Final PEIR will amend the mitigation language to describe that SANDAG's San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RTP) Revenue Constrained Managed Lanes and Highway Network identifies operational improvements along the following mentioned segments instead:

- I-5 northbound from Old Town Avenue to Washington Street (TRANS 5.2-19)
- I-5 southbound from I-8 to Old Town Avenue (TRANS 5.2-21)

A3-10 (cont.) Thus, creating a stop and go condition on both the mainline and the ramp. This is an increase in congestion, not appropriate traffic mitigation. Please consider other forms of mitigation at this location; such as, adding an additional storage to the ramp.

Complete Streets and Mobility Network

10. Caltrans views all transportation improvements as opportunities to improve safety, access and mobility for all travelers in California and recognizes bicycle, pedestrian and transit modes as integral elements of the transportation system. Caltrans supports improved transit accommodation through the provision of Park and Ride facilities, improved bicycle and pedestrian access and safety improvements, signal prioritization for transit, bus on shoulders, ramp improvements, or other enhancements that promotes a complete and integrated transportation system. Early coordination with Caltrans, in locations that may affect both Caltrans and the City of San Diego, is encouraged.

    To reduce greenhouse gas emissions and achieve California's Climate Change target, Caltrans is implementing Complete Streets and Climate Change policies into State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects to meet multi-modal mobility needs. Caltrans looks forward to working with the City to evaluate potential Complete Streets projects.

A3-11

Land Use and Smart Growth

11. Caltrans recognizes there is a strong link between transportation and land use. Development can have a significant impact on traffic and congestion on State transportation facilities. In particular, the pattern of land use can affect both local vehicle miles traveled and the number of trips. Caltrans supports collaboration with local agencies to work towards a safe, functional, interconnected, multi-modal transportation system integrated through applicable "smart growth" type land use planning and policies.

    The City should continue to coordinate with Caltrans to implement necessary improvements at intersections and interchanges where the agencies have joint jurisdiction, as well as coordinate with Caltrans as development proceeds and funds become available to ensure that the capacity of on/off-ramps are adequate.

Mitigation

A3-12 12. Pages S-9 and 5.2-34 of the DPEIR reference Mitigation Measure TRANS 5.2-24 state "Improvements could include reducing the ramp meter cycle length or providing

A3-9 (cont.):

- I-5 southbound from Washington Street to Pacific Highway (TRANS 5.2-22)
- I-5 southbound from Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street (TRANS 5.2-23)

It should be noted that the change in mitigation measures would still result in significant and unavoidable impacts, since the City does not have jurisdiction of the interstate and cannot guarantee the implementation of the improvements.

A3-10: The City understands that changing the ramp release rate without an evaluation of the whole system could increase congestion and would not be a suitable traffic mitigation. The City will revise the freeway ramp mitigation measure in the Final PEIR to state the following:

The City of San Diego shall coordinate with Caltrans to address ramp capacity at impacted on-ramp locations. Particularly, this impact could be reduced to less than significant by the following improvements: additional lanes, interchange reconfigurations, the implementation of a second interchange between Sea World Drive and Clairemont Drive (which is not currently included in the San Diego Forward Plan), and Transportation Demand Measures (TDM) as described in the Mobility Element in policies ME-7.1 through 7.9; however, specific capacity improvements are still undetermined, as these are future improvements that must be defined more over time. Furthermore, implementation of freeway improvements in a timely manner is beyond the full control of the City since Caltrans has approval authority over freeway improvements. Additionally, the Preferred Plan includes a variety of transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities that may help to reduce single-occupancy vehicle (SOV) travel which can help improve ramp capacity.

A3-11: Comment noted.

A3-12 (cont.)

additional travel lanes; however, specific capacity improvements are still undetermined as these are future improvements that must be defined more over time." Mitigation identified for freeway entrance ramps, includes adjusting ramp meter rates. Freeway flow is a major concern for Caltrans, and ramp meters are adjusted to maintain acceptable levels of freeway flow. If additional traffic is anticipated on local roads, then it is recommended to increase storage on freeway on-ramps. The mitigation needs to be revised to exclude "ramp meter cycle length" as it cannot be an improvement used for mitigation. Mitigation Measures should identify other alternatives for TRANS 5.2-24.

A3-13

13. Caltrans endeavors that any direct and cumulative impacts to the State Highway System be eliminated or reduced to a level of insignificance pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) standards.

A3-14

14. Caltrans recommends consideration of "fair share" funds towards future improvements associated with I-5 and I-8 corridors. Impacts that are significant and unmitigated/unavoidable need to have an alternative mitigation identified in the DPEIR TIS. Page 5.2-35 states that Caltrans facilities impacts "would remain significant and unavoidable". Recommended feasible mitigation measures include "fair share" contribution towards ramp widening and/or auxiliary lanes.

A3-15

15. Mitigation conditioned as part of a local agency's development approval for improvements to State facilities can be implemented either through a Cooperative Agreement between Caltrans and the lead agency, or by the project proponent entering into an agreement directly with Caltrans for the mitigation. When that occurs, Caltrans will negotiate and execute a Traffic Mitigation Agreement.

Right-of-Way

A3-16

16. Any work performed within Caltrans right-of-way (R/W) will require discretionary review and approval by Caltrans and an encroachment permit will be required for any work within the Caltrans R/W prior to construction. As part of the encroachment permit process, the applicant must provide an approved final environmental document including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determination addressing any environmental impacts within the Caltrans's R/W, and any corresponding technical studies.

17. Pages 5.11-5 to 5.11-6 (Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities) proposes parks in Caltrans Right-of-Way (R/W). For any proposed parks/park equivalencies on State R/W, further coordination is needed between Caltrans and the City to

A3-12: Comment noted. Please see the response to comment A3-10.

A3-13: Comment noted.

A3-14: Comment noted. As described in the Draft PEIR's mitigation measure descriptions for the impacted freeway facilities, there is uncertainty related to the actual improvements and associated traffic impacts that will materialize over time especially for this programmatic-level project. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify potential transportation impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through project-specific mitigation including but not limited to physical improvements, fair share contribution, transportation demand management measures which may be more cost effective than alternative infrastructure improvements, or a combination of these measures. The Draft PEIR also states that for mitigation measures TRANS 5.2-17 through TRANS 5.2-24, the City will continue to coordinate with Caltrans and SANDAG on future improvements, as future project-level developments proceed, to develop potential "fair share" mitigation strategies for freeway impacts, as appropriate.

A3-15: Comment noted.

A3-16: Comment noted.

A3-16 (cont.)

determine if the R/W can be declared excess and sold to a third party. If not, it may be possible to pursue an airspace lease. Caltrans policy allows for transportation compatible uses within the airspace defined as "any property within right of way limits of an existing highway… that is capable of other development without undue interference with the operation and foreseeable future expansion of the transportation corridor" and includes "area in cut or fill slopes" (Caltrans Right-of-Way Manual, Section 15.01.01.01). Furthermore, Marler-Johnson Park Agreements (Section 15.04.01.05) allows a local agency to request use of Caltrans airspace for park or recreational purposes; Marler-Johnson agreements may be offered for a period of ten years with five-year extensions.

If you have any questions, please contact Kimberly Dodson, of the Caltrans Development Review Branch, at (619) 688-2510 or Brandon Tobias of the Community Planning Branch, at (619) 688-2503.

Sincerely,

SETH CUTTER, Branch Chief
Community Planning and Multimodal Programs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter A4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA — EDMUND G. BROWN JR., *Governor*

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
320 WEST 4TH STREET, SUITE 500
LOS ANGELES, CA 90013

February 20, 2018

Susan Morrison
City of San Diego
1010 Second Ave, Suite 1200, east tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

SENT VIA EMAIL

Re: Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town San Diego Community Plan Updates
SCH# 2015111013 and SCH# 2018011022

Dear Ms. Morrison:

A4-1 The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC or Commission) has jurisdiction over the safety of rail crossings in California. The California Public Utilities Code requires Commission approval for the construction or alteration of crossings and grants the Commission exclusive power on the design, alteration and closure of rail crossings. The Commission's Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch (RCEB) reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Reports (DEIR) for the *Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town San Diego Community Plan Updates* (SCH# 2015111013 and SCH# 2018011022). The City of San Diego is the lead agency.

In the Community Plan Updates, there are proposed policies that encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use. There is discussion of improving "pedestrian and bicycle facilities that provide connections to transit stops, stations, and the Old Town Transit Center". The policy should recognize that a number of the pedestrian and bicycle routes must cross the railroad and/or transit tracks to get to a station or transit center.

A4-2 For the current community plan updates, a policy addressing the safety of at-grade rail crossings should be clearly identified. RCEB suggests the following policy in Mobility Element of both community plans:

> "Coordinate with MTS, North County Transit District, CPUC and other agencies as appropriate to construct vehicular and pedestrian safety improvements at existing rail crossings. Specific rail crossings that should be targeted for improvements are identified below."

A4-3 There are at least five rail crossings, including both railroad and light rail transit tracks, in the area covered by the Community Plan Updates. The tracks are near the eastern edge of the 'Midway-Pacific Highway' community and the western edge of the 'Old Town San Diego' community. Pedestrian, vehicular, and rail safety should be considered near the tracks. Development near the railroad and rail transit right-of-way should be planned with the safety of the rail corridor in mind.

The five railroad crossings listed below have an unusual combination of factors that may justify particular attention to rail crossing safety during the community planning process. These factors include the high number of trains and trolleys, projected increases in train volumes, presence of four tracks at each crossing, concurrent operation of mainline railroad and adjacent trolley tracks,

Letter A4 - California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC [2/20/2018])

A4-1: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis presented in the Draft PEIR; however, comments related to the Draft Community Plan will be addressed in an attachment to the Planning Commission Staff Report.

A4-2: The Draft Community Plan includes policy ME-4.9 which addresses safety at rail crossings. To address this comment, this policy will be revised to state the following: "Coordinate with MTS, North County Transit District, and California Public Utilities Commission as appropriate to reduce trolley, vehicle, and pedestrian conflicts. Strategies may include elevated tracks and platforms, rail realignment, vehicular and pedestrian safety improvements at existing rail crossings, and aesthetic improvements to strengthen pedestrian access and walkability." At-grade rail crossings that may be targeted for improvement are Noell Street, Washington Street, Sassafras Street, and Palm Street.

A4-3: Comment noted.

significant volumes of roadway users, higher train speeds than the downtown area, and the presence of nearby intersections.

There are five at-grade rail crossings that have both railroad and transit tracks in this area.

DOT#	Street Name	Adjacent Station
026852D	Taylor Street	Old Town Transit Center
026856F	Noell Street	
026857M	Washington Street	Washington Street Station
026859B	Sassafras Street	
026861C	Palm Street	Middletown Station

A4-3 (cont.)



Figure 1 (above): Map of rail crossings

Grade separation

A4-4

Consistent with policy stated in Commission General Order 75-D, CPUC staff supports grade separation at rail crossings. Such projects may reduce or eliminate conflicts between trains and roadway users. However, due to a variety of constraints discussed in the Community Plan Updates, it seems likely that the at-grade rail crossings will remain for many years.

Safety of At-Grade Rail Crossings

A4-5

The safety of the rail crossings can be improved through traffic signal modifications (such as construction of pre-signals), railroad crossing warning devices (such as construction of gates for pedestrians), and other treatments. There is funding available for construction of safety improvements at railroad crossings. However, to accomplish such improvements would require that the City coordinate with a number of organizations including San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS), North County Transit District, and CPUC. Other agencies may also have a role in such

A4-4: Comment noted.

A4-5: Comment noted.

projects, including the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), and San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.

These crossings have automatic warning devices which are maintained in generally the same configuration as constructed approximately 20 years ago, when trolley tracks were extended to Old Town Transit Center. However, the City should consider that there has been and continues to be further development in San Diego since that time, and an increasing number of trains is expected along this corridor in the future. These five rail crossings could benefit from further safety improvements.

A4-5 (cont.)

There have been incidents at these crossings in which a person along the sidewalk has been struck by a train, or in which a vehicle stopped on the tracks has been struck by a train. Most of those incidents have occurred at the railroad tracks, not the transit tracks, but adjacent to the transit stations. Because of the close proximity of the transit stations to the railroad tracks, safety improvements for the railroad crossing may require modifications at the railroad tracks, as well as modifications at the transit tracks and platforms.

Safety Improvement Costs

Regarding implementation, the Old Town Community Plan, Section 11.2 states:

> "Grants and other sources of funding should be pursued wherever possible. A complete list of public infrastructure and facilities needs identified during the preparation of this Community Plan is included in the Impact Fee Study."

A4-6

The City should consider the costs to initiate and develop safety improvement projects at rail crossings. There is federal funding, administered by the state, for construction of rail crossing safety improvements. For additional information, please refer to the 'Funding Programs' link on the CPUC website at http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/crossings . The planning for such improvements should consider that some costs, such as project management, preliminary design, or right-of-way acquisition, may need alternate sources of funding as part of such a project.

Rail Safety Considerations

A report[1] published in 2017 by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) provided a number of insights regarding rail crossing accidents. The top four items identified in the report are directly relevant to the rail crossings listed above.

A4-7

The results of the in-depth data analysis provided the following insights into grade crossing accidents:

1. Rail and highway traffic volumes have the largest influence on accidents.
2. Train speed has a significant effect on the injury and fatality rate of vehicle drivers.
3. Higher volume of main tracks and highway lanes lead to more accidents.
4. Having a highway intersection near a grade crossing nearly doubles the risk for accidents.

Figure 2 (above): Excerpt from 2017 FRA report

[1] "In-Depth Data Analysis of Grade Crossing Accidents Resulting in Injuries and Fatalities", Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), May 2017.

A4-6: This comment will be addressed in the responses to comments for the Old Town San Diego Community Plan Update Draft PEIR.

A4-7: Comment noted.

1. Traffic Volumes

   a. Rail Traffic Volumes:
      - *Rail traffic (railroad and trolley) volumes are high along this rail corridor, and are projected to increase.*
      - The crossings between Old Town Transit Center and the downtown Santa Fe Depot Station are projected to have the highest rail traffic volumes of any rail corridor in San Diego County.
      - Along the railroad tracks, there are currently approximately 50 trains per day. However, projections for year 2030 show nearly twice as many trains--98 trains per day[2].
      - Along the trolley tracks (MTS/SDTI Green Line as of 2016), there are approximately 177 trolley trips per day. The frequency of trips (headway) along this line is one trolley in each direction approximately every 15 minutes. However, projections for year 2030[3] show headway of 7.5 minutes. With a shorter headway, there may be near 300 trolley trips per day through these crossings.

A4-7 (cont.)

   b. Motorist Traffic Volumes:
      - Past traffic counts have identified relatively high volumes of traffic that that cross the tracks at the major arterials: Taylor Street and Washington Street. In 2016, Sassafras Street traffic volumes may have increased upon the opening of the new rental car center at the airport.

   c. Pedestrian traffic volumes:
      - Pedestrians have been observed at all of these crossings, with the highest volumes where there is an adjacent or nearby station, including Taylor Street, Washington Street, and Palm Street. Policies and goals stated in the Community Plan Update would encourage higher numbers of pedestrians at locations near the rail transit corridor, particularly in the vicinity of those stations.

2. Train speed:
   a. *Rail speeds (railroad and trolley) speeds are higher than in the downtown area.*
   b. *Railroad speed.* Currently train speeds are allowed at up to 65 MPH at Noell Street and Washington Street, and up to 50 MPH as Sassafras Street and Palm Street. At Taylor Street the maximum train speed is currently 40 MPH, however, in the past there were severe incidents involving trains at higher speeds.
   c. *Trolley speed.* Typical trolley speeds are highest at Sassafras Street and Noell Street (up to 55 MPH). At crossings adjacent to stations, trolleys are typically traveling around 20 MPH or less.

3. Multiple tracks and multiple lanes
   a. Multiple tracks
      - All of the crossings above have 4 tracks, including 2 light rail transit tracks and 2 mainline railroad tracks.

[2] "Table 6.1.12: Oceanside to San Diego Total Train Trips", LOSSAN Corridorwide Strategic Implementation Plan, LOSSAN, 2012.
[3] "Table 3-20. Summary of Transit Performance - 2010 and 2030", Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project, SANDAG, September 2014

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

- Multiple tracks result in a long distance for pedestrians or vehicles to move across all the tracks. For example, at Washington Street, a pedestrian must travel approximately 80 feet to move across all 4 tracks. At 3.5 feet per second, this would take approximately 23 seconds.
- There is potential for confusion about why warning devices remain activated. A pedestrian may believe that warning devices are activated for a train that has just passed, or a trolley that can be seen approaching the station. The pedestrian may casually walk past the flashing light signals. However, the pedestrian may not recognize that the warning devices are activated due to an approaching train traveling 65 MPH along railroad track adjacent to the trolley station.

b. Multiple Lanes
- At Taylor Street, Washington Street, and Sassafras Street, there are multiple lanes of traffic in each direction.

A4-7 (cont.)

4. Nearby intersections
   a. All of the crossings have a nearby intersection on both sides of the tracks.
   b. Traffic queues can extend from nearby intersections, resulting in vehicles stopping on the tracks.
   c. There are a variety of measures that should be considered, including the installation of pre-signals and/or queue cutters, which are traffic signals intended to stop vehicles prior to the tracks.

Based on the FRA's Web-Based Accident Prediction System[4] the crossings of Washington Street, Palm Street and Sassafras Street currently have the second, third and seventh highest accident prediction rates of the 142 crossings that are listed by FRA within the City of San Diego.

Truck Access

In the Midway-Pacific Highway plan, there is a proposed policy regarding truck access:

ME-9.4 Coordinate with Caltrans, the San Diego Unified Port District, and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority to improve truck access to and from the San Diego International Airport and I-5.

A4-8

Trucks can present a concern at the rail crossings, such as Sassafras Street and Washington Street, due to the limited distance between the tracks and nearby intersections. If trucks are directed to use particular at-grade rail crossings, additional safety measures may need consideration at those locations.

Conclusion

A4-9

Modification to an existing public rail crossing requires authorization from the Commission. RCEB is available to discuss the safety of crossings. More information can be found at: http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/crossings/

[4] Reviewed on February 1, 2018, FRA Web Accident Prediction System (WBAPS), http://safetydata.fra.dot.gov/webaps/

A4-8: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis presented in the Draft PEIR; however, Draft Community Plan policy ME-9.4 will be modified to include coordination with CPUC as well as Caltrans, the San Diego Unified Port District, and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.

A4-9: Comment noted.

If you have any questions, please contact me at kevin.schumacher@cpuc.ca.gov or (415) 310-9807

Sincerely,

KS

Kevin Schumacher
Utilities Engineer
Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch
Safety and Enforcement Division

CC: State Clearinghouse, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter A5

PORT of SAN DIEGO

VIA EMAIL TO: PlanningCEQA@sandiego.gov

February 20, 2018

Susan Morrison, Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 2nd Avenue, Suiter 1200, East Tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: San Diego Unified Port District Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update (Project No. 561546)

Dear Ms. Morrison,

The San Diego Unified Port District (District) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update (CPU). The City of San Diego (City) proposes to provide detailed, community-specific policy direction to implement the General Plan with respect to the distribution and arrangement of land uses (public and private); multimodal mobility, and transit network; provision of parks and public facilities; community-wide and site-specific urban design guidelines; and recommendations to preserve and enhance historic and cultural resources within the Midway-Pacific Highway community (Project). The District has reviewed the Draft EIR for the Project and understands that the Draft EIR evaluates the potential impacts associated with the Project.

A5-1

COMMENTS

The District was created in 1962 under state legislature titled the "San Diego Unified Port District Act" (Port Act). Under the Port Act, the state's tidelands and submerged lands within San Diego Bay were conveyed to the District to manage and control for the benefit of the people of California. The area conveyed to the District includes areas located within the boundaries of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan and the Project site boundaries identified in the Draft EIR. Under the Port Act, the District is required to exercise its land management authority and powers over property and development within its jurisdiction, and the District's uses supersede any conflicting local ordinances or land use plans.

As a tool to allow the District to regulate both granted and acquired lands, the Port Act requires the District to adopt a Port Master Plan. Accordingly, both tidelands and submerged lands granted to and acquired by the District are considered within the District's jurisdiction. The Port Master Plan provides the official planning policies, consistent with a general statewide purpose,

Letter A5 - Port of San Diego (2/20/2018)

A5-1: Comment noted.

for the physical development of the tidelands and submerged lands conveyed and granted in trust to the District; and pursuant the California Coastal Act, the Port Master Plan was certified by the California Coastal Commission in 1981.

A5-1 (cont.)

On a parallel track with the Project, the District is processing a separate but related effort: the comprehensive Port Master Plan Update (PMPU), guided by the Integrated Planning Vision (Vision). The Vision includes the Integrated Planning Vision Statement, Guiding Principles, and Framework Report, which were accepted by the Board of Port Commissioners in 2014 and 2015, respectively. Combined, the Vision provides a bridge between the visioning conducted for Integrated Planning to the drafting of the PMPU document. Once complete, the PMPU will set forth a policy level blueprint and continue to guide all future redevelopment across District tidelands.

A5-2

As currently drafted, the CPU and the Project site boundaries in the Draft EIR include parcels in the Kettner District of the CPU that are within the land management authority of the District, as shown on Attachment 1 to this letter. Pursuant to Section 30711 of the California Coastal Act, "...each city, county, or city and county which has a port within its jurisdiction shall incorporate the certified port master plan in its local coastal plan" for informational purposes. However, as currently drafted in the CPU and Draft EIR, specifically, the existing and proposed land use maps of the Draft EIR, Figure 2-3 and Figure 3-1 respectively, do not accurately portray the land uses defined in the certified Port Master Plan. The District refers the City to look at the certified Port Master Plan, Figure 9, Planning District 2: Harbor Island/Lindbergh Field Precise Plan, for the existing land use designations, and for purposes of analyzing consistency with the Port Master Plan in the Draft EIR. For consistency purposes, with regard to the proposed land use designations for District parcels, the District recommends the City refer the reader to the certified Port Master Plan and not show specific land use designations as these may be modified in the PMPU. Additionally, the CPU and Draft EIR should clearly state that the District has land management authority over these parcels and that the District parcels are included in the Draft EIR and CPU for informational purposes only. It should also be noted, parcels that are owned by the District but are currently not included in the Port Master Plan, are under the coastal permitting authority of the California Coastal Commission. As the Draft EIR and CPU are currently written it is inaccurate for the Draft EIR to base its analysis on inconsistent characterization of the District's parcels. The above comments apply specifically to the Executive Summary, Environmental Setting, Project Description, Land Use, and Alternatives sections of the Draft EIR.

A5-3

The District supports Draft EIR and CPU policies LU.4-76 and LU.4-84 regarding coordination with the District and looks forward to future and ongoing coordination with the City on projects and plans, as well as continued collaboration on multi-agency efforts to address mobility issues in the area.

A5-2: While the Draft Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan states on Pages IN-10 and LU-41 that portions of the community are within the land use jurisdiction of the San Diego Unified Port District (see Attachment 1 below), Draft Community Plan Figures 1-2 (Government-Owned Properties map), 2-1 (Land Use Map), and 2-16 (Kettner District map), as well as Draft PEIR Figures 3-1 (Proposed Land Use Map), 8-2 (Alternative 1 Land Use), and 8-3 (Alternative 2 Land Use), have been modified to more clearly delineate properties owned by and under the land use jurisdiction of the San Diego Unified Port District, and to apply a land use designation of "Port Properties" to these sites. The discussion in Draft Community Plan Introduction Section 1.5, Legislative Framework, and Land Use, Villages and Districts Element Section 2.4.11, Kettner District, and related Draft PEIR sections have also been revised in the Final PEIR to refer readers to the Port Master Plan for land use policies relating to these properties.

A5-3: Comment noted.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft EIR. Please contact me at (619) 686-6469 or lnishihi@portofsandiego.org with any questions regarding the information detailed above.

Sincerely,

Lesley Nishihira
Director, Planning Department
Planning and Green Port

Cc:
Jason Giffen, Assistant Vice President, Planning and Green Port
Ashley Wright, Senior Planner, Planning Department

Attachment: Attachment 1 – District Owned Land within the Midway-Pacific Community Plan

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Attachment 1: Port Owned Property within the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter A6

SANDAG

401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101-4231
(619) 699-1900
Fax (619) 699-1905
sandag.org

February 16, 2018 File Number 3300300

Ms. Susan Morrison
City of San Diego
1010 2nd Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Ms. Morrison:

SUBJECT: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (Project No. 561546)

MEMBER AGENCIES
Cities of
Carlsbad
Chula Vista
Coronado
Del Mar
El Cajon
Encinitas
Escondido
Imperial Beach
La Mesa
Lemon Grove
National City
Oceanside
Poway
San Diego
San Marcos
Santee
Solana Beach
Vista
and
County of San Diego

ADVISORY MEMBERS
Imperial County
California Department of Transportation
Metropolitan Transit System
North County Transit District
United States Department of Defense
San Diego Unified Port District
San Diego County Water Authority
Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association
Mexico

A6-1

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the City of San Diego's Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update (CPU) Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). The San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) appreciates the City of San Diego's efforts to implement the policies included in San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (Regional Plan) that emphasize the need for better land use and transportation coordination. These policies will help provide people with more travel and housing choices, protect the environment, create healthy communities, and stimulate economic growth. SANDAG's comments are based on policies included in the Regional Plan and are submitted from a regional perspective.

Smart Growth

A6-2

The project site is in a Smart Growth Opportunity Area (SD MD-1, designated as a Town Center) on the SANDAG Smart Growth Concept Map. Development in these areas supports a sustainable and healthy region, a vibrant economy, and an outstanding quality of life for all. The Town Center Smart Growth Opportunity Area includes a minimum residential density target of 20 dwelling units per acre. The land use map in the draft Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan designates most residential sites well above the minimum density. SANDAG appreciates the City of San Diego's land use changes that support the Smart Growth Concept Map.

A6-3

Additionally, Smart Growth Opportunity Areas can support increased transit use, walking, and biking. Please consider including the following planned transit routes/services in the plan documents and increasing access to these services (e.g., pedestrian and bicycle improvements to ensure access to the Old Town Transit Station):

- *Rapid* service (Routes 10, 30, and 640A)
  - Routes 10 and 30, currently high-frequency local bus services, will be transitioned to *Rapid* service

Letter A6 - San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG [2/16/2018])

A6-1: Comment noted. The City appreciates the San Diego Association of Governments' (SANDAG's) participation in the public review comment process.

A6-2: Comment noted.

A6-3: Comment noted. A discussion of planned transit routes/services is included in the Alternative Transportation analysis in Section 5.2, Transportation and Circulation, of the Draft PEIR, as well as Section 3.4 of the Mobility Element of the Draft Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan. These specific routes/services are also included in Figure 5.2-3, Planned Transit Facilities, of the Draft PEIR and Figure 3-4, Planned Transit Facilities, of the Draft Community Plan.

A6-3 (cont'd)

- High-frequency local bus service (Routes 8, 9, 28, and 34)
- Trolley service (Mid-Coast Trolley Extension)

Transportation Demand Management

SANDAG appreciates the inclusion of transportation demand management (TDM), parking management, and intelligent transportation system measures in the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and draft PEIR. Please also consider developing policies that encourage developers to integrate TDM strategies through the entitlement process. This could include priority parking for carpools and vanpools, secure bike parking, and bike amenities at key destinations.

A6-4

In addition to the shared mobility strategies identified in the Mobility Element, consider pursuing partnerships with other mobility providers, specifically as it applies to commercial village areas and prospective mobility hub locations in the Sports Arena Community and the Dutch Flats Urban Villages. This could include partnerships and pilot projects with on-demand rideshare (e.g., Uber, Lyft, Waze Carpool), microtransit, scootershare, and electric bikeshare providers that can enhance connections to regional transit services at the Old Town Transit Center, recreational areas, or entertainment destinations. Electric, shared mobility services require fast charging points to support operations. Siting future electric vehicle charging stations and/or wireless charging technology near transit and at key community destinations will ensure a connected charging network. Additionally, explore partnerships with employers to subsidize these shared mobility services for employees as a method for reducing parking demand at employment sites.

While priced parking may not be a feasible near-term strategy, consider developing a comprehensive parking management plan that analyzes the feasibility of parking strategies identified in Section 3.8 of the Mobility Element. Additionally, consider strategies like unbundled parking and the implementation of dedicated passenger loading areas and flexible use of curb space with clear wayfinding signage along commercial corridors.

A6-5

In both the draft CPU and PEIR, please remove all outdated references to SANDAG's ridematching service and consider including a current list of offerings provided by the SANDAG TDM program, also known as iCommute. The SANDAG Vanpool Program provides a subsidy of up to $400 per month for eligible vans, and iCommute has recently launched a carpool incentive program with Waze Carpool. Schools and organizations in the community are encouraged to participate in the iCommute Go by Bike Mini-Grant program and iCommute bike education services that promote bike safety. The iCommute Employer Services Program works with employers to develop and implement customized commuter benefit programs for their employees to encourage the use of transportation alternatives to driving alone. More information on these programs can be accessed through www.iCommuteSD.com.

Other Considerations

A6-6

SANDAG has a number of additional resources that can be used for additional information or clarification on topics discussed in this letter. These can be found on our website at www.sandag.org:

1. Riding to 2050, the San Diego Regional Bike Plan

A6-4: Comment noted. TDM strategies are addressed in the Draft Community Plan, specifically in the Mobility Element. Mobility Element policy ME-7.1 addresses car-sharing spaces, policy ME-7.8 addresses bike share and car share programs, and policies ME-3.2 and ME-3.3 address secure bike parking and amenities at key destinations. Regarding pursuing partnerships with SANDAG's mobility providers, Mobility Element policy ME-4.6 addresses coordination with MTS and SANDAG to provide Rapid Bus stations and mobility hubs at the Sports Arena Community Village and the Dutch Flats Urban Village. A comprehensive parking management plan that analyzes the feasibility of parking strategies identified in Section 3.8 of the Mobility Element will be performed at the project-level of development.

A6-5: No references to SANDAG's ridematching service are included in the Draft PEIR. However, in Section 3.7, Transportation Demand Management, of the Draft Community Plan (December 2017), policy ME-7.6 currently states "Encourage employers to participate in SANDAG's TDM programs, such as ridematching services, subsidized vanpool program, guaranteed ride home, and teleworking, to reduce vehicular trips." Policy ME-7.6 has been revised to read "Encourage employers to participate in and inform employees about SANDAG's TDM programs."

A6-6: Comment noted.

2. Planning and Designing for Pedestrians, Model Guidelines for the San Diego Region
3. Integrating TDM into the Planning and Development Process – A Reference for Cities
4. Trip Generation for Smart Growth
5. Parking Strategies for Smart Growth
6. Designing for Smart Growth, Creating Great Places in the San Diego Region

A6-6 (cont'd)

When available, please send any additional environmental documents related to this project to:

Intergovernmental Review
c/o SANDAG
401 B Street, Suite 800
San Diego, CA 92101

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the City of San Diego's Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Draft PEIR. If you have any questions, please contact me at (619) 699-1943 or via e-mail at seth.litchney@sandag.org.

Sincerely,

SETH LITCHNEY
Senior Regional Planner

SLI/KHE/ais

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter B1

MIDWAY PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

February 20, 2018

Alyssa Muto
Deputy Director
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower
San Diego, California 92101

Submitted via email to: planningCEQA@sandiego.gov

Subject: **MIDWAY-PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE**
DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
SCH #2015111013

Ms. Muto:

By action of the Midway Pacific Highway Community Planning Group (MPHCG), at its meeting of February 14, 2018, please accept this letter as our public comment in response to the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update [MPHCPU] Draft Program Environmental Impact Report [DPEIR].

B1-1 We appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the environmental effects of a plan for our community and recognize this unique opportunity to help shape the future of our planning area. We sincerely appreciate the efforts of City Staff, particularly Victoria White and Tate Galloway who have both worked long and hard on this project, and the consultants for bringing about the update of the MPHCPU.

Our comments have two primary objectives. The first is to comment on the adequacy of environmental analysis, and secondly, but equally important, is that we seek to point out issues we've identified in the DPEIR and MPHCPU.

Our comments are organized into several topics.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

B1-2 Please explain how Alternative 1 can be considered preferred when it fails to meet city objectives which are intended, among other things, to improve the environment? See Page 8-36, Section 8.4

How can Alternative 1 be the superior alternative when a redevelopment plan for the Sports Arena and surrounding areas has not come forward yet and both the plan and the DPEIR fail to provide specifics?

SPORTS ARENA REDEVELOPMENT

B1-3 Has the plan and/or the DPEIR considered the potential impacts of redevelopment on the Sports Arena if it stays (i.e. how will events and access be impacted during redevelopment?) Is it even realistic to consider?

TRANSPORTATION

B1-4

1

Letter B1 - Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group (2/20/2018)

B1-1: Comment noted.

B1-2: Alternative 1 is not "considered preferred". The project (proposed CPU) as analyzed throughout the PEIR is the preferred project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) requires that an EIR present a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, that could feasibly attain a majority of the basic project objectives, but that would avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant environmental impacts of the project. Among the three alternatives analyzed, the No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan), Alternative 1, and Alternative 2, Alternative 1 meets these criteria, and has been idenitfied as the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

There are no plans for new development at the San Diego Sports Arena site at this time. The project (proposed CPU) and PEIR would allow the retention of a sports arena/entertainment use on the existing Sports Arena site in the existing Sports Arena or in a new structure (Stadium/Arena use), or would allow the Sports Arena use to be replaced by other land uses. Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would also permit the Stadium/Arena use for the Sports Arena to remain or be replaced with other uses. However, for the purposes of CEQA analysis, the most intense land use possible with application of the proposed land use designation (replacement of Stadium/Arena use with mixed-use development) has been assumed.

B1-3: Future redevelopment at the site, with or without the Sports Arena would require preparation of a specific plan or master plan and subsequent environmental review. Construction-related activities associated with redevelopment of the site, including traffic-control during events at the Sports Arena would be addressed in the environmental document and further defined during the ministerial permit process.

MIDWAY PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

B1-4 (cont.) Page 5.2-14, Impact Analysis, Issue 1 a. Counts were completed in 2012 (six years ago), and validated in 2015/2016 what assurance do we have these are still relevant? What does validated mean? The counts were completed well prior to much of the commercial development at Liberty Station, what assurance do we have that Liberty Station traffic has not significantly impacted the MPHC area roadways?

B1-5 Table 5.2-6 – Greenwood Street – Why create a new street that operates at LOS F? Same for Dutch Flats Parkway at LOS E?

B1-6 Table 5.2-7 – Please explain how Intersection #1 (Lytton & Rosecrans results in future LOS worsening to F&E respectively. Same for Intersections 30, 34, 35, and intersections outside of the planning area 44 & 54.

B1-7 Table 5.2-8 – Do these calculations take into consideration the new trolley line and the potential traffic reductions as a result?

B1-8 Alternative Transportation (Page 5.2-27, Issue 2) – Why are bus routes and other alternatives not being implemented until 2035 which is the end of the expected life of this plan? Bicycle and pedestrian plans are fine, but they don't work in inclement weather, what options should be considered?

B1-9 Why doesn't the DPEIR consider alternative forms of transportation improvements not brought forward by the Mobility Study (including but not limited to shuttle service from residential developments to transit, underground bypass of surface intersections for the Rosecrans/Sports Arena Blvd and Midway intersections)?

B1-10 **MCRD/MILITARY**

MCRD was not previously included in planning area. Why is it now? If it is to be included in the planning area, shouldn't it have future zoning proposed as the other military properties already have? MCRD comprises approximately 1/3 of the acreage of the planning area and its potential usage will have significant impacts on the planning area and our neighbors.

B1-11 **PARKS**

Page 5.11-3 Impact Analysis Issue 1b Parks and recreation identifies a deficit at build out of population-based parks. Considering the proposed increase in population, why hasn't a dedicated dog park been proposed for the community?

B1-12 **TANDEM PARKING**

The Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone is being proposed for amendment to include the MPH community. Has Tandem Parking been shown to improve parking issues in other areas where implemented or does it result in more on-street parking?

B1-13 **LA PLAYA TRAIL**

The La Playa Trail is an important part of San Diego's history. Should the La Playa Trail be more predominantly identified in the plan and the EIR?

2

B1-3 (cont.):

including consideration of potential environmental effects, and to determine the appropriate level of environmental documentation in accordance with CEQA Section 15004.

B1-4: Generally, traffic counts that are within 10% of each other are considered to be within an acceptable range. It is acknowledged that traffic volumes vary during different seasons of the year, with no clear conclusion of one being consistently higher or lower than the other. Historically, ADT volumes within the Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Communities can be affected by a number of factors that are uncontrollable and can vary significantly on a daily basis. Some of these factors include special events at the Sports Arena complex, the Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD), Old Town State Historic Park, or Liberty Station (formerly the Naval Training Center).

In the Midway-Pacific Highway study area, most traffic count data was collected in the spring and summer time, with one count collected in the winter. The traffic counts utilized in the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update mobility reports were obtained from various sources including the 2009 Rosecrans Corridor Mobility Study (RCMS), 2010 historic counts provided by National Data Services (NDS), as well as counts conducted in 2011. This historic existing traffic data was validated or justified to determine if the counts still adequately represented baseline traffic conditions for continued use in the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update. The more recent ADT volumes (counts from 2015/2016) are both higher and lower than the counts obtained in 2011, but are within 10% of the previous traffic counts. The ADT volumes for two of the primary gateways into both the Old Town community (Taylor Street and Pacific Highway) and the Midway-Pacific Highway Community (Midway Drive between W. Point Loma Blvd/Sports Arena Boulevard to Kemper Street),

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

B1-4 (cont.):

indicate that traffic volumes have not experienced significant change over the last few years. For example, traffic volumes along Pacific Highway between Sea World Drive and Taylor Street remained fairly constant between 2010 and 2016 with a difference of 371 vehicles on a daily basis. In general, the results of the count comparison supports the validity of the 2009 to 2011 traffic counts used by the City in developing the Existing Conditions Report.

B1-5: The implementation of the new streets (i.e. Greenwood Street and Dutch Flats Parkway) as part of the Preferred roadway network aligns with Mobility policies and goals to create a livable, walkable community by providing additional connections for motorists, Conditions Report. pedestrians, and bicyclists, which break up the superblocks. Additionally, future traffic volumes were assessed with and without these connections in place and this comparison showed that Greenwood Street and Dutch Flats Parkway would shift traffic from the major roadways, reducing traffic demand on those major roadways.

It should also be noted that the study intersections on each end of these segments are projected to operate at an acceptable level of service (LOS) during both the AM and PM peak hour. Therefore, since the intersections control the flow and ultimately the capacity of roadway segment, it is anticipated that these segments will operate at an acceptable level even though the projected volumes exceed the theoretical daily roadway capacity based on segment classification.

B1-6: Due to the increase in both local and regional vehicular trips, the traffic at all of the intersections listed in the comment is anticipated to increase, resulting in additional delay and a degraded level of service (LOS). The primary reason for the degraded LOS in the case of the intersection listed in the comment is specifically discussed below:

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

B1-6 (cont.):

#1 Rosecrans Street / Barnett Avenue / Lytton Street – The westbound through movement, as well as the southbound left-turn and through movements are projected to be over capacity under implementation of the Preferred Plan during the AM peak hour. It should also be noted that this intersection currently operates at LOS E during the AM peak hour (in existing condition) and any additional traffic exacerbates the delay further.

#30 Kettner Boulevard and West Laurel Street – The eastbound-through movement on Laurel Street is projected to be over capacity during the PM peak hour under implementation of the Preferred Plan.

#34 Pacific Highway and Sassafras Street – The southbound Pacific Highway to eastbound Sassafras Street left-turn movement is projected to be over capacity during the PM peak hour under the implementation of the Preferred Plan.

#35 Pacific Highway and West Laurel Street – West Laurel Street is projected to be over capacity during both peak hours under implementation of the Preferred Plan.

#44: Nimitz Boulevard / Lowell Street & Rosecrans Street – The eastbound approach on Rosecrans Street is projected to be over capacity under implementation of the Preferred Plan during the PM peak hour.

#54: Moore Street & Old Town Avenue - The eastbound and northbound approaches are projected to be over capacity under implementation of the Preferred Plan during peak hour.

B1-7: The calculations take into account the transit improvements that were identified to be constructed by Year 2035, and included in revenue constrained of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

B1-7 (cont.):

These improvements were assumed in the SANDAG Series 12 Transportation forecast which was used to project the future traffic volumes under Preferred Plan conditions. Therefore, any reduction in vehicular traffic associated with these improvements was accounted for.

B1-8: Bus service and operations is currently under of the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS). Therefore, the City of San Diego does not have the authority to implement new services or change existing ones. The timing of the implementation of these future transit services was derived from the 2050 RTP which plans and sets the funding for regionally significant transportation infrastructure within the San Diego region, including transit service.

B1-9: The alternative transportation improvements noted in this comment require public-private partnerships with organizations and businesses within the community. The DPEIR is a programmatic document that addresses alternative forms of transportation improvements through Mobility Element Policies ME-7.1 through ME-7.9.

B1-10: Comment noted. MCRD is included in the community plan area because of it's connectivity to, and shared dependence on the community roadway network. This issue will be further addressed in an attachment to the Planning Commission Staff Report.

B1-11: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis presented in the Draft PEIR; however, comments related to the Draft Community Plan will be addressed in an attachment to the Planning Commission Staff Report.

B1-12: Comment noted. Parking is not an issue area requiring analysis under CEQA. Comments related this issue will be further addressed in an attachment to the Planning Commission Staff Report.

MIDWAY PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP

B1-14 We again with to thank you for this opportunity to comment on the DPEIR and look forward to receiving your responses to our comments.

Sincerely,

Chair
Midway Pacific Highway Community Planning Group

3

B1-13: The summary of the historic context in the Historic Preservation Element of the Draft Community Plan does address the La Playa Trail, and the policies of the Education and Incentives section addresses it more indirectly, as follows (italics used to emphasize existing language related to La Playa Trail):

HP-3.1: Promote opportunities for education and interpretation of the Midway - Pacific Highway community's unique history and historic resources through mobile technology (such as phone apps); printed brochures; walking tours; interpretative signs, markers, displays, and exhibits; and public art. *Encourage the inclusion of both extant and non-extant resources, as well as the retention of existing commemorative and interpretive markers, as appropriate.*

HP-3.2: *Partner with local community and historic organizations, including the La Playa Trail Association*; the Marine Corps Recruit Depot Museum and Museum Foundation; the San Diego Air and Space Museum; the Jewish Historical Society of San Diego; and the San Diego History Center *to better inform and educate the public on the unique history of the Midway - Pacific Highway community*, as well as the purpose, objectives, merits and benefits of historic preservation.

A new policy has been added to the Historic Preservation Element of the Draft Community Plan that states,

"Explore options to better demarcate, either physically or virtually (through websites, apps, etc.), the La Playa Trail and inform the public of its history and history."

The La Playa Trail is discussed in Section 2.3.3.2, History on page 2- 11, and in Section 5.8.3, Impact Analysis, Issue 3 on page 5.8-3, of the Draft Midway-Pacific Highway CPU PEIR (Draft PEIR). However, no significant impacts to the La Playa Trail were identified in the analysis of the Draft PEIR.

B1-14: Comment noted.

Letter B2

Peninsula Community Planning Board

February 15, 2018
Alyssa Muto
Deputy Director
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower
San Diego, California 92101

Subject: **MIDWAY-PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLAN UPDATE**
DRAFT PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
SCH #2015111013

Ms. Muto,

By action of the Peninsula Community Planning Board [PCPB], at its meeting of February 15, 2018, please accept this letter as our public comment in response to the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update [MPHCPU] Draft Program Environmental Impact Report [DPEIR].

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input on the environmental effects of a plan for a neighboring community whose development is vitally important to the future of our own. Moreover, we applaud the efforts of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group, City Staff and consultants for bringing about the update of the MPHCPU. The plan update, the subject environmental impact report and the implementing funding and zoning actions all bring needed clarity of vision for the Midway area.

B2-1

Our crafting of this response letter had two primary objectives. The first was to comment on the adequacy of environmental analysis and respond to potential effects of the MPHCPU within the Peninsula Community Plan area, acting in our capacity as the City's authorized advisory body. Secondly, and equally important, is that we sought to broaden the understanding of the effects of the MPHCPU by our constituent Peninsula residents through the process of disseminating and discussing the review and policy responses contained in this letter during open sessions at committee and PCPB meetings.

This letter comprises three parts. The first comments on significant impacts declared in the DPEIR for locations within the Peninsula Community Plan area and states our policy responses to those impacts. The second part presents questions or issues which came to light through our review. The third component is an administrative request that traffic modeling data output be made available to us, for major streets within the Peninsula Community Plan area.

SIGNIFICANT PENINSULA COMMUNITY AREA IMPACTS NOTED

Traffic at Intersections. The DPEIR identifies two significant traffic impact locations at intersections within the Peninsula Community Plan area, neither of which are proposed to be fully mitigated.

B2-2

Lytton Street & Rosecrans Street (Impact 5.2-7) – Full mitigation of the MPHCPU impact of increased traffic at this location would require addition of a second southbound left-turn lane from Lytton Street to eastbound Rosecrans Street, an additional westbound through movement lane on Rosecrans Street,

Peninsula Community Planning Board
1220 Rosecrans Street. PMB 549, San Diego, CA 92106
www.pcpb.net
pcpbsd@gmail.com

Letter B2 - Peninsula Community Planning Board (2/15/2018)

B2-1: Comment noted.

B2-2: Comment noted.

Peninsula Community Planning Board

and implementation of right-turn overlap phases at all legs of the intersection. The DPEIR indicates that partial mitigation, comprising addition of a second southbound left-turn lane from Lytton Street to eastbound Rosecrans Street and implementation of the right-turn overlap phases at all legs of intersection, is proposed for implementation funding. The proposed mitigation measure [TRANS 5.2-7b] would reduce impacts at the intersection of Lytton Street and Rosecrans Street to LOS E in the AM peak hour and to LOS D in the PM peak hour, thereby reducing the impact in the PM peak hour to less than significant.

B2-2 (cont.)

PCPB Review of This Impact: The PCPB does not question the calculation of this outcome.

PCPB Policy Response: The PCPB accepts the partial mitigation of the significant traffic impact at this intersection in lieu of the disruption which would result from the acquisition and construction required to add the additional through lanes on Rosecrans Street necessary to achieve full mitigation.

Nimitz Boulevard/Lowell Street and Rosecrans Street (Impact 5.2-15) -- Full mitigation of the MPHCPU impact of increased traffic at this location would require widening the eastbound and westbound approaches of the intersection along Rosecrans Street to include a third through lane, and an additional left-turn lane from eastbound Rosecrans Street to northbound Nimitz Boulevard. This mitigation is not proposed for implementation.

PCPB Review of This Impact: The DPEIR fails to account for the City's *Nimitz & Rosecrans Roadway Improvement Project*, a presently funded and planned improvement at this intersection. The project is scheduled for construction beginning in the current FY 2018. It will partially widen the eastbound approach of Rosecrans Street and add an additional left turn lane from eastbound Rosecrans Street to northbound Nimitz Boulevard. The impact of the MPHCPU should be recalculated to account for this reasonably anticipated new configuration.

B2-3

PCPB Policy Response: The PCPB accepts the partial mitigation of the significant traffic impact in the form of the currently anticipated reconfiguration at this intersection, in lieu of the disruption which would result from the acquisition and construction required to add the additional through lanes on Rosecrans Street necessary to achieve full mitigation.

Arterial Traffic Noise. The DPEIR declares a significant impact would occur for ministerial projects exposed to vehicular traffic noise, in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element, based on future (2035) noise contours as shown in Figure 5.5-3 (Impact 5.5-3).

PCPB Review of this Impact: Figure 5.5-3 maps the impact noise contours only within the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area. A reasonable inference of the figure, however, would indicate significant noise impacts on two residential neighborhoods within the Peninsula Community Plan area. These locations include residences fronting Rosecrans Street east of Lytton Street and multifamily residences fronting Midway Drive, immediately south of West Point Loma Boulevard. Because residential uses are more sensitive to noise impacts and because these locations are developed and more likely to improve under ministerial processes,

B2-4

-2-

B2-3: Intersection #44: Nimitz Boulevard / Lowell Street and Rosecrans Street is currently under construction with the implementation of the Nimitz & Rosecrans Roadway Improvement Project, which includes adding a second left-turn lane on the eastbound and westbound approaches along Rosecrans Street, as well as providing a separate westbound right-turn lane. These intersection improvements were not incorporated into the operations analysis of Intersection #44: Nimitz Boulevard/Lowell Street and Rosecrans Street presented in the traffic impact studies (TISs) and the Draft PEIR of the Midway Pacific Highway CPU. Since these intersection improvements become a part of the future condition, the operations analysis of Intersection #44: Nimitz Boulevard / Lowell Street and Rosecrans Street under the CPU's Preferred Plan has been revised.

The updated analysis results show that the intersection is no longer significantly impacted under the AM peak hour and only the PM peak hour impact still remains. Additionally, the mitigation measures proposed at Intersection #44: Nimitz Boulevard / Lowell Street and Rosecrans Street were also revised due to the implementation of the Nimitz & Rosecrans Roadway Improvement Project. The analysis indicates the significant impact at this intersection would be fully mitigated by roadway widening to construct an additional through lane in the eastbound direction along Rosecrans Street. However, there is not enough right-of-way on Rosecrans Street to widen to five lanes; therefore, this project is not identified in the Midway Pacific Highway IFS and the impact at this intersection continues to remain significant and unavoidable.

Overall, all the appropriate figures, tables, and text in the TIS and Final PEIR were updated to reflect the revised analysis.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

B2-4: The comment suggests that Impact 5.5-3 understates the potential for future traffic noise impacts on noise sensitive land uses created or located in the adjacent Peninsula Community Plan area. The language used in the impact statement covered all potential ministerial projects that may occur anywhere within the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Additional clarification regarding the noise sensitive land uses in the adjacent Peninsula Community Plan area has been added to the applicable locations in Section 5.5, Noise, of the Draft PEIR.

The comment suggests a voluntary retrofit assistance program for residential properties outside of the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Although not shown on Figures 5.5-2 & 5.5-3, traffic noise was analyzed for areas adjacent to the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Based on the analysis, exterior noise impacts associated with future ministerial projects exposed to vehicular traffic noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element, based on future (2035) noise contours, would result in a significant impact. No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address this impact because there is no mechanism or funded program in place to provide noise attenuation at existing structures that would be exposed to ambient noise increases, and the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Peninsula Community Planning Board

B2-4 (cont.)

the significance of the impact on these locations is more critical than conveyed by the DPEIR in its current assessment. The DPEIR should be amended to reflect these impacts.

PCPB Policy Response: The PCPB would support a voluntary retrofit assistance program for the limited number of residential properties within the impacted frontage areas. Absent further knowledge of possible mitigation measures, the PCPB reserves judgement on this matter.

QUESTIONS AND CLARIFICATION MATTERS

In the process of reviewing the DPEIR, we noted the following matters, requiring response and further analysis.

B2-5

I-5/I-8 Interchange Configuration -- Table 8-6 appears to indicate that the provision of the missing I-5/I-8 interchange movements contained in the "No Project" Alternative (being the current Midway Community Plan) would be carried forward into the proposed MPHCPU. It describes the missing movements as "eastbound-to-southbound and southbound-to-westbound connectors" [underline emphasis added].

PCPB Review of this Matter:

- The description should read "eastbound-to-northbound and southbound-to-westbound".
- Was the carry forward of these components, correctly encoded, included in the forecasting done in the Mobility Study and DPEIR traffic analysis?
- Is a proposal for funding of these connectors to be included as mitigation or included in the upcoming the financing plan?
- If it was modeled, and implementation was not assured by mitigation or the financing plan, would the future absence of these components have led to an understatement traffic impacts within the community?
- If the completion of these connectors is left unmitigated but identified as the responsibility of CalTrans, is the City of San Diego prepared to pursue design and funding in the ongoing presently ongoing I-5 freeway corridor study and subsequent Regional Transportation Plan funding cycles?

B2-6

Zoning Capacity -- The proposed zoning map (Figure 3-5) indicates zoning designations for the MPHCPU. Critical among these are three particular areas which have broad possibilities for future development. These areas and their assigned proposed zoning can be generally described as SPAWAR [IP 2-1], the former Post Office [CO 3-1], and the Sports Arena [CC 3-6].

PCPB Review of this Matter:

- In Figure 3-5, the color assigned to the Post Office site does not appear to match the correlating color in the figure legend.
- Are the impacts generated by these sites, in terms of traffic generation and other similar scaled demands calculated on buildout of the total site acreage at the maximum capacity of the assigned zones, as a "worst case" analysis?
- If so, will the mitigation and finance plans similarly project maximum financial contributions from these sites?

- 3 -

B2-5: Bullet #1: Table 8-6 in the Draft PEIR will be revised to be "eastbound-to- northbound and southbound-to-westbound." Table 8-6 will be revised to note that the I-8 to I-5 connector ramps are not carried forward in the Preferred Plan.

Bullet #2: The missing I-8 East to I-5 North, and I-5 South to I-8 West ramps are included in the Unconstrained Revenue scenario of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); therefore, there is currently no funding mechanism for these ramps and they are not included in the Preferred Plan assessment.

Bullet #3: Per response above, these ramp connectors were not modeled or included in the Preferred Plan assessment.

Bullet #4: Please see previous response; as these ramps were not included in the model, there is no funding at this time associated with their construction.

Bullet #5: A policy statement that supports these ramp connectors is included in the Mobility Element as Policy ME-5.10.

B2-6: Regarding Draft PEIR Figure 3-5, the legend has been corrected to correspond to the map color used for the CO-3-1 zone. Regarding Bullets 2 & 3, the proposed zoning would implement the proposed land use designations. As discussed in Draft PEIR Section 3.6 and PEIR Appendix N, future development projections per the land uses allowed have been identified and are used for facility planning, technical evaluation, and environmental review purposes for this PEIR, as well as for the preparation of the Impact Fee Study for the Community Plan Update. The assumptions were developed based on the draft community plan vision, land use map, and policies, and on market demand, existing conditions, and constraints. Proposed mitigation measures are based on the potential impact identified in the Draft PEIR, not on future development projections.

Peninsula Community Planning Board

B2-7 Historic Resources -- The DPEIR contains no discussion of La Playa Trail in its Historical Resources sections.

PCPB Review of this Matter:

- The generally understood alignment of the La Playa trail was the Rosecrans corridor, between the north shore of San Diego Bay northeastward toward the Presidio and Mission San Diego de Alcala. In the past, the trail route has been acknowledged by markers.

B2-8 Bicycle Facilities -- The text on page 8-14 indicates that a Class I bikeway, "along the Bay-to-Bay canal alignment" as contained in the "No Project" Alternative (being the current Midway Community Plan) would be carried forward into the proposed MPHCPU.

PCPB Review of this Matter:

- Such an alignment does not appear to be shown on the DPEIR Figure 5.2-2 ["Existing and Planned Bicycle Network".
- Is a proposal for funding of this ambitious alignment to be included as mitigation or included in the upcoming the financing plan?

ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST FOR DATA OUTPUT

Apart from the discussion of the DPEIR itself, this letter specifically requests that the City of San Diego compile and produce for the PCPB a table or graphic depicting the output traffic projections in the Mobility Study and DPEIR traffic analysis for each General Plan-level arterial and major street segment within the Peninsula Community Plan area.

B2-9 The City of San Diego has rightly invested a considerable amount of staff time and consultant funding to conceive mobility proposals and create traffic models as critical components in assembling the MPHCPU and the DPEIR. This effort provides a unique opportunity for the PCPB to gain a greater understanding of future traffic in the Peninsula Community Plan area. We see these output daily traffic projections as valid indicators based on some unique situational factors. We are adjacent to the subject planning area; we are down-peninsula, in a kind of cul-de-sac with little through traffic; and our zoning and plan designations have changed little over the years. We hope that you can provide us with the mapped or tabular data as requested.

B2-10 We again thank you for this opportunity to comment and participate in the assessment of this valuable community plan update DPEIR. We look forward to the response to these comments and the fulfillment of our administrative request.

Sincerely,

Jon Linney
Chair
Peninsula Community Planning Board

B2-7: Please see the response to comment B1-13.

B2-8: The text on Page 8-14 of the Draft PEIR relates to the No Project Alternative, which is the existing 1991 Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan. The Bay-to-Bay Connection section of the existing Community Plan includes a policy which states "Develop appropriate uses within the canal influence area adjacent to the canal, including a mix of passive, park-like amenities, walking and bicycling paths, as well as hotel, retail and other uses that can take advantage of this unique amenity." Since the Bay-to-Bay canal concept was determined to be infeasible, City Council has provided direction for the proposed CPU to include an alternate Bay-to-Bay connection. Figure 5.2-2, which relates to the proposed CPU, includes a Bay-to-Bay bicycle and pedestrian connection with a route along Sports Arena Boulevard, Kemper Street, Dutch Flats Parkway, and Barnett Avenue. This connection can also be seen in CPU Figure 3-2. The proposed pedestrian and bicycle connection is included in the draft Impact Fee Study for the proposed CPU.

B2-9: Roadways and intersections within the project study area were selected based on criteria described in Section 2.1 of the TIS (provided as Appendix B to the Draft PEIR). The requested traffic projections and analysis are outside the scope of work for this effort.

B2-10: Comment noted.

CC: Hon. Lorie Zapf, City of San Diego Councilmember, District 2
Chair Cathy Kenton, Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group
Tony Kempton, Advising Planner to the PCPB
Vicky White, Advising Planner to the MPHCPG

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter B3

PALA TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

PMB 50, 35008 Pala Temecula Road
Pala, CA 92059
760-891-3510 Office | 760-742-3189 Fax

PALA THPO

December 29, 2017

Susan Morrison
City of San Diego Planning Dept.
1010 2nd Ave, Suite 1200
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update

Dear Ms. Morrison:

The Pala Band of Mission Indians Tribal Historic Preservation Office has received your notification of the project referenced above. This letter constitutes our response on behalf of Robert Smith, Tribal Chairman.

B3-1 We have consulted our maps and determined that the project as described is not within the boundaries of the recognized Pala Indian Reservation. The project is also beyond the boundaries of the territory that the tribe considers its Traditional Use Area (TUA). Therefore, we have no objection to the continuation of project activities as currently planned and we defer to the wishes of Tribes in closer proximity to the project area.

We appreciate involvement with your initiative and look forward to working with you on future efforts. If you have questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone at 760-891-3515 or by e-mail at sgaughen@palatribe.com.

Sincerely,

Shasta C. Gaughen, PhD
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Pala Band of Mission Indians

ATTENTION: THE PALA TRIBAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL REQUESTS FOR CONSULTATION. PLEASE ADDRESS CORRESPONDENCE TO **SHASTA C. GAUGHEN** AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS. IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO ALSO SEND NOTICES TO PALA TRIBAL CHAIRMAN ROBERT SMITH.

Consultation letter 1

Letter B3 - Pala Tribal Historic Preservation Office (12/29/2017)

B3-1: Comment noted. All culturally affiliated tribal groups in San Diego County were sent a public notice for the Draft PEIR. At the close of public review, in addition to this letter indicating the project is not within the aboriginal territory or boundaries of the territory that the Rincon tribe considers its Traditional Use Area (TUA), the Viejas Tribal Government submitted a comment letter indicating that the project site has cultural significance or ties to Viejas, and requests adequate buffer zones, that all NEPA/CEQA/NAGPRA laws be followed, and to immediately contact Viejas on any changes or inadvertent discoveries.

Additionally, an NOP was released in October 2015, several months after the passage of AB 52. At that time, the City of San Diego had not yet received any formal requests for notification by a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed CPU, and therefore, formal consultation under AB 52 was not initiated. During this time, however, the City had already provided notification to locally affiliated tribes in accordance with SB 18 and no requests for consultation were requested. On June 30, 2016, the City received letters and maps from the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel and Jamul Indian Village identifying their traditionally and culturally affiliated areas within the City of San Diego's jurisdictional boundaries for the purpose of AB 52 notification, which includes the CPU area. In July 2017, letters were sent to both Tribes informing them that a Draft PEIR was being prepared for the project, and requesting if consultation was required in accordance with the provisions of AB 52. Although no response was received within the proscribed timeframe, information about the CPU project scope, records search results and proposed Mitigation Framework for subsequent project review was presented at the monthly tribal consultation meeting in November 2017. Specifically, the City's programmatic approach to subsequent "project-level" environmental review detailed in the Mitigation Framework was discussed, including

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

B3-1 (cont.):

assurance that tribal consultation in accordance with the provisions of AB 52 would be implemented during project specific environmental review when known resources are present or a potential exists for resources to be encountered. All concurred and consultation was concluded.

Letter B4

RINCON BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS
Cultural Resources Department
1 W. Tribal Road · Valley Center, California 92082
(760) 297-2330 Fax:(760) 297-2339

January 3, 2018

Susan Morrison
The City of San Diego
Planning Department
1010 2nd Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Project No. 561546

Dear Ms. Morrison:

B4-1 This letter is written on behalf of the Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians. Thank you for inviting us to submit comments on the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Project No. 561546. Rincon is submitting these comments concerning your projects potential impact on Luiseño cultural resources.

The Rincon Band has concerns for the impacts to historic and cultural resources and the finding of items of significant cultural value that could be disturbed or destroyed and are considered culturally significant to the Luiseño people. This is to inform you, your identified location is not within the Luiseño Aboriginal Territory. We recommend that you locate a tribe within the project area to receive direction on how to handle any inadvertent findings according to their customs and traditions.

B4-2 If you would like information on tribes within your project area, please contact the Native American Heritage Commission and they will assist with a referral.

Thank you for the opportunity to protect and preserve our cultural assets.

Sincerely,

Destiny Colocho
Manager
Rincon Cultural Resources Department

Bo Mazzetti, Tribal Chairman · Tishmall Turner, Vice Chairwoman · Steve Stallings, Council Member · Laurie E. Gonzalez, Council Member · Alfonso Kolb, Council Member

Letter B4 - Rincon Band of Luiseño Indians (1/3/2018)

B4-1: Comment noted.

B4-2: Comment noted. Please also see the response to comment B3-1.

Letter B5

VIEJAS
TRIBAL GOVERNMENT

P.O Box 908
Alpine, CA 91903
#1 Viejas Grade Road
Alpine, CA 91901

Phone: 6194453810
Fax: 6194455337
viejas.com

January 8, 2018

Susan Morrison
Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Dept.
1010 2nd Ave. Suite 1200, East Tower, MS-413
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update

Dear Ms. Morrison,

In reviewing the above referenced project the Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians ("Viejas") would like to comment at this time.

The project area may contain many sacred sites to the Kumeyaay people. We request that these sacred sites be avoided with adequate buffer zones.

Additionally, Viejas is requesting, as appropriate, the following:

B5-1

- All NEPA/CEQA/NAGPRA laws be followed
- Immediately contact Viejas on any changes or inadvertent discoveries.

Thank you for your collaboration and support in preserving our Tribal cultural resources. I look forward to hearing from you. Please call me at 619-659-2312 or Ernest Pingleton at 619-659-2314, or email, rteran@viejas-nsn.gov or epingleton@viejas-nsn.gov, for scheduling. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ray Teran, Resource Management
VIEJAS BAND OF KUMEYAAY INDIANS

Letter B5 - Viejas Tribal Government (1/8/2018)

B5-1: Comment noted. Tribal Cultural Resources are addressed in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources, of the Draft PEIR. The CPU is not subject to NEPA, and as such no further review under federal laws would be required. Subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the CPU may be subject to review in accordance with CEQA, and NEPA/NAGPRA if federal funds are involved.

The need for archaeological and Native American Kumeyaay monitoring during all project-related activities is described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources, of the Draft PEIR, Subsection 5.3.6 in mitigation measure HIST 5.3-2. These recommendations are also consistent with policies included in the City of San Diego's General Plan Historic Preservation Element and as specifically stated in the City's Historical Resources Guidelines for each phase of a project that involves cultural/archaeological resource surveys and/or investigations. Furthermore, the City is committed to maintaining an on-going relationship with the local Native American community through informal and formal consultation/meetings to ensure that the City is meeting its regulatory compliance obligations in accordance with Senate Bill 18 and AB 52.

Letter B6

San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.
Environmental Review Committee

17 February 2018

To: Ms. Susan Morrison
Planning Department
City of San Diego
Suite 1200, East Tower, MS413
1010 Second Avenue
San Diego, California 92101

Subject: Draft Program Environmental Impact Report
Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update
Project No. 561546

Dear Ms. Morrison:

I have reviewed the cultural resources aspects of the subject DPEIR on behalf of this committee of the San Diego County Archaeological Society.

B6-1

1. Based on the information contained in the DPEIR and its archaeological and historical resources appendices, we have the following comments:

2. Regarding both archaeological and historical resources, in-depth review awaits submittal of each individual project for public review via the City's environmental review process. We look forward to participating in that process.

B6-2

3. Will it is probably of no major consequence because this is a programmatic document, we note that the records searches were most recently obtained in 2011 and thus are in excess of the normal five years threshold for acceptability.

B6-3

4. Considering that the West Point Loma Dump site is of historic age and unknown extent, archaeological monitoring needs to be included in most future projects in this planning area. We note that, most of the area is fill over salt flats, the origin and dates of that fill is likely unknown. Consequently, there is a possibility of historic material in that fill. And the City should therefore require an archaeological monitor to also be present during geotechnical testing.

B6-4

As noted above, please ensure SDCAS is included in the public review of project level environmental documents for this planning area.

P.O. Box 81106 San Diego, CA 92138-1106 (858) 538-0935

Letter B6 - San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc. (2/17/2018)

B6-1: Comment noted.

B6-2: Comment noted. A subsequent records search of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) was conducted by qualified City staff in 2014, prior to distribution of materials to all culturally affiliated California Native American tribe identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in accordance with Senate Bill 18 (SB 18). The updated records search did not identify any newly recorded archaeological sites within the CPU and does not change the significance determination. This information was inadvertently excluded from Subsection 2.3.3.1, Prehistory, and Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources, of the Draft PEIR and as such, the subsection and section have been updated accordingly in the Final PEIR.

B6-3: Comment noted. The need for archaeological monitoring during all project-related activities is described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources, of the Draft PEIR, Subsection 5.3.6 in mitigation measure HIST 5.3-2. Archaeological monitoring during geotechnical testing is determined on a case-by-case basis when an application is submitted for review as described in the Mitigation Framework.

B6-4: Comment noted.

Thank you for including SDCAS in this community plan update's DPEIR.

Sincerely,

James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson
Environmental Review Committee

cc: AECOM
SDCAS President
File

P.O. Box 81106 • San Diego, CA 92138-1106 • (858) 538-0935

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter B7

Save Our Heritage Organisation

Saving San Diego's Past for the Future

Tuesday, February 20, 2018

Susan Morrison, Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update/No. 561546

Ms. Morrison,

Save Our Heritage Organisation (SOHO) supports the historic preservation survey done as part of the Program Environmental Impact Report for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan update (No. 561546), which identified 43 potentially historic resources. However, in addition to the intact Motor Courts (or auto camps) within this plan area, the historical development of this location is quite significant on a national scale to the Air and Space Industry. These two themes, the Air and Space Industry and early auto camps, highlight an important industry and early transportation improvements within San Diego, and should be used to establish a multiple property listing (MPL) for buildings associated with these two identified themes.

B7-1

Examples for the Air and Space industry include the Ryan Airline industrial hanger where Charles Lindbergh built a custom M 1 monoplane, called the Spirit of St. Louis. Another example is buildings from Consolidated Aircraft, which had "the greatest impact to San Diego's aerospace industry," (HP-160). Motor courts, which used to be prevalent and are now rare, are part of the greater promotion of tourism in Old Town and within San Diego. They are located non-contiguously, but illustrate an important pattern of infill development for this plan area. Examples of the few remaining intact auto courts include 4432 and 4440 Pacific Coast Highway.

SOHO supports the historic survey but strongly urges two multiple property listings be included as recommendations, the Air and Space Industry and Motor Courts.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment,

Bruce Coons
Executive Director
Save Our Heritage Organisation

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Jaye MacAskill, President • David Goldberg, Vice President • Jessica McGee, Treasurer • John Eisenhart, Secretary
M. Wayne Donaldson • Erik Hanson • Paul Johnson • Nancy Moors • John Rush • Scott Sandel • David Swarens • Kiley Wallace
Bruce Coons, Executive Director

Letter B7 - Save Our Heritage Organisation (2/20/2018)

B7-1: This letter requests the identification of potential Multiple Property Listings (MPLs) related to auto camps and aerospace-related resources within the community. Auto camps/motor courts are addressed in Section 10.1, Prehistoric and Historic Context, of the Draft Community Plan. However, the survey identified few extant examples – primarily the Twin Palms Motel, which has been identified as a potential individual resource. The survey did not indicate a significant presence of extant auto camps that would warrant a community-specific MPL related to auto-camps. However, if the City pursues a City-wide MPL in the future related to bungalow courts and/or auto-camps, any relevant properties within the Midway-Pacific Highway community would be eligible for inclusion.

In regard to the aerospace MPL, SOHO previously raised this issue after the context and survey had been finalized. To address their comment, the following policy was included in the Historic Preservation Element of the Draft Community Plan:

HP-2.6**:** Evaluate the possibility of a multi-community or Citywide historic context statement and Multiple Property Listing related to the aerospace industry in San Diego.

This added policy captures and addresses this comment.

Letter B8

Morrison, Susan

From: slaub@landsolutionsinc.net
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 3:21 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: Morrison, Susan; White, Vickie; cathy@kentonproperties.com; Chris Penrose; 'Jim Thomas'; 'Jim Seman'; 'Tom Fox'
Subject: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Draft PEIR; Project No 561546; SCH # 2015111013
Attachments: Letter of Comment - draft PEIR.pdf

Attached to this email please find my letter of comment dated this date, February 20, 2018, regarding the draft PEIR for the referenced Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update – Project No. 561546. I am submitting this letter on behalf of my clients, the owners of 15 parcels collectively referenced as the Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne properties, located between Kurtz St and Hancock St. These properties are identified in Attachment A to the letter.

B8-1

We request that these comments and your appropriate responses per CEQA be included in the Final PEIR for the project. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

We appreciate your emailed response before close of business today to verify your receipt of these comments for inclusion in the Final PEIR. Thank you.

Steve Laub
Land Solutions, Inc.

7593 El Paso Street
La Mesa, CA 91942
Office: 619-644-3300
Fax: 888-213-9141

Serving Clients and Community Since 2001

Website: www.landsolutionsinc.net

"The secret of success is constancy to purpose."
- Benjamin Disraeli

Letter B8 - Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne Holdings (Land Solutions, Inc. [2/20/2018])

B8-1: Comment noted.

LAND SOLUTIONS INC.

7593 El Paso St
La Mesa, CA 91942
(619) 644-3300
Fax (888) 213-9141

February 20, 2018 Delivered via email

Susan Morrison, Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 2nd Ave, Suite 1200, East Tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

RE: PROJECT NAME: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update
PROJECT No.: 561546/SCH No.: 2015111013

Dear Ms. Morrison:

B8-2 I represent the owners of 15 properties comprising approximately 9.14 acres of property within the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Area. These 15 properties are listed on Attachment A to this letter and outlined on Attachment B, and are collectively referred to as the Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne holdings. On behalf of my clients, the owners of these properties, I am herewith submitting the following comments and recommendations for the Draft PEIR referenced above. We thank you for the opportunity to submit these comments.

B8-3 The proposed land use designation of the Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne holdings as "Business Park – Residential Permitted (0-44 du/ac)" and proposed zoning designation of "CO-3-1" is inappropriate. We request that these properties be designated as "Mixed Commercial Residential (0-73 du/ac) and zoned as CC-3-8 for the following reasons.

1. While the surrounding properties are proposed to be designated for Mixed Commercial Residential (0-73 du/ac) and zoned CC-3-8, carving out these few properties for the lower density unfairly places them at a market disadvantage to other properties in the area. We question how and why it was decided that a business park is needed in this area, and how and why it was decided that these specific properties were chosen for the stronger Business Park restrictions.

B8-4 2. 9.14 acres is not large enough to attract business park tenants or developers. The types of businesses permitted by the proposed CO zone prefer to locate where there are other similar businesses in the immediate area. Such a small secluded business park as is proposed here would not be effective in attracting such businesses.

B8-5 3. This location for a business park is not adequately served by the street network. Employees, customers, and services to such a business park would be required to turn off of Sports Arena Boulevard, onto Hancock Street and again onto Kurtz St. Not only is such an out-of-the-way destination poorly accessible, but cannot

B8-2: Comment noted. Attachments A and B are included below.

B8-3: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis presented in the Draft PEIR; however, comments related to the Draft Community Plan will be addressed in an attachment to the Planning Commission Staff Report.

B8-4: Please see the response to comment B8-3.

B8-5: Comment noted. The draft Community Plan's planned mobility network has been designed to meet the needs of forecast future land uses in the community. Notably, the draft Community Plan recommends mobility improvements throughout the community, including three planned new roads through the Sports Arena site connecting Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street in the vicinity of the properties designated as Business Park – Residential Permitted. These new roads will also provide improved pedestrian and bicycle connections from Kurtz Street to transit services along Sports Arena Boulevard.

561546/SCH No.: 2015111013
February 20, 2018

B8-5 (cont.)

accommodate the traffic for these uses. Kurtz Street's designation as 2-lane Collector street is insufficient for a business park.

4. This location is not consistent with the planning documentation that preceded the draft land use plan and zoning and was ostensibly a basis for the proposed land use distribution. The Keyser-Marston report Financial Feasibility of Development Prototypes, Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Planning Area (October 2012) uses as a prototype for a Business Park (page 10) the San Diego Spectrum in Kearny Mesa. That example has frontage on the highly visible and accessible 6-lane Major street of Kearny Villa Rd. and the 4-lane Major street of Lightwave Ave. The Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne properties designated for business park use do not have similar advantages. We question why they were designated for a business park in contradiction of the Keyser-Marston study for this community.

B8-6

5. This location is also too far from available public transit for the employees of a business park. The community plan update's own standard for walking distance from transit is ¼ mile, as indicated on Figure 3-4, page ME-62. That figure shows these properties as beyond the "0.25 Mile walkshed Buffer around Station/Stop". If all transit routes, including the Rapid Bus system, are to be on Sports Arena Blvd., the proposed plan for a business park greater than that standard, where employees would have to walk through commercial and residential developments to get to and from work, is not a practical location.

B8-7

6. We question why the Midway-Frontier/Queen Ann properties are reserved for a business park when there is already a highly successful business park at Sports Arena Village on the City-owned property on Hancock St. The street in front of that property is designated for 4-lanes, which is much more appropriate for a business park than is the 2-lane Kurtz St. There is a good reason why Sports Arena Village is a successful business park; it is in the right location with high visibility and ease of access.

B8-8

7. The designation of these properties is not consistent with the Economic Prosperity Element of the draft Community Plan Update. While the Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne properties are within the area labeled as the Camino del Rio District, the Economic Prosperity Element identifies four other areas – and not the Camino del Rio District - as appropriate for employment uses: the Dutch Flats, Kettner, and Kemper districts, and the Sports Arena Village (page EP-105, specifically:
   - "The Community Plan envisions that Dutch Flats Urban Village will provide office and research space for defense, high-tech, and clean-tech R&D businesses in a mixed use environment, along with flex space for other businesses."
   - "Opportunities also exist in the Kettner District for development of technology and R&D uses."
   - The Kemper Neighborhood Village and Sports Arena Community Village also offer opportunities for professional and multi-tenant office development."

B8-5 (cont.):

The business park designated properties are located approximately one-quarter mile (5-minute walk) to one-half mile (10-minute walk) from an existing transit stop on Sports Arena Boulevard, via the conceptual routes of planned new streets. These three planned new streets are described in Sections 3.4, Project Description, and 5.2. Transportation and Circulation, of the Draft PEIR. In addition, this comment concerning the street network will be addressed in an attachment to the Planning Commission Staff Report.

The travel demand forecasting model appropriately reflects the proposed land use designation of the proposed Community Plan, which includes the business park on Kurtz Street. Specifically, the traffic analysis of the Preferred Plan appropriately captures the traffic patterns and trip generation of the proposed land use. As shown in Table 5.2-6 in the Draft PEIR, Kurtz Street between Hancock Street and Rosecrans Street is projected to operate at LOS D under the Preferred Plan. LOS D is considered acceptable for Mobility Element roadway segments in the City of San Diego.

B8-6: Please see the response to comment B8-3.

B8-7: Please see the response to comment B8-3.

B8-8: Please see the response to comment B8-3.

B8-8 (cont)

If the plan's own Economic Prosperity Element designates those four areas for employment but not the Camino del Rio District, why is the Midway-Frontier/Queen Ann properties in Camino del Rio District designated with the more restrictive employment designation of "Business Park", while the Kemper and Sports Arena villages are designated entirely for commercial and residential uses with no employment land whatsoever?

B8-9

8. Plan areas to the east are more appropriate locations for business park designations due to their proximity to the airport and transit station and better highway access to I-5. Business Park designations should be prioritized in these locations – the Kettner District, Hancock Transit Corridor, Kurtz District, and Dutch Flats, and not on a few small and poorly accessible parcels in the Camino del Rio District.

B8-10

On February 14, the Midway Community Planning Group (Item 6.b.) voted to recommend revising the designations of my client's properties to "Mixed Commercial Residential (0-73 du/ac) and the zoning to CC-3-8.

For these reasons, we request that the Midway/Pacific Highway Community Plan Update designate the Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne properties for "Mixed Commercial Residential (0-73 du/ac) and zoned as CC-3-8, to be consistent with the surrounding properties, the Plan's own analyses and conclusions, the position of the community planning group, and good planning principals.

Sincerely,
LAND SOLUTIONS, INC.

Steve Laub
Principal

Cc Mr. Jim Thomas – for Midway-Frontier properties
Mr. Jim Seman - for Queen Anne properties
Mr. Chris Penrose
Ms. Cathy Kenton – Midway Community Planning Group
Ms. Vickie White – City of San Diego Planning Department

B8-9: Please see the response to comment B8-3.

B8-10: Comment noted.


Attachment A
Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne Properties List

Assessor's Parcel No.	Address	Acres
441-340-03	3612 Kurtz St	1.04
441-340-05	3602 Kurtz St	1.04
441-340-08	3502 Kurtz St	0.21
441-340-10	3608 Kurtz St	1.04
441-340-18	Kurtz St	0.50
441-340-19	3620 Kurtz St	0.38
441-340-20	Kurtz St	0.45
441-340-21	Hancock St	0.13
441-340-22	3501 Kurtz St	0.62
441-240-23	3511 Hancock St	0.56
441-340-24	3505 Hancock St	1.28
441-340-28	3550 Kurtz St	0.55
441-340-29	3540 Kurtz St	0.55
441-340-30	3520 Kurtz St	0.34
441-340-31	3520 Kurtz St	0.45
TOTAL ACRES		**9.14**


THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Attachment B
Midway-Frontier/Queen Anne Properties

City Proposed Land Use Map



City Proposed Zoning



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter B9

Morrison, Susan

From: Dorian Siemens <dorian@verticalhold.com>
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2018 9:59 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf; White, Vickie; Murphy, Jeff
Subject: Public comment on PROJECT No. 561546, Midway Pacific Community Plan (corrected)

Hancock St. Neighborhood Business Association

Public comment on PROJECT No. 561546

(Corrected version; previously sent draft described the South Hancock Shareway as between Laurel and Noell, and the area we are specifying is Hancock between Witherby and Noell, apologies)

We are the Hancock Neighborhood Business Association, and we are offering our feedback as a part of the Public Review of Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan, PROJECT No. 561546.

B9-1

The Hancock Neighborhood Business Association (HNBA) is composed of the following participating businesses; Culture Shock Dance Center, San Diego Circus Center, Cali-Coast Elite Gymnastics, Bikram Yoga College, Vertical Hold Climbing Gym, and Murphy Construction.

We are specifically concerned with the portion of the plan described on page 45 of the mobility report, **section 3.4.2 Bicycle Improvements.**

" Class II Bike Lanes in both directions along Hancock Street between Old Town Avenue and Noell Street."

We are happy to see improvements being made for bicyclists, but as our neighborhood has major parking congestion issues, we would like for the city to consider our proposal, "The South Hancock Shareway" alternative. It is an inexpensive solution that is balanced and serves the local business community, and provides for the safety of bicyclists.

Instead of two Class II Bike Lanes, we would like for the planning board to consider:

B9-2

The South Hancock Shareway

- **A Class III Bike Route through this corridor**, creating "shareways" in both directions along Hancock St. between Witherby and Noell. There should be abundant signage and painted "sharrows".
- **Back in Angled parking along the eastern curbline of Hancock St**. Currently, this side of Hancock has non-designated parallel parking. This parallel parking should be replaced with back-in angled parking stalls. When leaving the back-in angled parking space, drivers have an unobstructed view of traffic and can enter the traffic stream directly. According to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information

1

Letter B9 - Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association (NBA) (1/19/2018)

B9-1: Comment noted.

B9-2: These comments do not address the adequacy of the Draft PEIR, but are part of the administrative record and will be considered by the City during the decision-making process. Parking is not an environmental issue analyzed under CEQA unless it is attributed to a specific physical impact on the environment, and it is therefore not discussed in the Draft PEIR. However, Planning considered Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility, parking net gain associated with each roadway configuration, and the balance of all transportation modes. Mobility goals for the Midway-Pacific Highway community include enhancements to streetscapes and street functionality that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit activity. A variety of policies in the Draft Community Plan and the City's General Plan are aimed at re-examining the existing right-of-way dedicated to vehicular use, and how to accommodate other modes of transportation for complete, safe, and efficient bicycle and pedestrian networks. These goals and policies reinforce the City's Climate Action Plan, in which a multimodal network is necessary to enact modal shift from single-occupancy vehicles to transit, cycling, and walking. Based on our technical engineering analysis and the aforementioned considerations, it is recommended that Class II Bike Lanes are constructed on each side of Hancock Avenue.

Center, back-in angle parking provides motorists with better vision of pedestrians, bicyclists, motor vehicles, and other road users as they exit a parking space and enter moving traffic. Back-In angle parking also eliminates the danger of bicycles colliding with open car doors, which would be a problem with the current Community Plan.

B9-2 (cont.)

- **Back in Angled parking along the western curbline of Hancock St**. Currently, this side of the street has wide and crudely painted angled parking stalls. Repainting with back in angled parking along the western curbline of Hanckock would help with bicycle safety and help add to the parking.
- **Narrowing of the traffic corridor.** This would have a speed softening effect, helping with pedestrian, cyclist and motorist safety..

B9-3 We are asking for the support of our District #2 City Councilmember Lori Zapf, and we hope those tasked with reviewing the Midway Pacific Community Plan will consider the needs of the neighborhood businesses and our community. This is an opportunity for a fair compromise. Please support this common sense plan and help our neighborhood.

[redacted]
Operations Manager
Vertical Hold Climbing Gym

[redacted]
Co-Owner, Culture Shock Dance Center
Founder, Chief Artistic Director, Culture Shock
Dance Troupes, Inc.

[redacted]
Director
Barnet Yuen San Diego

[redacted]
Founder Hand Candy
CalCoastline Gymnastics

[redacted]
Founder & CEO
San Diego Circus Center

[redacted]
Co-Owner Principal Construction Manager
Morley Construction

--
Dorian Siemens
Operations Manager
Vertical Hold Climbing Gym
VERTICAL HOLD

2

B9-3: Comment noted.

Letter B10

Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Enclosed in this envelope are the signatures that we collected from businesses along Hancock Street during May-June of 2017.

When we circulated this petition, we were asking people to voice their support for parking improvements to this neighborhood. There are nearly 1300 signatures here. I'm sure that these signatures have no official weight, as this was not an officially sanctioned petition, but I wanted to share the volume of responses that we received. I was also impressed by how broad of a geographic range our visitors come from. Our neighborhood draws visitors from all over the county, every day. We likely have over a 1000 visitor's everyday to Hancock Street, and they share ~145 street parking spots between Noell and Witherby. If we could add even 30 or 40 spaces to this total, it would have a huge impact.

B10-1

We feel strongly that the proposed South Hancock Shareway is the best use of space. It provides for the safety of bicycle traffic and adds to the available parking for automobiles.

Thanks for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Hancock Neighborhood Business Association

Letter B10 - Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association (Petition [2/20/2018])

B10-1: Comment noted.

Friends, Neighbors and Patrons of the Hancock Street Business area:

We would like to ask the city for help in finding more parking options for our Hancock Neighborhood.

This diverse and excellent community will be better able to serve its customers and grow if we can better utilize the existing street parking.

The current state of parking during peak user traffic creates an unsafe and stressful environment. Customers will commonly have to walk 3 or more blocks after/if they find parking. This in turn limits the accessibility of our neighborhood to potential visitors. Cars are often double parked in traffic lanes while drivers wait for passengers and parking. This, combined with cars that speed through our neighborhood, produces an unnecessarily hazardous and unwelcoming environment.

B10-2

We would like to ask the city to consider repainting the East side of Hancock Street with angled parking. We would also like to ask the city to encourage a shared use corridor for cyclists with signage and "sharrows" so that our cyclists are kept safe. These small measures will cost very little, and will help create more opportunity for the businesses that are here, and will help keep our visitors to this neighborhood safer and more likely to re-visit.

Please Help our local businesses succeed and lend your voice to this common sense cause. Sign our petition today!

B10-2: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
1. Siemens, Darrien		5.9.17	92116
2. Heanes, Denis		5.9.17	92118
3. Eric Galindo		5.9.17	92111
4. RAPENACHER JACOBS		5.9.17	92102
5. Rademacher, Benjamin		5/9/17	92103
6. DUYAO, ALANA		5/9/17	92126
7. Holmes, Russell		5/9/17	92124
8. Ramos, Chris		5/9/17	92014
9. Ozuna, Eric		5/9/17	91910
10. Vargas, Stacy		5/9/17	11249
11. BLACKWELL, MARTA		5/9/17	92122
12. Blackwell, Justin		5/9/17	CL 122
13. Meyer, Kurt		5/9/17	92134
14. Harrison, Rachael		5/9/17	92134
15. Mike Cesare		5/9/17	92101
16. Lynnette Tessitore		5/9/17	91910
17. Corrigan, Angela		5/6/17	91977
18. Michelina D'Amore		5/10/17	92127
19. Michael Carmelo Dimbarre		5/10/17	92115
20. Jannika Dimbarre		5/10/17	92110
21. Ryan Walsh		5/10/17	92107
22. MATT ANDERSON		5/10/17	92111
23. McNeal, Jenna		5/10/17	92122
24. Tran, Tuan		5/10/17	92117
25. Luis Do		5/10/17	92111

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

B10-3

B10-3: Comment noted. There are no specific comments, but a list of signatures is provided. Please note: petition numbers are out of order due to the petition's pages being submittal by several participating businesses located along Hancock Street, including Culture Shock Dance Center, San Diego Circus Center, Cali-Coast Elite Gymnastics, Bikram Yoga College, Vertical Hold Climbing Gym, and Murphy Construction.

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
51.	Parr, Mary		5/11/17	92127
52.	Anna Mihaly		5/11/17	92117
53.	Elio Navarro		5/11/17	92116
54.	Justin Hess		5/11/17	92103
55.	James Beckwith		5/11/2017	92114
56.	Nicole Kasavod (skim)		5/11/17	92107
57.	Emilie Jappelli		5/11/17	92107
58.	JESSE ORTIZ		5/12/17	92114
59.	Matthew Camilo		5/12/17	92107
60.	Danielle Kaberle		5/12/17	92106
61.	[illegible] Nguyen		5/12/17	92182
62.	Steven Loy		5/12/17	92122
63.	GARZA, MICHAEL		5/12/17	92122
64.	FULCHER, [illegible]		5/12/17	92126
65.	Bustamante, Ranier		5/12/17	92111
66.	Ruben Lopez		May 12, 2017	92114
67.	KATIE BASS		5/12/17	92116
68.	[illegible] Nguyen		May 12	92129
69.	Jeane Patton		5/12/17	92107
70.	TAMAYO, Eduardo		5/12/17	92123
71.	BORGOS, ANGELA		5/12/17	92129
72.	John Berkowitz		5/12/17	92103
73.	Gregina Kellman		5/12/17	92104
74.	Rafael Cuellar		5/13/17	92154
75.	Francia Morales		5/13/17	92154

BID-3 (cont)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
26.	Feist, Orion		5/10/17	92071
27.	Winders, Ryan		5/10/17	92117
28.	Sweeney, Mark		5/11/17	92115
29.	Johnson, Christopher		5/10/17	92109
30.	Hipp, James		5/11/17	92106
31.	Hoi, Kelvin		5/11/17	10583
32.	Kyle Skutt		5/11/17	92134
33.	Thomas Davenport		5/11/17	92120
34.	Joseph Smith		5/11/17	92115
35.	Lisa Schmid		5/11/17	92109
36.	Costa Vinnie		5/10/17	92071
37. (Bill-3 cont)	Benko, Jonathon		5/11/17	92107
38.	Graves, Owen		5/12/17	92101
39.	Daniel Sibley		5/12/17	92065
40.	Tyler Coffee		5/12/17	91945
41.	McGowan, Aaron		12 MAY 2017	92109
42.	Watson, Braden		5/12/17	92105
43.	Dorland, Taylor		5/10/17	92109
44.	DeBoth, Alisha		5/11/17	92104
45.	Soria, Nicole		5/11/17	92104
46.	Della, Quintin		5/11/17	92113
47.	Brian, Morgan		5/11/17	92104
48.	Jacksonville, Sebastian		5/11/17	92106
49.	Michael Chan		5/11/17	92117
50.	Yuval Gil		5/11/17	92102

ALSO the Paint job looks S

Thank you for supporting

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
76.	Davis, Melodie		5/13/17	91915
77.	Buell, Erika		5/13/17	92117
78.	[illegible] Jeff		5/13/17	91941
79.	Elizabeth Ellison		5/13/17	92019
80.	Joseph Strehlau		5/13/17	92122
81.	John Lu		5/13/17	92122
82.	Zach Wallach		5/13/17	92107
83.	Jamesan Tripp		5/13/17	92107
84.	Jessica Coelio		5/14/17	92123
85.	Christie Pass		5/14/17	92118
86.	Jessica Bash		5/14/17	92065
87.	John Pasternak		5/14/17	92104
88.	LINDA Cui		5.14.17	92122
89.	Cristobal Pacheco		5-14-17	92122
90.	Michael OBrien		5/14/17	92107
91.	Shelby Sleger		05-14-17	92107
92.	Pardis Sabeti		5/14/17	92107
93.	Guillermo Escobar		05/14/17	91914
94.	Sophia McClain		5/16/17	92121
95.	Ed Fuller		5.16.17	92101
96.	Alcanel, Justin		5-15-17	92025
97.	Dakota [illegible]		5.15.17	92117
98.	DEMACIA, DANIEL		5/15/17	92064
99.	Ekaterina Evdokimenko		5/15/17	92037
100.	Kendall Martin		5/15/17	91104

B10-3 (cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
101.	Jeffrey Rogers		5/15/17	92101
102.	Alex Tang		5-15-17	92110
103.	Joy Tatar		05-15-17	92110
104.	EVANS ANDREW		5/15/17	92111
105.	Alex Iraup		5/15/17	92109
106.	Naomi Spielman		5/15/17	92109
107.	Edward Seeley		5/15/17	92104
108.	Jenny Zhan		5/15/17	92109
109.	Lily Vazquez		5/15/17	92154
110.	Kenton Warren		5/16/17	92115
111.	MARK ALTMAN		5/15/17	92123
112.	Shane Finnerty		5/15/17	92117
113.	BERNARD GALVEZ		5-15-17	92154
114.	Leigh Tu		5-15-17	92118
115.	Karen Garcia		5-15-17	92014
116.	Bryce Belshan		5-15-17	92011
117.	Matt Belshan		5/15/17	92014
118.	Natalie Read		5/15/17	91978
119.	GRIFFITTS, KYLE		5/15/17	92101
120.	Chris Wallwaring		5/15/17	92107
121.	Laura Varela		5/15/17	92123
122.	Nathan Rios		5/15/17	92122
123.	Sean Hill		5/15/17	92107
124.	Taylor Diehl		5/15/17	92107
125.	E Greenblatt		5/15/17	92105

BP-3 (cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
126.	PERRY, ASHLEY		5.16.17	92106
127.	PERRY, MICHAEL		5.16.17	92106
128.	Jacobs, Lorow		5/16/17	92124
129.	Joyner, James		5/16/17	92117
130.	Hardy, Dan		5/16/17	92101
131.	Gonzalez, Mike		5/16/17	92114
132.	Lopez, Isaac		5/16/17	92108
133.	Ick, Christine		5/17/17	92139
134.	KOLEOS, KELLY	Kelly Koleos	5/17/17	92024
135.	Yanfang, Hank		5/17/17	92103
136.	Kong, James		5/17/17	92111
137.	Goodrich, Chris		5/16/17	92110
138.	Anthony Bergan		5/17/17	
139.	Daniel Nagy		5/17/17	92107
140.	Josiah Cooper		5/17/17	92120
141.	Paul Framel		5/17/17	92107
142.	Phoebe Liao		5/17/17	92123
143.	Chris LaPlant		5/17/17	92109
144.	Jan Savas-Carstens		5/17/17	92150
145.	Morgan Paintsparkdi		5/17/17	92122
146.	Hayden, Nicholas		5/17/17	92019
147.	Nicole Friend		5/17/17	92126
148.	Zack RADFUSS		5/17/17	92126
149.	Katy Torres		5/17/17	
150.	Lauren Ledesma		5/17/17	91978

B10-3 (cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
151.	Carr, Krysten		5/17/17	92120
152.	Melis Santos		5/17/17	92126
153.	DeMaria, Lydia		5/18/17	92064
154.	Travis West		5/18/17	19382
155.	Joey Reyes		5/18/17	92102
156.	WHITE, AARON		5/18/17	92110
157.	Gormley, Ashley		5/18/17	92109
158.	FEARLY Emilie		5/18/17	92109
159.	Otars Janet		5/18/17	92109
160.	CHRIS KRAMARZ		5-18-17	92110
161.	HEUSSENSTAM		5/19/17	92109
162.	K. HOFMAN 2018 #		19 MAY 17	91913
163.	Crawford, Michelle	Michelle Crawford	5/19/17	92110
164. (BIC-3 (cont.))	Walter, Ken		5/19/2017	96734
165.	Lorelle Anne		5/18/2017	92106
166.	FERTONANI DARIO		5/20/17	92122
167.	Kenneth North		5/20/17	92107
168.	Eribuck, Aaron		5/20/17	92057
169.	Stephen		5/20/17	
170.	Brad Crane		5.20.17	92057
171.	Nicole Cramer		5/20/17	92057
172.	John Lockard		20 May 17	92107
173.	William McDonough		20 MAY 17	92117
174.	Madelyn Stellpflug	Madelyn Stellpflug	5/20/17	92118
175.	Madelyn Allinger	Madelyn Allinger	5/20/17	92118

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
176.	Blore, Olivia		05/20/17	92118
177.	Hobleman, Joanne		5/20/17	92109
178.	MacKenzie Kaph		5/20	92118
179.	Miles Brenda		5/20	92102
180.	McCollum, Brandon		5/21	92166
181.	LEUNG, WAI CHUK		05/21	92122
182.	TOMLIN, JEFF		5/21	92118
183.	Kelbi Redquest		5/21	92126
184.	Redquest Christopher		5/21	92120
185.	William Stonehouse		5/21	9211
186.	Joey Becker		5/22	92021
187.	Brooke Babbs		5/22	92021
188.	Carlos Ojeda		5/22/17	91910
189. (BD-3 (cont))	Peter Salud		5.22.17	91911
190.	DENNIS SALAZAR		5.22.17	91911
191.	JOSEPH MACLEOD		5 22-17	92119
192.	[illegible] ADAM		5/22/17	92120
193.	Dingwall, B Jay		05/22/17	92114
194.	Peralta, Jennifer		05/22/17	92114
195.	Manley, Jake		5.22.17	92109
196.	Jenny Zuniga		5/22/17	92109
197.	Natalie Stringer		5/27/17	92118
198.	Elizabeth Hazard		5/22/17	92024
199.	Nichols CLARK		05/22/17	92118
200.	Arko, Brian		5/22/17	92109

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
201.	O Neil, Kevin		5/22	92109
202.	Yoon, Lily		5/22	92154
203.	Park, Sungjun		5/22	92108
204.	Corbett, Suzy		5/22	92106
205.	Renayne, Robert		5/23	92107
206.	Sun, Ling		5/23	92122
207.	Yiran Fujita		5/23	92122
208.	ANAR, NASRIN		5/23	92115
209.	McLaughlin, Kathleen		5/23	92103
210.	Wu, Ivan		5/23	92117
211.	Kotsuk, Alex		5/23	92037
212.	ANGEL, Gonzalez		5/23	92101
213.	Scott Black		5/23	92109
214.	Michael Montero		5/23	92106
215.	Wheeler, Megan		5/23	92106
216.	~~Theresa Davis~~, Theresa Davis		5/23	92117
217.	Ngo, Charles		5/23	92122
218.	[illegible]		5/23	92154
219.	patricia hua		5/23	92122
220.	Phillip Lin		5/23	
221.	Audrey Kim		5/23	92122
222.	Chris Shaw		5/23	92122
223.	Drew Dawson		5/23	91950
224.	Paul Kwon		5/23	
225.	Kara Bartone		5/23	92014

BIO-3 (cont)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
226.	Ten Holke, Peter		5/23/17	92014
227.	ZINTAK, DAVIDSON		5/24/17	92056
228.	Ryan, Mick		5/24/17	92116
229.	Metcalf, Colin		5/24/17	92103
230.	Galey, Josh		5.24.17	92110
231.	Mercer Tricia		5/24	92103
232.	Davis Kelly		5/24	92104
233.	Searles, Pauline		05/24/17	92104
234.	Patrick Gaetano		5/24/17	92120
235.	Reiger, Megan		5/24/17	92107
236.	Lau, Shirley		5/24/17	92109
237.	Ellis David		5/24/17	92071
238.	Eric Bowden		5/25/17	91203
239.	Lau, Corrine		5/25/17	92122
240.	Nguyen, Vu		5/24/17	92109
241.	ARGUELLO, ALEXANDRA		5/25/17	92104
242.	Milton Aguilar		05/25/17	92104
243.	Ferene Montoni-Lake		5/25/17	92110
244.	Kyle Williams		5/25/17	91901
245.	Orlando Cruz		5/24/17	92123
246.	Elizabeth Toledo		5/25/17	92123
247.	Richard Steel		5/25/17	92127
248.	Madeleine Moss		5/25/17	92103
249.	Jessica Van Ruiten		5.25.17	92104
250.	Ron Chu		5.25.17	92037

BB-3 (cont'd)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
251.	Mc Gorry Keith		5-25	92106
252.	Amanda Vignes		5.25	92106
253.	Rae Cooper		5 26	91977
254.	SPENCER COOPER		5-26	91977
255.	Melissa Lee		5-26	92116
256.	Owen Eigenbrot		5-26	92116
257.	CHRISTY BRILL		5-26	95122
258.	Michael Contreras		5-26	92118
259.	Jonathan Contreras		5-26	92115
260.	Liam Ryan		5-26	92104
261.	Dean Ram		5.26	92109
262.	LAMAR MATHEWSON		5.26	92109
263.	Chris Ra		5.26	92037
264.	Tupper Michelle		5.27	91977
265.	Danielle Haiden		5-27	92109
266.	David Collis		5-27	92109
267.	Alexandra Kriel		5-27	92109
268.	ERICHSEN, RYAN		5-27	92109
269.	Devin Wheeler		5-27-17	91941
270.	Sousa, Giovanni		5/27/17	91910
271.	Cedallos, Brianna		5/27/17	91910
272.	Greg Hayden		5/27/17	92118
273.	Barr, Arishanya		5/27/17	92111
274.	Parnizari, Dylan		5/27/17	92114
275.	Jonna Pabla			

BIO-3 (cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
276.	Tran, Qui		5/28/17	92102
277.	Josephy, Nicholas		5/28/17	92111
278.	Villavicencio, Erika		5/28/17	92019
279.	David Challman		5/28/17	92117
280.	Lauren Oberdorfer		5/28/17	92106
281.	Paul Oberbauer		5/28/17	92106
282.	Mitchell McNeill		5/28/17	92118
283.	Matsuzawa, Leah		5/28/17	92116
284.	Jonathan Spurgin		28-May-2017	92103
285.	Tyler Arthur		5/28/17	92108
286.	Marcos Hiraldo		5/28/17	92108
287.	Douglas DeCarme		5/28/17	92104
288.	Badal, Chiquibelle		5/29/17	92114
289.	Boyle		5/29/17	92037
290.	Neil Mirelle		5/29/17	92109
291.	Scott Baughton		5/29/17	92037
292.	BART CALAME		5/29/17	92037
293.	BRIAN WANG		5/29/17	92102
294.	Hongjin Chen		5/29/17	92037
295.	Candace Chan		5/29/17	92102
296.	Fox, Dallis		5/29/17	92107
297.	Pedro Fong		5/29/17	92101
298.	Matt Hayden		5/30/17	91977
299.	David Willard		5/30/17	92107
300.	Cory McMullen		5/30/17	92109

B103 (cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
301.	[illegible], Anthony		5/30/17	92107
302.	Trevor Prentice		5/30/17	92101
303.	TEX a Megan		5/30/17	92020
304.	Megan Rowey		05/30/17	92121
305.	Celia MacBean		5/30/17	92103
306.	Dionisopoulos, James		5/30/17	92020
307.	Alex Barba		5/30/17	92103
308.	KAMANJA ARAYSA		5/30/17	91911
309.	[illegible], Victoria		5/31/17	92110
310.	Cave, Daniel		5/31/17	92110
311.	Corcoran, Nathan		5/31/17	92115
312.	[illegible] Garlitz		5/31/17	92117
313.	[illegible], MATTHEW		5/31/17	92104
314.	TIM OMELIA		5/31/17	92101
315.	Joana Flores		5/31/17	92104
316.	JESSICA ELLISON		5/31/17	92025
317.	Jim Heddleson		6/1/17	92037
318.	Jose Ahedo		6/1/17	91977
319.	[illegible] ESPADA		6/1/17	92118
320.	Ernesto [illegible]		6/1/17	91932
321.	JACOBS FOGLE		6/2/17	40324
322.	Dominick Corelli		6/2/17	96701
323.	MAT Arvins		6/2/17	92118
324.	JOSE ROMERO		6/2/17	92503
325.	Cristine Sotomango		6/3/17	92120

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
326.	Clavel, Solène		6/3/17	92102
327.	James Beckwith		6/3/17	92114
328.	~~Eric Hernandez~~		6/3/17	91911
329.	Adrian Gonzalez		6/3/17	92154
330.	Angelica Ocaña	Angelica Ocaña	5 June	91914
331.	Chelsea Pelayo		5 June	91910
332.	Mike Tran		June/5	91910
333.	Albert Cheng		6/5/2017	92130
334.	Destin Estrella		6/5/2017	92111
335.	Miles Scott		6/5/2017	92114
336.	Kylie C.		6/5	91932
337.	Tyson H.		6/5/17	9216
338.	Emily Patriarca		6/5/17	92107
339.	Caroline Cortez		6/5/17	92103
340.	Gloria Ballesteros		6/6/17	92117
341.	KAMRON ORION		6/6/17	92117
342.	Scott Muraki		6/6/17	92122
343.	Alex Pavlowitz		6/6/17	92118
344.	Yaneth, Kahony		6-6-17	91914
345.	Gaven, Cannon		6-6-17	91911
346.	Bradley J Medick		6-7-17	92109
347.	Tanner Shimp		6/7/17	92037
348.	Stephen Everett		6/7/17	92116
349.	Markeva D. Lyman		6/7/17	92101
350.	Kelley Petnel		6/7/17	92129

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
351.	MASSEY, CHRIS		09JUN17	77573
352.	WALDELBERGER, JOSHUA		09JUN17	77573
353.	Benbow, Alaina		10 Jun 17	91910
354.	Cohen, Emily		10 Jun 17	92122
355.	Elke, Ashley		10 June 17	92123
356.	Jeffrey Black		6/10/17	91962
357.	Soto, Ines		6/10/17	92173
358.	Lentz, David		6/10/17	92115
359.	Samuel McFarlane		6/10/17	92115
360.	Tia Relles		6/10/17	92102
361.	Lauren Biddlecome		6/10/17	92123
362.	Camille Lauer		06/10/17	92116
363.	Cameron Kelly		06/10/17	92930
364.	GOLDSMITH, SAMUEL		06/11/17	92118
365.	ARREOLEGA, CARINA		6/11/17	92831
366.	Wong, Lawrence		6/11/17	92092
367.	Jamonne Wagoner		6/11/17	92130
368.	Edward Chappell		6/11/17	92107
369.	Cheng-Hao Ta		6/11/17	92121
370.	Echo Mia		6/11/17	92121
371.	Katie Ewing		6/11/17	91360
372.	Fred Lippa		6/11/17	91941
373.	Kirsten Sorenson		6/11/17	92019
374.	David Cerros		6/12/17	91910
375.	Missa Ostrolenk		6/12/17	92104

BIO-2 (cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
376.	[illegible]			
377.	Cirnacle, Lance		6/12/17	91978
378.	Reman, David		6/12/17	91947
379.	Chiu, William		6/12/17	92064
380.	Madrid, Mayra		06/12/17	91902
381.	Madrid Alejandro		06/12/17	92113
382.	Skaggs-Bunch, Dominica		6/13/17	92104
383.	Skylar Kurth		6-13-17	92107
384.	Caitlin Hoover		6-13-17	92129
385.	Morgan Fougner		6-13-17	92107
386.	Ryan McLaughlin		6-13-17	92064
387.	Chelsea Pfau		6-13-17	92109
388.	Noe Silva		6-13-17	92026
389. (cont.)	Leathernander		6-13-17	92108
390.	Pedro Cerda		13JUN17	92108
391.	Yuxiang Qiu		6/13/17	P2 of 2
392.	Bill Brewer		6-13-17	92110
393.	Samantha Salais		6/13/17	91910
394.	Ryan Cosgrave		6/13/17	92114
395.	[illegible]		6/13/17	92128
396.	Sarah DeBuse		6/13/17	92024
397.	Nathan Friedman		6/13/17	92122
398.	Brenda Martinez		6-13-17	92037
399.	[illegible]		6-13-17	92111
400.	Gustavo Cappetta		6-14-17	92067

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
401.	TWeet, Rai		JUN 14, 17	92101
402.	Tweet, Natalie		JUN 14, 17	92101
403.	Byrd—, Michael		6/19/2017	92104
404.	Morgan, Alexandria		6/14/2017	92105
405.		ANGEL GONZALEZ	JUN 14 2017	92101
406.	Jamer Lasswood		06/14/2017	92126
407.	Mia Le		06/14/2017	92126
408.	Margaret Chiu		6/14/17	92104
409.	Kristin Serranos		6/15/17	92019
410.	Nick Bourdon		6/15/17	92107
411.	Marc SAVANIER		6/15/17	92122
412.	Paul Kemp	Paul Kemp	6/16/17	91941
413.	charlene cheung		6/16/17	92122
414.	Frankie Martinez		6/16/17	92122
415.	Sanchez, Jesse		6/16/17	92114
416.	Silver, Emily		6/16/17	92127
417.	LANDIS, Guy			
418.	Bryce Zander		6/17/17	92106
419.	Kambiz Mehrkhani		6/17/17	92109
420.	Christine Tran		6/17/17	92109
421.	KENT DAVIS		6/17/17	91942
422.	Gina Barraza		6/16/17	91941
423.	Rebecca Barraza		6/16/17	91941
424.	Jose Barraza		6/16/17	92139
425.	Daniel Rom		6/19/17	91942

(cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
426.	Jason Hanse		6/20	92085
427.	WARD, ELIZABETH		6/20	92104
428.	Kenneth Jackson		6/20	92101
429.	Luke Sanford		6/21	92111
430.	Regina Ouch		6/22	92115
431.	De Petris D.		6/22	92115
432.	VYSOTSKIY, ROMAN		6/22	92108
433.	Nicole Vysotskaya		6/22/17	92100
434.	Patricia Rebecca		6/22/17	92107
435.	LUIS VALLADARES		6/23/17	92117
436.	Skyle Barry		6/23/17	99137
437.	Kayleigh Herrander		6/23/17	92107
438.	Cassie Jungers		6/24/17	92021
439. (BID-3 cont.)	Elise Metcalf		6/24/17	92103
440.	Michael [illegible]		24 JUN 17	92123
441.	Abraham V.		6/24/17	92102
442.	Martha Senar		6/27/17	92102
443.	JEFF MAS		6/24/17	92126
444.	Lunsford, Lisa		6/25/17	92104
445.	RYAN P. SMOKE		6/25/17	92102
446.	Samantha Garcia		6/26/17	92114
447.	Juliana Powell		6/26/17	92110
448.	Brandon Hankin		6/26/17	92110
449.	Christ Peroni		6/26/17	92122
450.	[illegible] Rogers		6/26/17	92111

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
451.		Christian Pompa	6.26.17	92126
452.	Kurt Dunlop		6/26/17	92117
453.	Williams, Brandon	B Williams	6/26/17	92071
454.	Anashkin, Anna		6/26/17	92122
455.	Aditya Gadhi		6/26/17	92109
456.	JOSEPH PETERS		6/26/17	
457.	Taylor Flinn		6/26/17	92110
458.	Jake Knuth		6/26/17	92130
459.	Jonathan Perez	Jonathan Perez	6/26/17	92114
460.	Jacqueline Alman		6/26/17	92103
461.	TRAVIS CLARKE		6/26/17	92107
462.	Madeline Holden		6/26/17	92103
463.	SHAWN BELMORE		6/26/17	92109
464.	ELVIS MANSOUR		6/26/17	92108
465.	Shansky Victoria		6/26/17	92025
466.	Liliosa Horanic		6/26/17	92122
467.	Erin Carey		6/26/17	92122
468.	Tyler Schick		6-26-17	91932
469.	Fadja Milz		6-26-17	92103
470.	Jaingkee		6-26-17	92104
471.	Adam Fonseca		6-26-17	92104
472.	Kristin Kurtin		6-26-17	92107
473.	Travor Nguyen		6-26-17	92126
474.	[illegible] MENDOZA		6/27/17	92104
475.	Sarah Clark		6/27/17	92109

92103 (cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
476.	Berry, Krista		6/27/17	92101
477.	Matt Mason		6/27/17	92101
478.	Jaclyn Mason		6/27/17	92101
479.	Tyson Johnson		6/27/17	"
480.	Marquis Wilson		06/27/17	90016
481.	BEN GUNDERSON		06/27/17	92104
482.	Alex Hollobe		6/27/17	92104
483.	Sara Dennis		6/27/17	92123
484.	Krissy Gonzalez		6/27/17	92127
485.	Kara Bertora		6/27/17	92014
486.	Hayden, Nicholas		6/27/17	92019
487.	JAIMILLO, RAFAEL		6/28/17	92129
488.	Rane, Christian		6/28/17	92111
489.	DUYAO, JOEL		6/28/17	92037
490.	Louis A		6/29/17	92130
491.	Sorensen, Michael		6/29/2017	92110
492.	Looser, Sofia		6/28/2017	92117
493.	Park Julia		6/29/2017	92131
494.	Butler Shannon		6/29/2017	47906
495.	Christie Spencer		6/29/17	92110
496.	Daniel Ramos		6/29/17	925990
497.	Oconor, Nicholas		6/29/17	92117
498.	SIMON LEGAN		6/29/17	92009
499.	MEGAN HAKIZAD		6/29/17	92009
500.	Aubrey Davis		6/29/17	91915

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
1.	Valentine Debra		May 10, 2017	92021
2.	Butler, Brianne		5/10/17	92037
3.	Adams n. rdfo		5/10/17	92138
4.	Jim Kallett		5/10/17	92110
5.	Vincent Casiano		5/10/17	92107
6.	Hazel, Nikesha		5/10/17	92103
7.	Jessica Aminoff		5/10/17	92106
8.	Pat Fitzmorris		5/10/17	92107
9.	Scott Hoover		5/10/17	92104
10.	Kessler, Michelle		5/11/17	92116
11.	Ashley Caddell		5/11/17	92057
12.	Martinez, Mercedes		5/11/17	92103
13.	Louise Kasell		5/11/17	92037
14.	BOWEN, EDWARD		5/11/17	92116
15.	Heldman Christian		5/11/17	92102
16.	Pitts Trevor		5/11/17	92111
17.	Erika Donnelley		5/11/17	92114
18.	Reed Dykal		5/11/17	92106
19.	Weaver Ashley		5/11/17	92111
20.	Luke Gilson		5/12/17	92107
21.	Philip Sinatra		5-12-17	92109
22.	Liz Fischer		5-12-17	92104
23.	Darrin Hopkins		5-12-17	92109
24.	GRAUPP PATRICK		5.12.17	92123
25.	Arden Crawley		5/12/17	92123

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
26.	Osuna, Armando		5/10/17	91913
27.	Hovda, Sean		5/10/17	92109
28.	Kuchar, Kimberley		5/10/17	92105
29.	Scher Amy		5/11/17	92020
30.	Lesle Lounsbury		5-11-17	92117
31.	[illegible]		5-11-17	92118
32.	TORR, JESSICA		5-11-17	92102
33.	Jimenez, Sarah		5/11/17	92116
34.	Kellett, Emma		5/12/17	92103
35.	Wurman, Heather		5/13/17	92065
36.	Cotter, Chasken		5/13/17	92131
37.	JAIME GOERTZEN		5/13/17	92105
38.	KRISSY OAKE		5/13/17	92104
39.	Michelle Camaya		5/14/17	92108
40.	Abreo, Tanya		5/14/17	92037
41.	MYRNNA JOHNSON		5-16-17	92107
42.	Troy DeLuz		5-16-17	92106
43.	Celine Reteas		5-16-17	92123
44.	Pruett Brent		5/16/17	92014
45.	Morrison, James Douglas		5/17/17	92103
46.	Metzger, Douglas		5-17-17	92124
47.	Kindel, Craig		5-17-17	92106
48.	Bou, Jennifer		5-17-17	92107
49.	Uhre, Emily		5/17/2017	92107
50.	Rivera, Jennifer		5/18/2017	92107

BIDS (cont.)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
51.	OSTRENKO, KAY		5/12/17	92067
52.	Alford Tess		5-12-17	92109
53.	Greta Harmon		5/12/17	92082
54.	Walsh, Kizzy		5-12-17	92104
55.	Patrick W Graham		5/12/17	92116
56.	Stutzman, Corey		5/14/17	92104
57.	ROSSMAN NATHAN		5/14/17	92104
58.	Kaese, Erin		5/14/17	92103
59.	Satomi Yamaguchi		5/14/17	92126
60.	Nath/Susan		5/12/17	92118
61.	Marath/Nathan		5/12/17	92117
62.	Hutchinson, Tom		5/12/17	92105
63.	Blocks (cont) Bokosky, JOHN		5/12/17	
64.	CAONSI CARLOS		5/12/17	
65.	SARA POLYCHRON		5/12/17	92014
66.	Leonel Alexander		5/12/17	92123
67.	REUBEN GARCIA		5-12-17	91945
68.	Russell, Raymond		5-12-17	92101
69.	Velasquez, Gladimiro		5-12-17	92010
70.	Pope, Charlie		5-12-17	92014
71.	Black, Alison		5-12-17	92103
72.	Courtland Anderson II		5-13-17	92104
73.	Figueroa, Marilyn		5/13/17	92116
74.	H2 Bobby		5/13/17	92123
75.	Esc/Nr Stephanie		5/13/17	92117

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
76.	[illegible] KATHRYN		5/13/17	92103
77.	[illegible] MICHAEL		5/13/17	92106
78.	Freeman, Victoria		5/13/2017	92106
79.	Purcella, Tamara		5/13/17	92103
80.	AMIN, TRUPTI		5/13/17	92102
81.	Amaral, Ann.		5/13/17	92108
82.	SARANDI, MARIO		5/13/17	92173
83.	RAHM, RYAN		5/13/17	92110
84.	Kryshopowicz, Kelly		5/13/17	92037
85.	Nazarian, Tommy		5/13/17	92120
86.	Alicia Maldonado		5/13/17	92103
87.	Hoffman, Craig		5/13/17	92117
88. (B103 cont.)	DANIELSON, ADAM		5/13/17	92110
89.	GRAHAM, JOHN		5/14/17	92103
90.	HAZEN, HEIDI		5/14/17	92116
91.	Sosenyo, Ramon		5-14-17	92116
92.	Whalen, James		5-14-17	92107
93.	[illegible]		5/14/17	92101
94.	Mariya Koko		5/14/17	92104
95.	Kevin Lettau		5/15/17	92107
96.	Rice-Reynoso		5/15/17	92109
97.	Christine Powell		5/15/17	92103
98.	Jacob Reinbold		5/15/17	92110
99.	Moises Cohen		5/16/17	92007
100.	McGrath, michael	Michael McGrath	5/16/17	92104

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
101.	Graziano Robert		May 25,17	92061
102.	Brittany Flores		May25	92106
103.	Jackson, Jeanette		May 25 2017	92103
104.	Victoria Gomez		May/25/17	92116
105.	LONDON			
106.	Tello, Graciela		May 24, 17	9206
107.	BUSKIRK, DAVID		MAY 26, 17	92116
108.	Cooke, JODI		May 26, 17	92117
109.	Brooks, Nikki		May 26	92102
110.	Bowen, Cheryl		5/27	92106
111.	Baker, Lea		5/27/17	92154
112.	Potts, Julie		5/27/17	92101
113.	CARTER, Douglas		5/27/17	92103
114. (cont'd)	Davidson, Susan		5/27/17	92104
115.	Darrum Nolander		5/27/17	92110
116.	Boersma, Isabe		5/27/17	92116
117.	Hulsey, Marvin		5/28/17	92115
118.	McDonald, Kris		5/27/17	92102
119.	Meyer- Joshua		5/27/17	92107
120.	Jeremy Shepherd		5/30/17	96825
121.	Gabrielle Ginter		5/30/17	92102
122.	Lipschutz	Louis	5/30/17	92102
123.	Badger	MELISSA	5/3/17	92102
124.	JONES	KEVIN	5/30/17	92101
125.				

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
126.	Petrosky, Gabrielle		6/1/17	92104
127.	Geresy, Louis		6/1/17	92102
128.	CYNTHIA CHONG		6/1/17	92103
129.	PENCE CAMPO		6/1/17	92115
130.	DIAZ, OLGA		6/3/17	92113
131.	Enama, Sharon	Sharon A. Enama	6/3/17	92116
132.	MERRIMAN, JESSICA		6/3/17	92103
133.	Greene, Jasmine		6/4/17	92116
134.	Faure, Farrah		6/5/17	92101
135.	LARGIE, PETA		6/6/17	92103
136.	Madina Dzaziński		6/6/17	92116
137.	Michael Slamanson		6/7/17	92103
138.	Tara Sanderson		6/7/17	92103
139.	JORDAN HOWTON		6/7/17	92101
140.	Christine Peters		6/8/17	92116
141.	CARL ZAPOLY		6/8/17	92103
142.	STEVE MILLER		6/11/17	92101
143.	Leila Newman		6/11/17	92120
144.	PALOMINO, PABLO		6/11/17	92102
145.	Timm, Michael		6/12/17	92110
146.	Timm, Cassandra		6/12/17	92110
147.	[illegible]		6/13/17	92101
148.	Stanley, Lindsay		6-16-17	92104
149.	McCutcheon, Lindsay		6/16/17	92110
150.	FALSTAFF, JASON		6-16-17	92101

92103 (Last)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
426.	Lewison, Rebecca		5/30/17	92104
427.	Williams, Ramon		5/30/17	92117
428.	Geronimo, Brian		5/30/17	92126
429.	Davis, Austin		5/30/17	92116
430.	Remigio, Marilyn		5/30/17	92127
431.	Edra, Herren		5/30/17	91913
432.	Alvarado, Jacob		5/30/17	91913
433.	Vincent Cabo		5/30/17	91914
434.	Christian Nagal		5/30/17	91915
435.	Barongan, Emmanuel		5:30.17	91977
436.	Ezekiel Samaniego		5/30/17	92139
437.	Justine Wang		5/30/17	92122
438.	Joyce Cao		5/30/17	92122
439.	Aaron Nigro		5/30/17	92122
440.	Vanessa Tse		5/30/17	92121
441.	Dustin Cathy		5/30/17	92093
442.	Chris Wong		5/30/17	92093
443.	Justin Wu		5/30/17	91791
444.	Janelle Feliciano		5:30.2017	91914
445.	Lorena Rivera		5/31/17	92105
446.	Lynn Le		5/31/17	92126
447.	Gina Wentz		5/31/17	92102
448.	Courtney Cifferman		5/31/17	78037
449.	Jennifer Danzig		5/31/17	92103
450.	Ellen Gonzalez		5/31/17	92114

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
451.	Carla Jordan		5/30/17	92139
452.	Scripture, Meghan		5/30/17	92107
453.	Steiber, Sarah		5/30/17	92104
454.	Tello, Anna		5/30/17	92115
455.	Anna Creed		5/30/17	92039
456.	Laurel Smith		5/31/17	92075
457.	John Davis		5/31/17	92104
458.	Tracy Koons		5/31/17	92102
459.	Karen Masterson		5/31/17	92103
460.	Pagador, Justin Lew		5/31/17	92103
461.	Kuo, Christine		5/31/17	92117
462.	Jessica Cordero		5/31/17	90631
463.	Rona Nalos		5/31/17	92108
464.	Jon MANO		5/31/17	92126
465.	Karen Africa		5/31/17	92105
466.	Deborah Sievers		5/31/17	92129
467.	Dennis Kelly		6/1/17	92107
468.	Sibet Alexander		6/1/17	92106
469.	NIC Ballbach		6/1/17	92108
470.	NOELLE FRANCO		6/1/17	92024
471.	DARIAN PATTERSON		6/1/17	91913
472.	Chris Martin		6/1/17	92122
473.	Paul Gabriele		6/1/17	92101
474.	Carlo Darang		6/1/17	92126
475.	Trey Wilson		6/1/17	91977

Culture Shock Dance Center
3110 Hancock Street, Suite 209
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
476.	Korolskaya Yana		6/1/17	92131
477.	Merino, michelle		6/1/17	92116
478.	Bruche Abawi		6/1/17	92116
479.	Mejia, Paola		6/1/17	92103
480.	CULLIMAN, GAY		6/1/17	92122
481.	Cetrone, TINA		6/1/17	92064
482.	Rachl-Segura, Floem		6/1/17	91978
483.	Chrastan, Real		6/01/17	91913
484.	LIN Stedman		6/01/17	92107
485.	Paula Meaney		6/01/17	92130
486.	Contontes, Richard		6/1/17	91914
487.	NAZLI GHASSEMI		6/1/17	92103
488.	Vanessa Olmos		6/1/17	92139
489.	Becky Kramer		6/1/17	92104
490.	Chad Adelson		6/1/17	91913
491.	James Mallen		6/1/17	92126
492.	Defindra Joseph		6/1/17	92107
493.	Marissa Roxas		6/1/17	92126
494.	Taylor Raymundo		6/1/17	92092
495.	Cassie Benitez		6/1/17	91913
496.	Denzel Escobar		6/1/17	91915
497.	Juan Diaz		6/1/17	91911
498.	SID NAVALES		6/1/17	92115
499.	JOHN RAMIREZ		6/1/17	92115
500.	KEI TSUKAMOTO		6/1/17	92111

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

ank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
151.	Adams, Martha	Martha Adams	5.19.17	92120
152.	Adams, Christopher	Christopher Adams	5.19.17	92120
153.	Gallardo, Luz		5/19/17	92101
154.	Goldman, Liran		5/19/17	92111
155.	Isabel Freeland	Isabel Freeland	5/19/17	92118
156.	Scherrer, Sarah	Sarah Scherrer	5/19/17	91913
157.	Huddleson, Bronwyn	Bronwyn Huddleson	5/19/17	92109
158.	Greene, Erin	Erin Greene	5/19/17	92116
159.	[illegible], Derek		5/20/17	60660
160.	LAROCQUE, FRANCIS	Francis Larocque	5/20/17	92067
161.	ZOUVAS, MARY		5/20/17	92106
162.	Hall, Christina	Christina Hall	5/22/17	92131
163.	[illegible]		5/23/17	92101
164. (cont.)	Schroeder, Susan		5/22/17	92110
165.	SCARBOROUGH, John		5/22/17	92115
166.	FURNER, DANIEL		5/23/17	92101
167.	Yesenia Padilla		5/23/17	92102
168.	TEYSSIER, PAUL		5/23/17	92103
169.	[illegible], ANNA		5/25/17	92106
170.	Sahota, Gurmanmeet		5/25/17	92103
171.	WARD, DACIL	David Ward	5/25/17	92116
172.	MILLER	Marie	5/25/17	92110
173.	Flem, [illegible]		5/25/17	92110
174.	Scherer, Paul		5/24/17	92103
175.	WOOLLEY, TAMSIN		5/25/17	92107

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:	
176.	LOTO, COREY		6/16/17	92101	
177.	Richardson, Debbie		6/16/17	92109	
178.	Dennis, Jeff		6/16/17	92111	
179.	SEBASTIANI, MELISSA		6/16/17	92101	
180.	Ben Yakitch-Allen		06/16/17	92107	
181.	COULSON	LAURA	6/18/17	92120	
182.	Forbes Olimpia		6/21/17	92154	
183.	Paula Engel		6/24/17	92067	
184.	Marie Gonzalez-Cho		6/23/17	92103	
185.	Chris Spengler		6/23/17	92110	
186.	Allison Heinlich		6/23/17	92104	
187.	Mariam Dotse		6/23/17	92115	
188.	Daniel Bekele		6/23/17	92111	BIO-3 (cont'd)
189.	Jycel Elico		6/23/17	92115	
190.	MAXIMIN, ANNA		6/23/17	92106	
191.	SCARBOROUGH, John		6/23/17	92105	
192.	Chilton, Akira T		6/26/17	#92107 W: 92101	
193.	Alvarado, Patricia		6/27/17	92173	
194.	NATALIA, Palekhina		6/27/17	92110	
195.	JENNIFER BURBY		27JUN17	92118	
196.	Kallett, Emma		6/27/17	92103	
197.	Kallett, Victor		6/27/17	92103	
198.	[illegible]		6/27/17	92104	
199.	Johnny Wu		6-27-17	92109	
200.	Williams, Jason		6/29/17	92102	

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
201.	Greene, Jasmine		6/29/17	92116
202.	Moore, Kevin		7/1/17	92101
203.	Jaime, Felicitas		7/4/17	92104
204.	Stevens, Vicky		7/7/17	92116
205.	CLEARY, JENNY		7/7/17	92101
206.	Seymour, Shonia		7/7/17	92120
207.	Yoh, Phoenix		7/7/17	92117
208.	Jimmy Lakolamala		7/8/17	92130
209.	Cheryl Parks		7/8/17	
210.	Salazar, Shanee		7/10/17	92126
211.	Sanders, Mike		07/10/17	92126
212.	Liggins, Heather		7/9/17	92128
213.	Darcie Dascin		7/10/17	92115
214.	Lionel Correia		7/10/17	92107
215.	Fredrick Kennedy Jr		7/10/17	92126
216.	Norma Castro		07/11/17	92110
217.	Alvarado, Patricia		7/11/17	92123
218.	Burk Amy		7/13/17	91911
219.	Mallory Lewis		7/19/17	92105
220.	Williams, Jaren		7/19/17	91950
221.	Maria Guitron		7/27/17	
222.	Mike Weinstein		7/27/17	92115
223.	Danielle Fischer		8-2-17	92111
224.	Craig Kindel		8-2-17	92106
225.	Lacson, Kameri		8-2-17	92109

B10-3 (cont)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
226.	Delgado, Anita		8/9/17	92116
227.	Wathi, Jeff		8/9/17	92104
228.				
229.				
230.				
231.				
232.				
233.				
234.				
235.				
236.				
237.				
238.				
239. (BID-3 Local)				
240.				
241.				
242.				
243.				
244.				
245.				
246.				
247.				
248.				
249.				
250.				

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
401.	[illegible], Jennifer		5/27/17	91945
402.	[illegible]		5/27/17	
403.	Johnson, Angela		5/27/17	92102
404.	Beasley, Angie	Angie Beasley	5/27/17	92117
405.	Figueroa, Kathy		5/27/17	92110
406.	Gonzalez, Laura		5/27/17	91915
407.	Gonzalez, Maya	Maya Gonzalez	5/27/17	91915
408.	Ordonez, Dan		5/27/17	91911
409.	Fuerbringer, Anastasia		5/27/17	92154
410.	Raymundo, Raymond		5/27/17	92123
411.	Gordon, Tony		5/27/17	92114
412.	Josefina Gomez		5/27/17	92115
413.	Rolan Bongolan		5/27/17	91911
414.	Peter Agustin		5/27/17	92115
415.	Jazmyn Phillips		5/27/17	92011
416.	Martin, Sonya	Sonya Martin	5/28/17	92151
417.	Martin, Kirsten	K. Martin	5/28/17	91911
418.	Duarte, Sierra		5/28/17	92564
419.	[illegible]			
420.	Jerome Villar		5/28/17	92126
421.	King, Susan		5/30/17	92103
422.	Seiberg, Kim		5/30/17	92075
423.	Mark [illegible]		5/30/17	92101
424.	Sawyer Douglass		5/30/17	92120
425.	Lisa Kim		5/30/17	92122

BID-3 (cont.)

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 260
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
376.	Trisha Ocampo		5/25	92114
377.	Nathan Tan		5/25	92102
378.	Leibowitz, Gabi		5/25	92037
379.	Tamlin, Faith		5/25	92103
380.	Carmen Nelsas		05/25	92173
381.	Cheryl Haas		5/25	92106
382.	Mayo, Ivanna		5/26	92101
383.	Jodie Desley		5/26	92107
384.	Lee Ann Kin		5/26	92121
385.	Liz Stall		5/26	92024
386.	Liz Langley		5/26	92154
387.	Green, Christian		5/26	91915
388.	Leissi Martin		5/26	91913
389.	Sophy Mann		5/26	92105
390.	Ryan Halvorson		5/26	92116
391.	Veronica Pretty		May 26	92102
392.	Tori Bush		5/26	92101
393.	Celeste White	Celeste White	5/26	91977
394.	Elias, Ivanna	Ivanna Elias	5/26	91932
395.	To Lesley		5/26	92123
396.	Kirkpatrick, Devin		5/26	92103
397.	Carter, Jennifer		5/26	92102
398.	Kelsey Figge		5/26	92108
399.	Zoe Deske		5/27	92103
400.	Katherine Abbey		5/27	92110

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
351.	Schreiber, Tracy		5/24/17	92129
352.	Corley, Tim		5/24/17	92114
353.	Oliver, Angelika		5/24/17	92107
354.	Chris Vonachen		5/24/17	92145
355.	Aimee White		5/24/17	92021
356.	Dena Gregory		5-24-17	92109
357.	Eddie Madison		5/24/17	91910
358.	Marcos Gonzalez		5/24	92570
359.	Peter Hawkins		5/24/17	92117
360.	Paulina To		5/24/17	92121
361.	Melyssa Tran		5/24/17	92129
362.	Seechao, Naichong		5/24/17	92129
363.	Arca, Luis		5/24/17	92111
364.	EDMUND VENEGAS		5/24/17	92115
365.	Ryan Parmeter		5/24/17	92134
366.	Miguel Palo		5/24/17	91913
367.	Angela Kiel		5/24/17	92109
368.	Susan Mills		5/25/17	92037
369.	Bernie Rost		5/24/17	92025
370.	Caroline, Chris		05/27/17	91915
371.	David Stein		5-27-17	92115
372.	York, Carina		5/24/17	92110
373.	Taylor Romero	Taylor Romero	5/25/17	92065
374.	Andrew Dougherty		5/25/17	92114
375.	Julian Sena		5/25/17	91914

Bio-3 (cont.)

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
326.	Johnson, Heather		5/23/17	92101
327.	BRENDA Goodall		5/23/17	92101
328.	Julian Silva		5/23/17	92115
329.	Leon Pisa		5/23/17	92102
330.	Vinh Nguyen		5/23/17	92126
331.	Ruiz, Laura		5/23/17	92109
332.	Ruiz, Robert		5/23/17	92109
333.	Jones, Michele		5/23/17	92126
334.	BURKE, BONNIE M		5/23/17	92160
335.	MATEO QUEEN		5/23/17	92101
336.	Laxamana, Claire		5/23/17	92124
337.	Dacayo, Erika		5/23/17	92114
338.	Dacayo, Alyssa		5/23/17	92114
339. (cont.)	Grantham, Shawn		5/23/17	92122
340.	Garcia, Nancy		5/23/17	92104
341.	Chambers SS		5/23/17	92111
342.	Allan Tufaro		5/23/17	9193
343.	Ryan Molinos		5/23/17	91911
344.	Jessie Acerot, Jessica		5/23/17	92130
345.	Adi Ehren		5/24/17	92037
346.	Nguyen, Dillon		5/24/17	92027
347.	Maccoren, Kenn P.		05/24/17	92103
348.	Rodriguez, Anthony		05/24/17	92105
349.	Domingo, Tiffany		5/24/17	92108
350.	Jillette, Rachel		05/24/17	92115

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 206
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
301.	Patterson Nicole		5/22/17	92109
302.	St Levia Sherry		5/22/17	92103
303.	Nechelle Mendoza		5/22/17	92124
304.	Natasha Bartley		5/22/17	92109
305.	Kenaida Jones		5/22/17	91945
306.	Flanigan, Pamela	Pamela Flanigan	5-22-17	92124
307.	PASSMAN SUSAN		5/22/17	92107
308.	Leach, Fonte	Fonte Leach	5-22-17	92114
309.	Yuanjing Yang		5/22/17	92124
310.	Padilla Clarisa		5/22/17	92113
311.	Rebecca Marmolejo		5.22.17	92057
312.	Camille Marmolejo		5/22/17	92057
313.	Zhovnovataya, Sofiya		5/22/17	92122
314. (BIDS 1 cont.)	JACKSON, RANDI		5/22/17	91942
315.	ALVARADO, ALAINA		5/22/17	92115
316.	Tram, Tina		5/23/17	92126
317.	Wesselin Kelly		5/23/17	92130
318.	Alyssa Smith		5/23/17	92116
319.	Larson, Jerilyn		5-23-17	92117
320.	Stacy Cosman		5/23/17	92114
321.	Jessica Gomes		5/23/17	91935
322.	Nauman Hanif		5/23/17	92120
323.	Jessica Woodley		5/23/17	92078
324.	Mallaian		5/23/17	92116
325.	Yaji Tramontini		5/23/17	92037

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
276.	Y. Alejandra, Gavaldon	Y. Alejandra Gavaldón	5/20/17	92104
277.	Limardo, Agnes		5/20/17	92120
278.	[illegible], Sara		5-20-17	92114
279.	Zubiate, Kristin		5-20-2017	92037
280.	Trauno, Anastasia		5/20/17	92154
281.	Ecu, Aaron		5/20/17	92111
282.	Janos, Maelin	Maelin Janos	5/20/17	92154
283.	Rachel Tapia		5/20/17	92106
284.	Lorien Bernal		5/21/17	92117
285.	Caporale, Evan		5/21/17	92116
286.	BRENDAN MCHAFFY		5/21/17	92104
287.	Sharon Burton		5/21/17	92111
288.	Hemye, Sean		5/21/17	92109
289.	Sarao, Anna		5/21/17	92117
290.	Aried Armes		5/21/17	92116
291.	Lucha Carrasco		05/21/17	92056
292.	Jessica Quillayo		5/21/17	92114
293.	[illegible]		5/21/17	
294.	King, Eric		5/21/17	92114
295.	Julio Velazquez		5/21/17	92102
296.	Kirstie Burton		5/22/17	92124
297.	Melanie Yoder		5/22/17	92040
298.	Angie Bunch		5-22-17	92104
299.	Deanna Hernandez		5-22-17	92113
300.				

P10-3 (cont.)

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

hank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
251.	Brock Kana		5/19/17	92104
252.	Brock, Joshua		5/19/17	92104
253.	Esperanza, Divina		5/19/17	92126
254.	Cox, Danielle		5/19/17	91902
255.	Gagliardo, Anna		5/19/17	92027
256.	SHAH, POOJA		5/19/17	92108
257.	Jennifer Vaughan		5/19/17	92116
258.	Flagan, Samantha		5/19/17	92108
259.	OLSON, AMANDA		5/19/17	91932
260.	OLSON, JOHN		5/19/17	91932
261.	Lamug, Lovelyn		5/19/17	92107
262.	Redfearn, Willie		5/19/17	92107
263.	KURG, JESSICA		5/19/17	91942
264. (cont.)	VALDEZ, CAROLINA		5/19/17	92029
265.	GREEN, LESA		5/19/17	92021
266.	David Simmons		5/19/17	91910
267.	BROOKS, LAUREL		5/20/17	92106
268.	Brooks, Isa		5/20/17	92106
269.	Murray, Barbara		5/20/17	92156
270.	Rounds, Megan		5/20/2017	92122
271.	Raceliis, Abby		5/20/17	92106
272.	Emmanuelle Takahashi		5/20/17	92111
273.	Keeling, Diane		5/20/17	92103
274.	Avez, Cheryl		5/20/17	91935
275.	Peralta, Jesus		5/20/17	92075

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
226.	HIGGINS, JON		5/18/17	91977
227.	DAVIS, CAITLIN		5/17/17	92008
228.	ROBERTSON, MARY		5/18/17	92116
229.	[illegible], VINA		5/18/17	92127
230.	Quoc Ho		5/18/17	
231.	Davey Chang		5/18/17	
232.	Kim, Brian		5/18/17	92107
233.	Joha Kim			
234.	TRAN, ANGELA		5/18/17	92105
235.	Jimenez, Alexis		5/18/17	92115
236.	Dani Garcia		5/18/17	92122
237.	DURAN, ZAYRA		5/18/17	91932
238.	Edward Collins		5/18/17	91932
239.	BECKWITH, CAROLYN		5/19/17	92064
240.	Finza, Shanon		5/19/17	91941
241.	Kanike, Mika		5/19/17	92154
242.	Marilen Tran		5/19/17	92120
243.	Kristina Knott		5/19/17	92109
244.	Courtney Dade		5/19/17	92113
245.	LISA Iarria		5/19/17	92025
246.	SARA LOBELSTEIN		5/19/17	92102
247.	Mercedes Mafara		5/19/17	92102
248.	John Brokenshire		5/19/17	92107
249.	[illegible]		5/19/17	92064
250.	Angel Castillo		5/19/17	91945

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
201.	Chanara Lemmex		5/14/17	92110
202.	Cybele Peña		5-14-17	92104
203.	[illegible] Ortiz		5-14-17	92107
204.	DEB NEUMAN		5-14-17	92103
205.	Nic Garza		5-14-17	91914
206.	Honnie Dunlap		5/15/17	92154
207.	Tim Kobayashi		5/15/17	92103
208.	Carolyn Fore		5/15/17	92124
209.	Elizabeth Ward		5/15/17	92124
210.	Reyna Sandoval		5/15/17	92113
211.	Jorge Sandoval		5/15/17	92113
212.	Alcaraz Liver		5/15/17	92154
213.	Beatriz Gandara		5/15/17	92103
214.	Justin Rose		5/15/17	92104
215.	Sheif Baskerville		5/15/17	92110
216.	Sarah Sanchez		5/15/17	92173
217.	Kelsey Tamashiro		05/16/17	92139
218.	Rochelle Jones		5/15/17	92114
219.	Gezell Custodio		5/15/17	92139
220.	Britni Hammett		05/16/17	92110
221.	Makoto Ikeda		5/15/17	92129
222.	Janice Ann		5/15/17	92115
223.	Jelish Balababa		5/15/17	92122
224.	Marcus McGhee		5/15/17	92104
225.	Melissa Adel		5/15/17	92102

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
176.	Haire Britney	Brittney Haire	5-13-17	92130
177.	SWIFT SIMONE		5-13-17	92057
178.	BAGUNE, ALAIN		5/13/17	92114
179.	Phillips Cheryl		5/13/17	92110
180.	Colorado, Geraldo		5/14/17	92116
181.	Watanabe, Hiraki		5/14/17	92111
182.	Meza, Veronica		5/14/17	91942
183.	Tran, Shannon		5/14/17	92092
184.	Scaff, Lucy Alcantara		5/14/17	92084
185.	Reid Volk		5/14/17	92109
186.	Garcia, Christian		5-14-17	92110
187.	Jensen, Allyson		5-14-17	92130
188.	Landry, Ricky		5-14-17	92130
189.	Baghbeh, Kimberly	Kimberly Baghbeh	5-14-17	92130
190.	Baghbeh, Kaitlyn	Kaitlyn Baghbeh	5-14-17	92130
191.	Gonzalez, Cassie		5-14-17	92122
192.	Rayanna Davis		5/14/17	92120
193.	Pritchett, Celeste		5/14/17	92130
194.	Kendal Roemer		5/14/17	92037
195.	Sarah Webber		5/14/17	92130
196.	Diana Lim		5/14/17	92130
197.	Colin Schlichter		5/14/17	92103
198.	Anthony Quintero		5/14/17	91910
199.	Calei Gilliam		5/14/17	92129
200.	Brianna Haire	Brianna Haire	5/14/17	92130

BID-3 (cont.)

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
151.	Jone O. Fiellet	Lorse O. Gulbaatt	5-14-17	91945
152.	Bethann Ruiz	Bethann Ruiz	5/13/17	92111
153.	CHRISTINE RUIZ		5-13-17	92111
154.	Rosales Zuly	Zulete Rosales	05/13/17	92116
155.	Francesca Arnott		5/16/17	92110
156.	Erin Provencher		05/13/17	92179
157.	Parra, Elisa		5/13/17	92108
158.	Kenneth Carter		13 May 17	92124
159.	Ame Parsley		13 May 17	92103
160.	Nicholas Rodrigues		5/13/17	92107
161.	Karla Morrell		5/13/17	92102
162.	JAMES RICHARDS		5/13/17	91914
163.	Kate Carlstrom		5/13/17	92101
164.	Cynthia Wang		5/13/17	92103
165.	JONATHAN PINTADO		5 13 17	92110
166.	Norma Hooper		5-13-17	92101
167.	Thomas, Fakiri		5-13-17	92114
168.	Sanford, Angelena		5-13-17	91941
169.	Stallsmith, Jason		5-13-17	92116
170.	Hill, Kathleen		5-13-17	92064
171.	Jenny Dyer		5-13-17	92111
172.	Tracy Hernandez		5-13-17	92128
173.	Prette, Kaylar		5 13-17	92139
174.	Holloway, Maureen		5-13-17	92116
175.	Venelli, Julia		5-13-17	92131

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
126.	Robello, Patty		5-13-17	92107
127.	Johnson, Jaime		5-13-17	92101
128.	Root, Alyssa		5/14/17	92108
129.	Zlotnik, Susan		5/14/17	92103
130.	Prado, Myra		5/14/17	91913
131.	RAMOS, NIVANIT		5/14/17	92154
132.	SAHAAN, GINA		5/14/17	91915
133.	Wreya, Vesna		5/14/17	91915
134.	Pizarro, Dorothy		5/14/17	91910
135.	Stencil, Christina		5/14/17	91902
136.	RASMUS GANDI		5/19/17	92024
137.	Finley, Emily		5/13/17	91942
138.	[illegible]		5/12/17	92154
139.	[illegible]		5/13/17	92108
140.	Chelsie Byrnes		5/13/17	92037
141.	[illegible]		05/13/17	92126
142.	DOUGHERTY, PETER		5/13/17	92115
143.	[illegible]		5/13/17	92102
144.	Katz, Perry		5/13/17	92130
145.	Saunders, Jessica		5/13/17	92109
146.	Wilke, Briana		5/13/17	91950
147.	Reed, Paul		5/13/17	92126
148.	Wong, Wyrett		5-13-17	92154
149.	WONG, JOCYE		5-13-17	92154
150.	PRITCHETT, [illegible]		5-13-17	9190

(Cont.)

Culture Shock Dance Center
2710 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
101.	Pait, Jared		05-11-17	91950
102.	San Juan, Anthony		05-11-17	92037
103.	Santa Domingo, Tatiana		5-11-17	92131
104.	Feria, Diego		5/11/17	92128
105.	Riley, Jordan		5/11/17	92880
106.	SONEGUAN, ZACHARIE		5/11/17	91915
107.	Jimenez, AJ		5/11/17	92154
108.	Juan Velasco		5/11/17	92154
109.	ROBERT KIM		5/11/17	92115
110.	Lauren Bennett		5/11/17	92124
111.	Marvin Ocampo		5/11/17	92114
112.	Susan Wulff		5/11/17	92104
113.	Janissa Saracino		5/11/17	92108
5:10-3 (cont) 114.	Mancilla, Lauren		5/11/17	92081
115.	Bolander, Alexander		5/11/17	92064
116.	BALDWIN, CAROLE		5/12/17	92102
117.	ADAMS, KATHIE		5/12/17	92117
118.	Keller, Linda		5/10/17	92101
119.	Keely, Tammi		5/12/17	
120.	VICTORIA BARRETT		5/12/17	92106
121.	Jami Glassman		5/12/17	92037
122.	~~[illegible]~~			
123.	Wanfang Wu		5/12/17	92122
124.	Telleson, Kirsti		5/12/17	92081
125.	SMITH, MICHAEL		5/13/17	92109

Culture Shock Dance Center
2100 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
76.	Nieva, Jayson		5-11-17	91913
77.	Josh Jarar		5-11-17	92108
78.	Chanisma Galegos		5-11-17	91910
79.	Nick Dolyak		5-11-17	92109
80.	Austin Galisgan		5/11/17	92126
81.	Dez, Sison		5/11/17	91913
82.	Christian, Lumba		5/11/17	91950
83.	NITO, SHARLANE		5/11/17	91913
84.	Brittney Fourty		5/11/17	92116
85.	Breanah Alviz		5/11/17	92115
86.	Jamie Adams		5/11/17	92114
87.	Brendan Gardiola		05/11/17	91913
88.	Kirstie Cristobal		5/11/17	91915
89.	Kiana Akard		5/11/17	92126
90.	Jeremy Borja		5/11/17	91911
91.	Megan Gauran		05/11/2017	92123
92.	Francis Florendo		5/11/17	91913
93.	Javier Ortega		5/11/17	92122
94.	Lauren Hale		5/11/17	92008
95.	George Wang		5/11/17	92122
96.	Angelo Cabanding		5/11/17	91914
97.	Joshua Pait		05/11/17	91950
98.	JASMINE VANANAVONG		05/11/17	92115
99.	Dezree Del Rosario		05/11/17	91911
100.	Savannah Sical		5/11/17	92071

BID-3 (cont.)

Culture Shock Dance Center
3770 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
51.	Blevins, Desiree		5-11-17	91977
52.	Blevins, Don A.		5-11-17	91977
53.	Rena, Denise		5-11-17	91911
54.	Ching, Juan		5/11/17	91911
55.	Delange, Nicole		5/11/17	92037
56.	Mundy, Robert		5/11/17	92107
57.	CHRIS VONCKHILL		5/11/17	92145
58.	Felix Joaquin		5/11/17	92129
59.	ETHAN NGUYEN		5/11/2017	92108
60.	KENNETH HARIAN		5/11/2017	92114
61.	Mona Mukherjea-Berg		5/11/2017	92104
62.	Valerie Larson		5-11-2017	92129
63.	DORIANA SINNETT		5-11-17	92124
64.	Kieran Miller		5-11-17	92101
65.	Kiyoshi Tsukamoto		5-11-17	91910
66.	Kelly Hodge		5-11-17	92107
67.	Sarah Huntington		5-11-17	92130
68.	Joshua Teodoro		5-11-17	92116
69.	Nicholas Dongrongsri		5-11-17	92020
70.	Matt Phelps		5-11-17	92108
71.	DUYEN TRAN		5/11/17	92121
72.	Matthew Dickson		5/11/17	91932
73.	REY FERNANDEZ		5/11/17	92154
74.	OSCAR ROSALES		5-11-17	91950
75.	PATTIN SPILLMAN		5/11/17	91911

B10-3 (cont)

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
26.	Dorothy Borzsak		5/11/17	92110
27.	Kiara Johnson		5/11/17	92104
28.	Zoe Bowers		5/11/17	92106
29.	Jessica Derson		5/11/17	92118
30.	Mira Kim		5/11/17	92130
31.	Juan Padilla		5-11-17	92104
32.	JANICE CHEN		5/11/17	92117
33.	Dawna Ellison		5-11-17	92037
34.	Jose Valentino		5/11/17	92110
35.	Meg Aoki		5/11/17	92117
36.	Valerie Sabroso	Valerie Sabroso	5/11/17	92122
37.	Constance Gomes		5/11/17	92111
38.	Grace Fearn		5/11/17	
39.	Jill JONES		5/11/17	92037
40.	JEFFREY ROSS L. HOGAN		5/11/17	91950
41.	Makaya Gilkes		5/11/17	92108
42.	Gonzales, Janelle		5-11-17	92173
43.	HATLELID, TESSA		5/11/17	92104
44.	Harding, Serenity		5-11-17	92111
45.	Morales, Sean		5-11-17	91902
46.	GRAVES, LATESHIA		5-11-17	92116
47.	TANISHA DENHAM	Tanisha L. Denham	5/11/17	92115
48.	Tracy Liu		5/11/17	92112
49.	Joshua Washington		5/11/17	91978
50.	Bridget Savant		5-11-17	92109

(10-3 (cont.))

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
1.	Shelby Stewart		5/16/2017	92116
2.	Katelina Jackson		5/16/17	92107
3.	Camille McKenna		5-16-17	92111
4.	Anne St Julien		5-16-17	92109
5.	Sarah Mintz		5-16-17	92037
6.	Kobayashi Antara		5/17/17	92103
7.	Andrew DeeDee		5/17/17	92127
8.	Kumiko Hashiguchi		5/17/17	91942
9.	Liensvarch, Sebastian		5/16/17	92119
10.	Arthur Rock		5/16/17	92103
11.	Ana Madrigal		5/16/17	91914
12.	Cadapan Evan		5/16/17	91913
13.	Zelle Niedermann		5/17/17	92109
14.	Wendy Hiner		5/17/17	92037
15.	Jung Han		5/16/17	92130
16.	JONATHAN CABASUG		5/17/17	92150
17.	Bailey Hofmann		5/17/17	92117
18.	Richard Brown		5/17/17	92019
19.	Chris Vaccaro		5/17/17	92106
20.	Samantha Barlin		5/17/17	92104
21.	Kaysey Chin		5/17/17	92126
22.	Yi Fang Wang		5/17/17	92024
23.	Tom Ray		5/17/17	92020
24.	[illegible]		5/17/17	92058
25.	Beverly an malicdem		05/17/17	92126

Culture Shock Dance Center
2710 Hancock Street, Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly)	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
1.	MARA MARTIN		5/10	92037
2.	Urwin Nicole		5/10	92071
3.	Alcaraz, Alexis		5/10	91913
4.	STEWART, MARK		5/10	92107
5.	JEAN-LYC MARTIN		5/11	92037
6.	Nolan, Heather		5/11	92126
7.	Nolan, Melody		5/11	92176
8.	Fields-Johnson, Matt		5/11	92115
9.	CHANG, JESSICA		5/11	92129
10.	Stang, James		5/11	92107
11.	Hollow, Jenna		5/11	92107
12.	Overton, Elizabeth		5/11	92115
13.	Murphy, Melissa		5/11	92135
14.	Laurent, Clara		5/12	92037
15.	Avila, Jessica		5/12	92114
16.	Swang, Jonathan		5/16	92114
17.	Tello, Anna		5/16	92115
18.	Davidson, Pam		5/16	92115
19.	Gutstadt, Rebecca		5/17	92115
20.	Spence, Laura		5/17	92024
21.	Rutledge, Shayna		5/19	92108
22.	Salmon, Lily		5/20	92124
23.	Felix, Jaylen		5/20	92124
24.	Coutts, Karen		5/22	92107
25.	Rubio, Donna		5/22	92107

(B10-2 cont)

WE WANT ANGLED PARKING!!

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Hancock Neighborhood Parking Improvement

	Last Name, First Name: (Please Print Legibly))	Signature:	Date:	Zipcode:
26.	DONNA RUBIO	Donna Rubio	5/24/11	78207
27.				
28.				
29.				
30.				
31.				
32.				
33.				
34.				
35.				
36.				
37.				
38.				
39.				
40.				
41.				
42.				
43.				
44.				
45.				
46.				
47.				
48.				
49.				
50.				

B10-3 (cont)

Thank you for supporting the Hancock Neighborhood.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter C1

Morrison, Susan

From: Amber Alexander <alexander478@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:21 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan

PROJECT NAME: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update PROJECT No.: 561546 / SCH No.: 2015111013 COMMUNITY PLAN AREA: Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor COUNCIL DISTRICT: 2 (Zapf)

C1-1

I'm writing in reference to the plan above. I own a condo in the Rue Dorleans complex and this plan will have a direct negative impact on my daily life. The plan to expand the number of residents to 11,775 - 27,070 residents will increase traffic. It will also have a negative environmental impact with increase pollution from cars and pollution to our waterways in the area. I currently enjoy living in this area because there's limited traffic on my way to work. However, I currently cannnot go home after work then leave and head east on I-8 because it's always backed up. Increasing the population that much in the area will make the current traffic in that area (I-8 E and I5South) worse. Also, driving around in the area near the Nimitz/W Pt Loma and Sunset Cliffs intersections are already congested. Adding onto the population in the area will make it worse. There's also a number of people who ride their bikes in this area and increased traffic would pose a risk to the people riding their bike. Rosecrans is also a very high traffic area and again, adding on this many units in the area would make this even worse. If this plan does go through, then I will honestly have to look at leaving the area. Please consider what the current area residents want for their community. I am all for additional retail space, another venue and a few more residential units, but please don't make our area another downtown. We chose this area because we don't want to live in a highly congested area.

Amber Alexander
3050 Rue DOrleans
San Diego CA 92110
619-453-3024

Letter C1 - Alexander, Amber (2/4/2018)

C1-1: Comment noted. This comment does not identify an inadequacy in the analysis presented in the Draft PEIR. The City has considered input from all Midway-Pacific Highway community stakeholders, including residents, business owners, community leaders, public officials, and other interested parties. The proposed changes in densities are intended to meet the primary CPU objectives, which include establishing multiple-use villages and districts within the community; creating a complete mobility system that promotes access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit, including within existing superblocks; providing housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit; and improving localized water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design, among other objectives. Higher densities have been proposed in areas along transit corridors to take advantage of and support existing and planned transit investments. In addition, the Mobility Element of the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies that propose improvements to street facilities to meet existing and future demand. SANDAG's Regional Plan also identifies planned transit system improvements including future trolley extensions and the implementation of Rapid Bus service in the Midway-Pacific Highway community.

Letter C2

Morrison, Susan

From: Guy Allen <guy193@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 6:26 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project # 561546

C2-1 Hello, I am writing this letter in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I am a member of Vertical Hold Climbing gym located on Hancock St. With current state of our street and lack of parking, I have personally been involved in and witnessed multiple near accidents do to drivers parked in the middle of the street waiting for a parking spot to open. I am a cyclist and I support the South Hancock Shareway.

V/R,
Guy

Letter C2 - Allen, Guy (2/20/2018)

C2-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C3

Morrison, Susan

From: Stephanie Anderson <stephaniejka@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 7:37 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,
I, Stephanie Anderson , am a faithful student and teacher of Bikram Yoga at the Bikram Yoga studio in San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.
Regards,
Stephanie Anderson

C3-1

1

Letter C3 - Anderson, Stephanie (1/24/2018)

C3-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C4

Ysabelle Anzures
2074 Hancock St.
San Diego, CA 92110

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C4-1 I've been living in San Diego for almost 5 years. A big portion of my experience in San Diego is spent at Vertical Hold Climbing Gym on Hancock Street. The community at this gym has made me want to make San Diego my forever home. Members like myself want to keep Vertical Hold and the amazing companies along Hancock St South thriving. By creating bike shareways we can do so. Parking is a very difficult situation on this street for patrons. At peak hours of the day people are flustered to find parking. This creates a dangerous environment for pedestrians, drivers, and cyclists. By painting back-in angled parking spots on boths sides of the street, drivers will be able to see pedestrians and cyclists on the road from either side of their windows. Also by creating narrower lanes we can slow down drivers and create a safer street for the pedestrians and cyclists. Thank you for taking your time to read my letter.

With Gratitude,

Ysabelle Anzures



Letter C4 - Anzures, Ysabelle (2/13/2018)

C4-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes the same improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C5

Morrison, Susan

From: Carlo & Ruth Aranda <carloandruth@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 6:01 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project# 561546

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C5-1 I am a member at Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym on Hancock St. South. Parking has been a huge issue since Vertical Hold has moved here. I am writing to support the South Hancock Shareway. This proposed plan would allow more parking for businesses and provide safer roads for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers. I am a huge proponent for more safe bicycle transportation and am very happy to see that the city is trying to provide this. I believe that the South Hancock Shareway will provide safe bicycle transportation while supporting local San Diego businesses. The plan is inexpensive and benefits everyone. Please consider implementing the South Hancock Shareway. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

With grattitude,

Carlo and Ruth Aranda

1

Letter C5 - Aranda, Carlo and Ruth (2/20/2018)

C5-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C6

Morrison, Susan

From: Ruth Tang <bruce.ruthweitang@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 6:00 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project# 561546

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C6-1 I am a member at Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym on Hancock St. South. Parking has been a huge issue since Vertical Hold has moved here. I am writing to support the South Hancock Shareway. This proposed plan would allow more parking for businesses and provide safer roads for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers. I am a huge proponent for more safe bicycle transportation and am very happy to see that the city is trying to provide this. I believe that the South Hancock Shareway will provide safe bicycle transportation while supporting local San Diego businesses. The plan is inexpensive and benefits everyone. Please consider implementing the South Hancock Shareway. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

With grattitude,

Ruth Aranda

Letter C6 - Aranda, Ruth (2/20/2018)

C6-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C7

Morrison, Susan

From: Kara Arnaudy <karaarnaudy@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 12:11 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

C7-1 To the planning department of the city of San Diego, I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.
Sincerely,
Kara Arnaudy

1

Letter C7 - Arnaudy, Kara (1/30/2018)

C7-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C8

Morrison, Susan

From: Max Atkins <mxatkins99@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 7:47 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

C8 My name is Max Atkins and I am a patron of the Vertical Hold rock climbing gym and the parking situation, as is, is dangerous and poorly supplied. We need more parking and a safer roadway for pedestrians and cyclists. The South Hancock Shareway is the best solution to our problems. I hope you consider this plan and institute this proposed solution.

Sent from my iPhone

Letter C8 - Atkins, Max (2/8/2018)

C8-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C9

Megan Ballow
2080 Hancock Street
San Diego, CA 92110

Feb. 17 2018

To The City of SDPD:

C9-1 Parking is an issue. Please create bike shareways on both sides of the street. It will create safer experiences for us all. Painting back in angled parking spots will allow drivers to view traffic while parking. Narrower roads will slow down traffic.

Thank You.
Megan Ballow

Letter C9 - Ballow, Megan (2/17/2018)

C9-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes the same improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C10

Morrison, Susan

From: Marliese Bartz <marliese@marliesebartz.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 7:04 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego:

C10-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,
Marliese Bartz

1

Letter C10 - Bartz, Marliese (1/30/2018)

C10-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C11

Jessica Bash
295 Letton St., Ramona, CA 92065

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I support South Hancock

02/13/2018

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C11-1 I am a resident of San Diego and member at Vertical Hold Climbing on Hancock St South. As much as I enjoy climbing at this gym, parking is an issue. At busier times of the day parking and traffic gets really congested. There are so many businesses that have frequent clientele including families. This can be unsafe for pedestrians, drivers, and cyclists. Cars trying to pass through will try to drive around cars that are waiting for a parking spot. Hostility arises and it ruins the experience at the gym and the other facilities on this street.

By creating bike shareways on both sides of the street, it will create a safer experiences for all patrons that travel this road. Painting back-in angled parking spots will allow drivers to view pedestrians, cyclists, and other drivers while parking. Narrower roads will slow down traffic and raise awareness of crossing pedestrians and cyclists. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

With gratitude,

Jessica Bash

Letter C11 - Bash, Jessica (2/13/2018)

C11-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C12

Shane Baxter
15831 Tobin Way
Sherman Oaks CA

RE: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I SUPPORT SOUTH HANCOCK SHAREWAY

February 15, 2018

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C12-1 I am a member at Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym and commute to Hancock Street 2-3 times a week. Whether it is the weekend, weekday or week night, parking on this road is horrendous. I am encouraged by the city's goal to be bike friendly and I hope this plan is achieved with consideration for ALL parties on the road. The South Hancock Shareway is the best plan for cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers. Thank you for considering my concerns as you plan the future of our community!

Sincerely,

Shane Baxter

Shane Baxter

Letter C12 - Baxter, Shane (2/15/2018)

C12-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C13

Morrison, Susan

From: Carly Bell <carlymcgowen@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 7:34 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,
I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

C13-1

Sincerely,

Carly Bell

1

Letter C13 - Bell, Carly (1/30/2018)

C13-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C14

Morrison, Susan

From: Bryce Belshin <bbelshin2019@hightechhigh.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 6:32 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

C14-1 My name is Bryce Belshin, I am a member at Vertical Hold, and a frequent user of South Hancock street. I would like to voice my support for Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546 and "South Hancock Shareway".

Thanks

1

Letter C14 - Belshin, Bryce (2/20/2018)

C14-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C15

Jon Benko

~~321 11th Street~~

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I support the South Hancock Shareway

February 13, 2018,

C15-1

To The City of San Diego Planning Department, I climb at Vertical Hold in Old Town and have continuous issues with parking. Due to the small size of Vertical Hold's parking lot, we are forced to park in the street with very little room. This creates hazardous situations for everyone in the area because it creates congestion. I love climbing at this gym and feel additional street parking reserved for Vertical Hold would be extremely helpful.

With Gratitude,

Jon Benko



Letter C15 - Benko, Jon (2/13/2018)

C15-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C16

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C16-1 I am a San Diego-native who regularly rock climbs at Vertical Hold's Hancock St. facility. I've recently been made aware of plans to reduce parking on Hancock St. to create a bike lane. While I support cyclists, I believe that the "South Hancock Shareway" plan would make Hancock St. safer for cyclists and pedestrians by reducing traffic on the street created by the crazy number of drivers seeking parking near local businesses. I also would appreciate the extra diagonal parking spots as it would make my experience seeking parking near my gym much easier and safer. Thank you for considering my, and my community's thoughts on this matter.

Sincerely,

Dylan Bier



Letter C16 - Bier, Dylan (2/13/2018)

C16-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C17

Morrison, Susan

From: Alex Blackbird <alex@soillholds.com>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2018 6:59 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Urgent - Hancock St.

To whom it may concern within the City of San Diego Planning Department,

I'm writing with regards to the Hancock St. South shareware. I frequent many local businesses on this particular street, such as Specialty Produce and Vertical Hold, and wanted to express my concerns. As a bike commuter I feel endangered by the speed of cars and the hyper focused mindset of drivers attempting to find what limited parking spaces there are. I have been run off the road on my bike as people maneuver to park multiple times, and I have seen too many almost accidents to count, and a few that weren't so fortunate. The lack of spaces causes a frenzy, and the vastness of the lanes encourages reckless driving behavior in an increasingly pedestrian busy area.

C17 The business in the area lend themselves to families and children, and I feel a great deal could be gained in safety from the addition of diagonal parking on the northbound street side. In my experience, bike only paths in areas like these only gain to cause a greater hazard to cyclists and are commonly used for waiting zones from drivers trying their hardest to find parking. As a member of this specific part of the community, and some one who is a cyclist, a pedestrian, and a driver frequenting the area, I urge you to open both directions of traffic only as bicycle shareways and increase the parking to ease the driving stress of area patrons. Higher visibility from cars pulling out, more spaces, as well as less wide roads to discourage reckless speeding would only create a safer environment for the families and cyclists looking to frequent this portion of the neighborhood.

Thank you so much for your time.

If I can be of any help on this issue, please don't hesitate.

Best,
Alex Blackbird
TAKEHOLDLV.com

1

Letter C17 – Blackbird, Alex (2/19/2018)

C17-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C18

Morrison, Susan

From: REVISION Creative Workspace <revisionworkspace@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 1:15 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello,
I'm writing in regard to the proposed changes in the area. I am the owner of REVISION, a charitable organization and creative workspace designed to provide inclusive access to art, culture and environmental education. We are a project founded under Life Works, and share the lobby of the building which used to be Buffalo Breath Costume store. We are approaching almost a year in this space and have noticed a few concerns mainly around community cleanliness and issues with parking. We were recently informed of a solution that seems wonderful! The South Hancock Shareway alternative would increase safety for cyclists (a major focus for us as environmentalists), safety for pedestrians (especially because we enroll children in our classes) while simultaneously providing additional parking (a huge need since this are his highly congested).
I have gathered with the other nearby businesses to consider the logistics of this change, and wanted to extend my support. Attached is a brief summary of that idea.

C18

Thanks you,

Joy Boe
REVISION Community Director
www.revisionsandiego.com
619-994-3218

The South Hancock Shareway

➢ **A Class III Bike Route through this corridor**, creating "shareways" in both directions along Hancock St. between Noell and Witherby. There should be abundant signage and painted "sharrows".

➢ **Back in Angled parking along the eastern curbline of Hancock St**. Currently, this side of Hancock has non-designated parallel parking. This parallel parking should be replaced with back-in angled parking stalls. When leaving the back-in angled parking space, drivers have an unobstructed view of traffic and can enter the traffic stream directly. According to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, back-in angle parking provides motorists with better vision of pedestrians, bicyclists, motor vehicles, and other road users as they exit a parking space and enter moving traffic. Back-In angle parking also eliminates the danger of bicycles colliding with open car doors, which would be a problem with the current city plan.

C18-2

Letter C18 - Boe, Joy (2/8/2018)

C18-1: Comment noted.

C18-2: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

C18-2 (cont)

➢ **Back in Angled parking along the western curbline of Hancock St**. Currently, this side of the street has wide and crudely painted angled parking stalls. Repainting with back in angled parking along the western curbline of Hanckock would help with bicycle safety and help add to the parking.

➢ **Narrowing of the traffic corridor.** This would have a speed softening effect, helping with pedestrian, cyclist and motorist safety..

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter C19

Morrison, Susan

From: Dorothy Borzsak <dborzsak@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 17, 2018 6:12 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

RE: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Dear Ms. Susan Morris and Ms. Lorie Zapf,

I would like to write in support of the creation of the "South Hancock Shareway" on Hancock Street, a project currently proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association which would involve painting angled, back-in spots along with the addition of painted "sharrows" to serve as a bike lane. I believe this Shareway would immensely increase safety for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles while also minimizing traffic congestion and providing additional parking.

C19-1

I am a frequent customer at Culture Shock Dance Center (located on 2110 Hancock Street) during weekdays, weeknights and weekends. We are often forced to drive to Culture Shock over an hour prior to class because of the difficult street parking situation. This is consistent at all hours. Any solution that would help improve the parking availability would be so helpful.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions/concerns.

Thank You,

Dorothy Borzsak, RN, MPH

619-847-7347

dborzsak@hotmail.com

Letter C19 – Dorothy Borzsak (2/17/2018)

C19-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C20

Susan Morrison, Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 2nd Ave, Ste 1200, East Tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

15 February 2018

Ms. Morrison:

My name is Emily Bosworth, and I am writing to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, a part of the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546.

I encourage you to consider the ways the South Hancock Shareway can positively impact the area and its businesses. I am a longtime student at Culture Shock Dance Center, a place where hundreds of children and adults alike benefit from excellent dance education. The studio has a reputation of inclusive dance education that serves people of all skill levels.

C20-1

With the effort the business has put to improve itself, has come its well-deserved success. As the studio grows in popularity, the only factor that puts off a negative aura is a factor the studio cannot control: unreasonably limited parking in the area. Due to a lack of parking spaces, traffic has become slower, many people must park further from the studio than reasonable, and visiting the studio is more dangerous and less satisfactory. Many cars slow down or stop to look for parking, causing the through traffic to drive in the wrong lane. The road has become an unpredictable and unsafe environment. It is clear that more parking would solve not only the hassle, but also the hazard.

For the sake of Culture Shock and its customers, and the safety of all pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers who travel South Hancock Street, I strongly encourage you to consider the Shareway proposal. Culture Shock works hard to flourish. Please allow it to do so safely.

Sincerely,

Emily Bosworth

Letter C20 – Emily Bosworth (2/15/2018)

C20-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C21

NAME Ashley Branum

ADDRESS
4324 W. Point Loma Blvd Apt. J San Diego, Ca 92107

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

To The City

C21-1 My fiancé and I come to Vertical Hold at least 2-3 times a week and several times on the weekend. The only issue we have ever had is with the parking and total access to the gym as already crowded. Vertical Hold is awesome and we would love to see an improvement in the parking. Please consider Vertical Holds plan "South Hancock Shareway" so that we can continue to enjoy coming to the gym!

With Gratitude,

Ashley Branum

Letter C21 – Branum, Ashley (2/13/2018)

C21-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C22

Morrison, Susan

From: Lydia Brizendine <lydiabrizendine@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 8:20 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Project #561546 parking on Hancock st.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

C22-1

To the planning department of the city of San Diego, I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.
Sincerely,
Lydia Brizendine
Sent from my iPhone

1

Letter C22 - Brizendine, Lydia (2/2/2018)

C22-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C23

Morrison, Susan

From: Kathy Brown <kvolle4318@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 8:02 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C23 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,

Kathy Brown

Sent from my iPhone

1

Letter C23 - Brown, Kathy (1/30/2018)

C23-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C24

Morrison, Susan

From: Angie Bunch <angie@cultureshockdancecenter.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 10:19 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: MIDWAY PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLAN, PROJECT #561546

Hello Susan,

C24-1 I am a business owner of the Culture Shock Dance Center, occupying 2110 Hancock Street, suites 200 and 300, and am writing to request that you seriously consider our South Hancock Shareway proposition. It will not only provide desperately needed additional parking for our, and our business neighbors, members but would also increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists, while also minimizing congestion. Culture Shock is in its 15th year in business and has (thankfully) progressively grown and expanded. We would like to think that this course may continue but know that parking is sometimes a deal breaker for many people.

Thank you very much for the consideration!

A.

Angie Bunch
Co-owner, Culture Shock Dance Center
Founder, Chief Artistic Director, Culture Shock Dance Troupes, Inc.
Director, A CULTURE SHOCK NUTCRACKER

1

Letter C24 – Bunch, Angie (2/20/2018)

C24-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C25

Morrison, Susan

From: Adam Burcombe <adamburcombe@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 12:01 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

I am a member of the local indoor rock climbing gym, Vertical Hold, and my wife is a staff member for the gym as well. Though the gym has a location closer to where I live, I sometimes like to visit their site on Hancock St. However, it is often rather difficult to find available parking spots in the area. While the climbing gym has a parking lot for members, it is usually full. Street parking is also regularly very limited because the climbing gym and the neighboring businesses bring in lots of customers who commute to the area. Additionally, there is continuous traffic of *pedestrians*, *cyclists*, and *other drivers* that flow through this community which makes it difficult to safely navigate the street and search for parking.

C25-1

Thankfully, our community's needs have been recognized by the *Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association;* and I am writing to express my support for their proposed **Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan** (**Project #561546**). I believe the **South Hancock Shareway** will improve the conditions of the road and create more available parking spots. I am asking that you take serious consideration and movement toward action regarding these needs and the association's proposal.

Sincerely,
Adam Burcombe

1

Letter C25 – Burcombe, Adam (2/16/2018)

C25-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C26

Morrison, Susan

From: ari duyao <ari_duyao@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 8:07 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my support for the **South Hancock Shareway** that has been proposed through the **Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan** (**Project #561546**).

I am a staff member of Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym located on Hancock St. Since I've worked with the gym I have noticed that it is very difficult to find parking in the area. As a courtesy to our members, our staff does not park in our building's lot. Instead we are expected to park on the street during our shifts. Unless I have an opening shift at 8:30AM, I have to drive up and down the street two to four times to find an available spot. There is usually continuous foot traffic, cyclists, and lots other drivers on this road, so circling the street and turning around can be hazardous; as well as, finding a parking spot becomes competitive.

C26-1

I know that I'm not alone in the struggle to commute to this area. Our gym brings in lots of members who commute here and lots of new customers interested in climbing. And we frequently hear complaints about parking from these clients. I also commute to this area to visit the neighboring businesses, including Culture Shock Dance Center where I am a student, so I know firsthand that the parking conflict negatively impacts our neighbors too.

I am requesting action from those who have power to change our situation and provide a solution. Our community needs increased safety on the road for our pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers. Thank you for taking the time to read my letter and for considering this request.

Best Regards,
Arianne Burcombe

1

Letter C26 – Burcombe, Arianne (2/15/2018)

C26-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C27

1.27.2018

To whom it may concern,

I, Michelle Camaya, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

C27-1

Regards,

Michelle Camaya

Thank you.

Letter C27 - Camaya, Michelle (1/27/2018)

C27-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C28

19 FEB 2018

Supporting South Hancock Share-way

C28-1 Hello, I am writing this letter in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan #561546. I am an employee of Vertical Hold Climbing Gym Located on Hancock St. My personal experiences with the current state of this street have been far from pleasant. The lack of parking has caused many near accidents due to the build up of cars waiting for the opening of a parking spot. I am here to support the south Hancock share-way. I believe that with an increase of parking spots, we will have safer driving conditions and less opportunity for an accident to happen. Thank you.

Regards,

-Antonio Carignan



Letter C28 – Carignan, Antonio (2/19/2018)

C28-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C29

Morrison, Susan

From:	Carolina Carvajal Sanclemente <carolinacarvajal7@hotmail.com>
Sent:	Wednesday, January 24, 2018 8:24 PM
To:	PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc:	CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject:	Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

I, Carolina Carvajal, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546.

C29-1 The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Carolina Carvajal

Letter C29 - Carvajal, Carolina (1/24/2018)

C29-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C30

Morrison, Susan

From: Alara Chilton <alarachilton@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 3:30 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

I, Alara T. Chilton, frequently attend Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St.

I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546.

C30-1

The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Criminal Defense and Consumer Protection
Alara Chilton, Esq.
185 W. "F" Street, Suite 100-J
San Diego, CA 92101
Phone: (619) 672-7201

Recipients should not file copies of this email and/or its attachments with publicly accessible records. Any disclosure, dissemination, distribution, copying or use of the information to or by others is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by immediate reply and delete the original message. Thank you.

Letter C30 - Chilton, Alara (1/24/2018)

C30-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C31

Honyin Chiu and Brian Wang
2074 Hancock St.
San Diego, CA 92110

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

C31-1 Hi, we're members of Vertical Hold rock climbing gym and we support the South Hancock Shareway project. We think it's important that we increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while minimizing congestion and provide additional parking.

With Gratitude,

Honyin Chiu and Brian Wang

Brian Wang

Honyin Chiu

Letter C31 - Chiu, Honyin and Wang, Brian (2/13/2018)

C31-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C32

Morrison, Susan

From: Gena Clark <genaclark@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 8:51 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project 561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,
I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child. I am a resident in this district and I vote.
Sincerely,
Gena Clark

C32-1

1

Letter C32 - Clark, Gena (1/30/2018)

C32-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C33

Morrison, Susan

From: Pamela Cook <pamancolin@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 10:59 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,
C33-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.
Sincerely,
Pamela Cook

1

Letter C33 - Cook, Pamela (1/31/2018)

C33-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C34

Morrison, Susan

From: Ian Crano <iancrano@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 5:45 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan - Project #561546

Ms. Morrison,

I understand that the City is taking public comment on Proposal Number 561546. As someone who frequents the midway area, I see a lot of potential for improvement in both pedestrian safety and parking.

The current wide girth of the road allows drivers a lot of comfort to drive VERY fast down the street, endangering the many pedestrians crossing from (typically) west side of Hancock Street to the multitude of businesses on the east side. I've personally almost been hit a number of times due to the current conditions.

C34-1

The inclusion of marked bicycle lanes in accordance with the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) guidelines (or similar) would also increase safety for the many cyclists who pass through the neighborhood while helping to reduce vehicle speeds.

Hopefully the City can improve the current level pedestrian safety and increase parking as a part of this project.

I look forward to seeing what the future has in store as this neighborhood continues to develop and be improved!

Thanks,
Ian Crano

Letter C34 - Crano, Ian (2/20/2018)

C34-1: Comment noted. The Mobility Element of the Draft Community Plan describes planned walkability and bicycling improvements in the Midway-Pacific Highway community.

Letter C35

Morrison, Susan

From: Michelina D'Amore <mdamore1190@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 11:34 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan (Plan #561546)

C35-1 I would like to share my support in fixing the parking on Hancock Street, requesting angled parking on both sides of the street to assist with parking availability and traffic flow.

Thank you!

1

Letter C35 – D'Amore, Michelina (2/20/2018)

C35-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C36

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 12, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C36-1

I've been a proud resident of San Diego for the past 10 years. Over that time, I have come to love all the activities that San Diego has to offer, including Vertical Hold rock climbing gym. I have found my closest friends here and every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday I frequent Hancock Street. I have a daughter with shared custody and I only have a certain amount of time with her during certain weekdays. Its very frustrating to spend some of that time (up to 30-45 min) looking for parking.

Through the great community I have found here I've learned about the South Hancock Shareaway and how it will increase safety for pedestrians and bicyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. I think it's a fantastic idea and I strongly support its approval and hope you will consider its passage.

I hope you will take my letter into consideration, and think about the safety for all on Hancock St.

Best regards,

Tyler Dandurand

Tyler Dandurand

Letter C36 – Dandurand, Tyler (2/12/2018)

C36-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C37 2/16/18

Dear Susan Morrison,

I am writing to express my support of the "South Hancock Shareway." It will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while minimizing congestion and providing additional parking.

C37-1

Thank you,

Jennifer Danzig
Client at Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock St. # 200
San Diego CA 92110

Jennifer Danzig

Letter C37 – Danzig, Jennifer (2/16/2018)

C37-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C38 – Dashe, Jonathan (2/12/2018)

Susan Morrison, [Letter C38] 2-12-2018

I am writing to voice my support for the "South Hancock Shareway" proposal for project #561546 "Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan".

C38-1 I am a member of the "Vertical Hold" climbing gym which operates a location on Hancock Street. The majority of times I visit this facility I find myself very frustrated by the lack of available parking. Parking spaces in this area seem severely disproportioned relative to the amount of traffic the businesses on this street generate. I understand that the South Hancock Shareway plan would provide more parking by using existing space more efficiently and at the same time improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists. This proposal seems like it will go some way toward resolving the parking shortage and congestion problems in this area.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jonathan Dashe

Jonathan Dashe
4809 Clairemont Mesa Blvd.
Apt 324
San Diego, CA 92117

C38-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C39

Morrison, Susan

From: Melodie Davis <miks0505@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 12:00 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello,

C39-1 My name is Melodie Davis, and I work for Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym on 2074 Hancock Street. Everyday I drive in for work, the street outside our business is very congested with vehicles and pedestrians meshing together in a very disorganized mess. I've received numerous complaints from customers about how challenging parking is, and from concerned parents who try to cross the street with their children in an area that isn't very clean or safe. This street is lined with businesses that provide a service to hundreds of San Diegans everyday, and I think these patrons and employees deserve a road that serves a basic purpose of providing enough adequate parking and safety to relief dangerous traffic. I support the "South Hancock Shareway" (Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546) as the best solution to solving this ongoing issue in the most cost effective and efficient way. Please strongly consider this project, because our community has been working very hard to keep the street safe and clean and we can do so much more with your help.


Thank you for your time,

Melodie Davis

1

Letter C39 - Davis, Melodie (1/23/2018)

C39-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.



Letter C40

TANISHA L. DENHAM

4240 Menlo Avenue #17, San Diego CA 92115

February 18, 2018

Susan Morrison
Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 2nd Avenue Suite 1200 East Tower MS 413
San Diego CA 92101

Dear Ms. Morrison

I'm writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan (Project #561546). I support the "South Hancock Shareway" because I am a Culture Shock Dance Center Student and see the need for additional parking firsthand.

C40-1 Drivers often make dangerous u-turns in the middle of the street to try to quickly pounce on an open spot. Some parents park in the street and turn on their lights as they wait for their children to quickly come to the car after dance class.

We need this shareway to increase the safety of pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing much need additional parking.

Sincerely,

Tanisha L. Denham

Tanisha L. Denham

Letter C40 – Denham, Tanisha (2/18/2018)

C40-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C41

Morrison, Susan

From: jessica baker-denson <bballmomjess@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 10:24 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific HWY Community plan, project #561546

Hi,

C41-1 I am someone who regularly attends classes at Culture Shock Dance Center. In recent months, parking has been very difficult and frustrating. I'm emailing you today to let you know that I support the proposed South Hancock Shareway. Additional parking is absolutely necessary in this area and I believe it will also assist with congestion & be safer for pedestrians.

Thank you for your time.

Jessica Denson

1

Letter C41 – Denson, Jessica (2/20/2018)

C41-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C42

Darren Denyer

942 Rosecrans St., San Diego, CA 92106

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I support the South Hancock Shareway

February 13, 2018,

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C42-1 I climb at Vertical Hold in Old Town and have continuous issues with parking. Due to the small size of Vertical Hold's parking lot, we are forced to park in the street with very little room. This creates hazardous situations for everyone in the area because it creates congestion. I love climbing at this gym and feel additional street parking reserved for Vertical Hold would be extremely helpful.

Respectfully,



Darren Denyer

Letter C42 - Denyer, Darren (2/13/2018)

C42-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C43

NAME Anthony DiMarco

ADDRESS
2147 Bacon St. San Diego Ca, 92017

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546


February 13, 2018

To The City

C43-1 I come to Vertical Hold 2-3 times a week. Parking and total access to the gym as already congested. Please consider Vertical Holds plan "South Hancock Shareway"

With Gratitude,

Anthony DiMarco



Letter C43 – DiMarco, Anthony (2/13/2018)

C43-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C44

Morrison, Susan

From: Jennifer D <peticures@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 2:59 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Good afternoon City of San Diego,

C44-1 I am a member of the SD Bikram yoga studio and have noticed since practicing here that the parking situation is a concern, especially in the afternoons/evenings. I know some members that have had to leave without going into yoga because they could not find a spot. I am so thankful that has not happened to be. I would have been livid! There was one day that my truck was sticking out a bit into the rock climbing entrance but not blocking entry. I went in to ask the business if it was OK and they said yes. Such nice people and support! I can't even think what it would be like if even one parking spot was taken away. CHAOS! I support the South Hancock Shareway as I think it would be a win-win situation for all. I also support the bicycle transportation. I recently visited Portland and they have wonderful shared roads for bicyclists. It's pretty amazing! The Hancock Street Community has wonderful businesses and I would hate for these awesome places to be impacted because patrons can't find parking. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Duarte

1

Letter C44 - Duarte, Jennifer (2/2/2018)

C44-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C45

Christian Duyao
9841 Dauntless St.
San Diego, CA 92126

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

To the City of San Diego Parking Department,

C45-1

I'm a member at Vertical Hold climbing gym and while I love the gym I find the parking off South Hancock Street to be chaotic at peak times throughout the day. I'm also an avid cyclist, I ride my bike to the gym quite often and while this helps my parking situation the street is not a safe place to ride due to the road conditions and the buildup of traffic that occurs due to people looking for parking.

By adding back-in parking and adding "sharrows" this will help relieve the congestion on Hancock Street. I support the "South Hancock Shareway" as I feel this will help with the parking issues and help cyclists and pedestrians remain safe.

Concerned Citizen,

Christian Duyao

Letter C45 - Duyao, Christian (2/13/2018)

C45-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C46

Morrison, Susan

From: Joel Duyao <joel.duyao@blujelly.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 10:49 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project# 561546

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

I'm a member of the Vertical Hold Climbing Gym on Hancock Street South. I go to this gym 3-4 times every week. That being said, I have witnessed firsthand many near accidents involving bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles. Some of those pedestrians included families with children. I have observed that this is usually caused by the incoming traffic of people looking for parking spaces.

While it is important to for pedestrians and cyclists to have the ability to commute safely, it is also important for local businesses to survive. I am aware of the city's plan to create two bike lanes on both sides of the street. If this occurs, then there will be less parking for the businesses. This will create an inconvenience for local and visiting consumers, therefore taking away from the street's local businesses' revenues.

C46-1

Furthermore, I strongly believe that bike lanes on Hancock would be ineffective in keeping cyclists safe on Hancock with the heavy congestion, speeding, and cars pulled over due to limited parking.

I propose that the City of San Diego create diagonal parking on BOTH sides of Hancock Street South, and to make the road a "sharrow". This will allow for all of the incoming consumers to find parking easier and quicker, creating less traffic congestion. The cyclists get their right of way, consumers have convenient parking, and opportunity is kept for the local San Diego businesses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Joel M. Duyao
Application Operations
Application Engineer & Project Manager
At a Local Business

Letter C46 – Duyao, Joel (2/20/2018)

C46-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Midway Pacific Highway Feb. 18, 2018
Community Plan, Project #561546

Letter C47

C47-1 I support the "South Hancock Shareway" project because everytime I go and take a dance class at Culture Shock Dance Center, it takes me at least 15 min. to 20 min. just to find parking, and I know this can be alleviated (the congestion).

Thank-you so much,
Elizabeth Eager
CultureShock Dance
Center Student

Letter C47 – Elizabeth Eager (2/18/2018)

C47-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C48

Gabriel easterling

2074 Hancock St.
San Diego, CA 92110

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

Hello,

C48-1 My name is Gabriel easterling and I have noticed a parking issue around hancock street. I think removing parking spots would cause a lot of problems. I have been attending the climbing gym and spin night club for many years and parking is always an issue. I believe better organized angled parking spots would help parking availability and traffic flow. I also think that sharrows would make the road safer for bicyclists and narrower driving lanes would slow traffic and make it safer for pedestrians because people tend to swerve around other cars on hancock st and speed frequently


With Gratitude,

gabriel



Letter C48 – Easterling, Gabriel (2/13/2018)

C48-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes similar improvements along Hancock Street.



Letter C49 – Fasbinder, Noah (2/16/2018)

C49-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C50

Morrison, Susan

From: Krista Fierro <kyfierro@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 9:18 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project #561546

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a patron at Vertical Hold Climbing Gym, a member of the Hancock Neighborhood Business Association. I am writing today to express my concerns with the current parking situation and proposed changes to Hancock Street.

The neighborhood is populated with many businesses that attract a large population. Parking is currently limited and slightly dangerous for motorist, pedestrians, and bicyclist. I've heard the proposed improvement is to change to Class II Bike Lanes in both directions along Hancock Street. I am happy to see improvements being made for bicyclist, but believe there is a better solution.

C50-1

I'd like the planning committee to consider the a South Hancock Shareway. A Class III Bike Route through this corridor, creating "shareways" in both directions along Hancock Street between Witherby and Noell. By adding back in angled parking along the eastern curb line and changing the western curb line to back in angled parking as well, this will provide motorist better vision of pedestrians, bicyclist, and other motor vehicles. Back in angle parking also eliminates the danger of bicycles colliding with open car doors, which would be a problem with the current community plan.

I hope those tasked with reviewing the Midway Pacific Community Plan will consider the needs of the neighborhood businesses and community and support the plan for a "shareway".

Thank you for your time.

Krista Fierro
Vertical Hold Community Member

1

Letter C50 – Fierro, Krista (2/20/2018)

C50-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C51

Morrison, Susan

From: Shane Finnerty <finnerty2393@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 11:27 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan (Plan #561546)

C51-1

I would like to share my support in fixing the parking on Hancock Street, requesting angled parking on both sides of the street to assist with parking availability and traffic flow.

Thank you!

Shane Finnerty
UCSD Marine Biology Undergraduate
(360) 722 0268

1

Letter C51 – Finnerty, Shane (2/20/2018)

C51-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes similar parking improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C52

Morrison, Susan

From: Troy Finnigan <troy.finnigan@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 10:42 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Project Name: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Project No.: 561546/SCH No: 2015111013 Community Plan Area: Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Council District: 2 (Zapf)

Project Name: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Project No.: 561546/SCH No: 2015111013
Community Plan Area: Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor
Council District: 2 (Zapf)

To Whom it May Concern,

C52-1

I am extremely interested in learning more about this potential redevelopment project. As an effective community organizer, successful businessman, long time San Diego resident, and having family in the commercial development industry (in Chicago), I am both invested in the outcomes and knowledgeable around the subject.

I understand that pre-planning is already underway (land use permits and rezoning are under consideration, there is market research being conducted, and long term contracts/leasing strategy is being shaped). This is understandable and should not alarm anyone (although absent more information, some residents are already getting concerned). I understand that these long term strategies do not come fully baked, but are shaped along an evolution that takes years.

As an invested resident and general proponent of the redevelopment, I'd like the opportunity to be involved however possible, from a voluntary standpoint (4329 Loma Riviera Ct.).

C52-2

My major considerations I'm hoping will be addressed are as the follows:

1. Population density - public services to support such a large increase in population (schools, police, fire, etc.)
2. Congestion - traffic is already an issue. How will the plans address this (both short term, during construction, and afterward, accounting for increase in population and visitors to the area).
3. Environmental impact
4. Bike lanes
5. Taxes

Very Best,
Troy

Troy Finnigan
858.525.3293

Sent from my mobile device: please excuse brevity and typos.

1

Letter C52 - Finnegan, Troy (2/15/2018)

C52-1: Comment noted. This comment does not address the adequacy of the analysis in the Draft PEIR; however, the City appreciates Mr. Finnigan's interest in the project and his willingness to volunteer. For ongoing information on the project and the community in general, the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group meets the third Wednesday of every month at 3:00 p.m. The meetings are held at the San Diego Community College District - Continuing Education, West City Campus, 3249 Fordham Street, Room 205. For additional information or to reach the community planning group, please contact chairperson Cathy Kenton at (858) 509-7996 or by email at ckenton1@san.rr.com. In addition, three hearings for this project will be tentatively held on 4/26/2018 (Planning Commission), 5/24/2018 (Smart Growth and Land Use Committee), and for adoption on 6/26/2018 (City Council).

C52-2: Public services, transportation and circulation (traffic congestion), environmental impact, and bike lanes are analyzed in Chapter 5, Environmental Analysis, of the Draft PEIR. However, the Draft PEIR does not consider taxes in the context of CEQA and the determination of environmental impact because direct social and economic effects, such as project effects on taxes, are not considered a significant impact under CEQA.

Letter C53

Amy Fourounjian
2074 Hancock St.
San Diego, CA 92110

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C53-1 I'm a member of Vertical Hold and upset by the parking situation nearby on Hancock Street. Angled back-in parking on both sides of the street will help greatly with parking availability and traffic flow. Narrower driving lanes will slow down the traffic and make the neighborhood safer for pedestrians. Sharrows will make it safer for bicyclists. Please consider our request to make the streets safer for pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers. Thank you for consideration in this important matter.

With Gratitude,



Letter C53 - Fourounjian, Amy (2/13/2018)

C53-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes the same improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C54

Morrison, Susan

From: Charles Freeman <drcharlesfreeman@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 12:31 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Support Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To whom it may concern,
I, Charles Freeman , am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

C54

Sincerely, Charlie

Charles R. Freeman, Ph.D.; PSY #25414
The San Diego
Sleep
Doctor
| Pain | Addictionologist
|
Behavioral Medicine
Psychologist
|
National Executive Coach, Sleep & Wellness Expert
3435 Camino Del Rio South, #110; San Diego, CA 92108
535 Encinitas Blvd., #110;
Encinitas
, CA 92024
(619) 405-7663; www.SleepPsy.com

Emails are checked daily, Monday - Friday during regular business hours. If you have an emergency call 911.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE
This electronic transmission is intended only for the personal and confidential use of the recipient designated above. It may also constitute a doctor-patient communication and therefore be legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient of this communication (or an agent responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient), you are hereby notified that any review, disclosure, or use of the information contained herein is

Letter C54 - Freeman, PhD, Charles (2/2/2018)

C54-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately. Please destroy the original message and all copies.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter C55

Morrison, Susan

From: Victoria Freeman <251victoria@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 12:16 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: support Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

C55-1

To whom it may concern,
I, Victoria Freeman , am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.
Regards,
Sincerely,
Victoria Freeman

1

Letter C55 - Freeman, Victoria (2/2/2018)

C55-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C56

February 9, 2018

Dear Susan Morrison,

I am writing in regard to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I am the owner of Life Works, a Supported Living Services Organization. We moved into our space on Hancock St. just under a year ago and have noticed some concerns since we moved in. Of greatest concern are issues around cleanliness and parking.

We were recently informed of an alternate solution that we are really excited about. The South Hancock Shareway would increase safety for cyclists and pedestrians while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. Below is a brief summary of that proposition.

The South Hancock Shareway

C56-1

- **A Class III Bike Route through this corridor,** creating "shareways" in both directions along Hancock St. between Noell and Witherby. There would be abundant signage and painted "sharrows".
- **Back in Angled parking along the eastern curb line of Hancock St.** Currently, this side of Hancock has non-designated parallel parking. This parallel parking would be replaced with back-in angled parking stalls. When leaving the back-in angled parking space, drivers have an unobstructed view of traffic and can enter the traffic stream directly. According to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, back-in angle parking provides motorists with better vision of pedestrians, bicyclists, motor vehicles, and other road users as they exit a parking space and enter moving traffic. Back-in angle parking also eliminates the danger of bicycles colliding with open car doors, which would be a problem with the current city plan.
- **Back in Angled parking along the western curb line of Hancock St.** Currently, this side of the street has wide and crudely painted angled parking stalls. Repainting with back in angled parking along the western curb line of Hancock St. would help with bicycle safety and help add to the parking.
- **Narrowing of the traffic corridor.** This would have a speed softening effect, helping with pedestrian, cyclist, and motorist safety.

We hope you will take into consideration feedback from the local businesses that would be directly affected by these changes.

Thank you,

Beth Gallagher
Life Works
www.lifeworks-sls.com
619-696-1402

Letter C56 – Gallagher, Beth (2/9/2018)

C56-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C57

Morrison, Susan

From: Phoebe Gao <phgao1994@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 1:54 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hi,

C57-1 My name is Phoebe Gao, and I just wanted to write in to say that I greatly support the South Hancock Shareway proposal. As of now, it's extremely difficult to find parking here during peak hours, and solving this issue would greatly increase the safety of pedestrians and cyclists passing through the area while minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for all the businesses in the area. I visit Vertical Hold Climbing Gym 2-3 times a week, and it would be a huge success if we can just improve the parking situation in the area. I've noticed that some people drive very dangerously and carelessly when desperate to nab a parking spot.

Thank You,

Phoebe Gao

Letter C57 - Gao, Phoebe (2/14/2018)

C57-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C58

Morrison, Susan

From: Karey Garcia <kareyg@me.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 11:57 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan (Project #561546)

C58-1

I am writing to request angled parking on both sides of Hancock Street. This will help with availability of parking and traffic flow.

In addition, I support the South Hancock Shareway.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Karey Garcia

Letter C58 – Garcia, Karey (2/20/2018)

C58-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C59

Morrison, Susan

From: Maureena Garcia <maureena.garcia@att.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2018 4:58 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: I support the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, the South Hancock Shareway

To the Planning Department of the city of San Diego,

C59-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I support the South Hancock Shareway because it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. I also witness cars driving recklessly on the wrong side of the road to pass cars that are waiting to park. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock Street safer for myself and my children.

Respectfully,
Maureena Garcia

1

Letter C59 – Garcia, Maureena (2/22/2018)

C59-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C60

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 12, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C60-1

I am a member at the Vertical Hold climbing gym on Hancock Street. As someone who cycles avidly, I would like to see Hancock Street become friendly for bikers and gym-goers alike. Adding diagonal parking spaces and painting "sharrows" to indicate sharing the road with cyclists would help make this a safer shared space.

I support the South Hancock Shareway as it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists. In addition a shareway on South Hancock will also minimize congestion and provide the additional parking the street desperately needs. Having additional parking will allow members to frequent the gym with less stress.

With Gratitude,

Alexa Gatti

Letter C60 – Gatti, Alexa (2/12/2018)

C60-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C61

Morrison, Susan

From: Amanda Williams <amanda@circatree.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2018 9:42 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To whom it may concern,
I, Amanda Gilbert , am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.
Regards,
Amanda Gilbert

C61-1

1

Letter C61 - Gilbert, Amanda (1/28/2018)

C61-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C62

Morrison, Susan

From: LG <sweetener@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 11:43 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C62-1 I, Luke Gilson, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Luke

Letter C62 - Gilson, Luke (1/25/2018)

C62-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C63

Morrison, Susan

From: Gabrielle Ginter <gabrielle.ginter@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 12:28 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

C63-1 I, Gabrielle Ginter , am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Gabrielle

Letter C63 - Ginter, Gabrielle (1/25/2018)

C63-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C64

Laura Gonzalez
1425 Silver Springs Dr.
Chula Vista, CA 91915

Susan Morrison, Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 2nd Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

February 15, 2018

I am writing in support of the South Hancock Shareway, as a way to increase the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and cars on Hancock Street. This is the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. Painting angled, back-in spots on both sides of the street would ease the terrible congestion that we experience as members of the Culture Shock community.

C64-1 I am a dancer, and my two teens are also dancers, so we are at Culture Shock at least once a week, sometimes twice. The situation is frankly dangerous, as people are waiting, making U-turns, and crossing without a crosswalk.

Additional parking is crucial on Hancock Street for the health of the businesses and the safety of people.

Thank you,

LGonzalez

Laura Gonzalez

Letter C64 – Gonzalez, Laura (2/15/2018)

C64-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C65

Morrison, Susan

From: Arden Graupp <ardengraupp@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 9:58 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Ms. Morrison,

I am writing to support the "South Hancock Shareway" that is being proposed for Hancock Street as part of the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan.

As a regular member of the Bikram Yoga facility located at 2110 Hancock Street, Suite 30,. the idea proposed would greatly reduce the congestion and parking limitations that now exist on that street. Cars drive up and down the street multiple times trying to find parking, while pedestrians are walking on the street and sidewalks coming to and from classes and business in the area, creating unnecessary congestion and danger.

C65-1

I believe the proposed angled parking spots and bike lane corridor would make the community safer for all of the community, especially pedestrians and cyclists. We would not want to wait until some unfortunate accident occurs to take action. Now is the time.

I appreciate your attention and support of this matter.

Arden Graupp

Letter C65 - Graupp, Arden (1/30/2018)

C65-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C66

Morrison, Susan

From: Devra <devra1@cox.net>
Sent: Thursday, February 01, 2018 10:44 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

This email is verifying my support of the South Hancock Shareway project.

My name is Devra Gregory, I am a patron at Culture Shock Dance Center at 2110 Hancock St #200, San Diego, CA 92110.

C66-1

I have been attending this business since it moved into the building and have seen the parking situation worsen over the years. There are hundreds of customers at various businesses along this stretch of Hancock and PARKING IS A DISASTER.

Please consider adding parking spaces by making diagonal parking lines.

Also, please consider creating a parking lot where there is heavy machinery and building materiel storage using the entire west side of that street opposite the 2110 Hancock building.

Thank you,

Devra Gregory

619-861-5496

1

Letter C66 - Gregory, Devra (2/1/2018)

C66-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9. This letter also requests creating a parking lot where there is heavy machinery and building material storage along the west side of the street opposite 2110 Hancock Street. Parking is not an environmental issue analyzed under CEQA unless it is attributed to a specific physical impact on the environment, and it is therefore not discussed in the Draft PEIR. However, the property located across the street from 2110 Hancock Street is a storage yard owned by MTS that is used for onsite storage of rails, equipment, and trolleys. The site is designated for Mixed Commercial Residential use with a residential density of 0-109 dwelling units per acre in the proposed CPU.

Letter C67

Morrison, Susan

From: Ben Harvey <ben@ltdonlinestores.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 11:56 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

C67-1 Hi my name is Ben Harvey and I am owner and Tenant of 2161 and 2163 Hancock St. I am interested to learn more about the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546 which I believe is called the "South Hancock Shareway". Parking and the erratic driving that is caused by people trying to park and frustrated drivers trying to pass cars trying to park is a big issue. As a business and property owner on the street I'd like to be part of the conversation and solution. Please let me know if there is someone I can speak with about the plans.

Thank you for your time,

Ben Harvey
619-818-4523

1

Letter C67 - Harvey, Ben (1/26/2018)

C67-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9. The "South Hancock Shareway" is not proposed as part of the project, but has been proposed by the Hancock Street NBA's participating businesses and their clients to address parking, traffic congestion, and bicycle safety.

Letter C68

Morrison, Susan

From: Matthew Hayden <haydenmatthew94@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 2:46 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello,

C68-1 My name is Matthew Connor Hayden and I am writing you today to ask for a better parking option on Hancock Street in San Diego. I have been a member of the climbing gym located here for many years, from when it was Solid Rock through its switch to Vertical Hold. Finding parking in this area has always been an issue and is becoming even more of an issue as the businesses in this area seem to be growing and gaining a larger customer basis. A prime example of this was when the rock gym came under new ownership as they held the previous customers from Solid Rock and brought many members from Vertical Holds prior location. Many of the businesses in the area are making great efforts to give this area of the city a much needed face lift and bring new life to it. They seem to be succeeding in doing so but need more parking in order to further the effort already put in, so now I ask you to do your part and help those who make use of this are to do so without the added struggle of finding parking. Thank you very much!

1

Letter C68 - Hayden, Matthew Connor (1/24/2018)

C68-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar concerns and proposes parking improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C68A

Matthew Hayden

19 FEB 2018

Supporting South Hancock Share-way

C68A-1

My name is Matthew Connor Hayden, this letter is written with regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan #561546. I support the plan for a share-way bike route down Hancock Street with diagonal parking spaces on both sides of the street. The businesses in the area have been growing and working to restore the area. I work at the climbing gym Vertical Hold and have noticed a heavy increase in traffic causing it to take up to 20 minutes or so to find parking in the area. Often times cars will block traffic waiting for a space as well which can be a bit of a hazard for cyclists and other drivers. I hope this plan passes so the area will become more functional and less hazardous to support the new growth. Thank you!



Letter C68A- Hayden, Matthew Connor (2/19/2018)

C68A-1: Comment noted. This letter was received subsequent to Mr. Hayden's January 24, 2018 letter. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar concerns and proposes parking improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C69

Morrison, Susan

From: Joseph Herrmann <joelouisherrmann@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 6:33 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: South Hancock Shareway

Hello, I am writing to show my support for the "South Hancock Shareway"

The project name is Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project # 561546

C69-1 My name is Joseph Herrmann and I am a member of The Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym. I attended 3-4 times a week and The parking in the area is a bust.

Let's all make the right decision and do what the community wants. More parking, less congestion and safety.

Thank you for your time.
Joe Herrmann

1

Letter C69 – Herrmann, Joe (2/20/2018)

C69-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C70

Morrison, Susan

From: Heuberger Jeremy <jeremyheuberger@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 11:46 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern:

My name is Jeremy Heuberger and I support the South Hancock Shareway (Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546.)

This Shareway will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists who utilize the many businesses on Hancock Street. It's very difficult to find parking along Hancock Street at any point throughout the day due to parallel parking on the east side of the street.

C70-1

If the east side of the road included angled parking spots, it would slow down the traffic and also provide additional spots. I love visiting my climbing gym Vertical hold on week-nights, but I absolutely detest trying to park, or crossing Hancock street. I often ride my bike from my neighborhood and have had several close calls with cars traveling too fast north bound, or making illegal u-turns due to the parking issues.

Please take the above into consideration when you review the project.

Thank you,
Jeremy Heuberger

Letter C70 - Heuberger, Jeremy (1/23/2018)

C70-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C71

February 9, 2018

Dear Susan Morrison,

I am writing in regard to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I am the owner of Kinship Project, an In-Home Care Organization. We moved into our space on Hancock St. just under a year ago and have noticed some concerns since we moved in. Of greatest concern are issues around cleanliness and parking.

We were recently informed of an alternate solution that we are really excited about. The South Hancock Shareway would increase safety for cyclists and pedestrians while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. Below is a brief summary of that proposition.

The South Hancock Shareway

- **A Class III Bike Route through this corridor,** creating "shareways" in both directions along Hancock St. between Noell and Witherby. There would be abundant signage and painted "sharrows".
- **Back in Angled parking along the eastern curb line of Hancock St.** Currently, this side of Hancock has non-designated parallel parking. This parallel parking would be replaced with back-in angled parking stalls. When leaving the back-in angled parking space, drivers have an unobstructed view of traffic and can enter the traffic stream directly. According to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, back-in angle parking provides motorists with better vision of pedestrians, bicyclists, motor vehicles, and other road users as they exit a parking space and enter moving traffic. Back-in angle parking also eliminates the danger of bicycles colliding with open car doors, which would be a problem with the current city plan.
- **Back in Angled parking along the western curb line of Hancock St.** Currently, this side of the street has wide and crudely painted angled parking stalls. Repainting with back in angled parking along the western curb line of Hancock St. would help with bicycle safety and help add to the parking.
- **Narrowing of the traffic corridor.** This would have a speed softening effect, helping with pedestrian, cyclist, and motorist safety.

We hope you will take into consideration feedback from the local businesses that would be directly affected by these changes.

C71-1

Thank you,

Kirk Hinkleman
Kinship Project
www.kinshipproject.net
619-930-9116

Letter C71 – Hinkelman, Kirk (2/9/2018)

C71-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C72

Morrison, Susan

From: jesschodge@gmail.com on behalf of Jesse Hodge <jess.c.hodge@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 7:31 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C72-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for me.

Sincerely,
Jesse Hodge

1

Letter C72 - Hodge, Jesse (1/30/2018)

C72-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C73

Morrison, Susan

From: Sean Hovda <seanhovda@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 12:01 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan

To whom it may concern,

C73-1 I, Sean Hovda, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association For the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

-Sean P. Hovda

Sent from my iPhone

1

Letter C73 - Hovda, Sean (2/2/2018)

C73-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C74

Morrison, Susan

From: bronwynhuddlesonphotography@gmail.com on behalf of Bronwyn Huddleson <bronwynhuddleson@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 7:39 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C74 I, Bronwyn Huddleson, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego and a local resident, I strongly believe this is the solution we need. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Bronwyn

www.bronwynhuddleson.com
619.800.6028
bronwynhuddleson@gmail.com
@bronwyn_photog

1

Letter C74 - Huddleson, Bronwyn (1/24/2018)

C74-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C75

Morrison, Susan

From: Bridget Hurst <steveandbridget@san.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 6:53 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Please Help Us

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

C75-1 To the planning department of the city of San Diego, I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.
Sincerely,
The Hurst Family

1

Letter C75 - Hurst, Bridget (1/30/2018)

C75-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C76

Morrison, Susan

From: Jeff Iwami <jiwami@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 4:18 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Dear City of San Diego Planning Department Team,

My name is Jeff Iwami and I have been a regular customer of the Bikram yoga studio on Hancock Street for over six years now. Notwithstanding all the details and considerations regarding the "South Hancock Shareway", I have felt for a long time (over six years) that the parking situation on the east side of Hancock Street demonstrated an inefficient use of space, was inconvenient during peak business times, but could easily be remedied.

Rather than laid-out for parallel parking as is currently, I always wished that new lines could be drawn for angled parking, thus creating much more available parking. The street is definitely wide enough to accommodate. To me, it's a no-brainer.

C76-1

So when this project (#561546) came to my attention, I had to express my support (although I'm doing it at the last minute because I procrastinate). I can't think of any contras, although my guess is they're out there.

Lastly, I want to point out that the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association represents a diverse group of businesses that promote healthy activities. Besides my yoga studio, there is the "urban" dance studio, the rock climbing place, gymnastics training etc. More parking would help them all.

Thank you for your attention.

Best regards,
Jeff Iwami
858-663-6154

Letter C76 – Iwami, Jeff (2/20/2018)

C76-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C77

Kenneth Jackson
3775 Boyd Ave.
San Diego CA, 92111

RE: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I SUPPORT SOUTH HANCOCK SHAREWAY

February 15, 2018

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C77-1

I support the South Hancock Street Shareway. I believe this is the safest and best options for cyclists, as well as patrons and businesses on this road. There are multiple apartment complexes, and companies that serve member bases as large as 1000+. From non-profits, fitness centers, to residential spaces, Hancock Street South is a thriving road that embodies community. The businesses on this street are valuable contributors that give back, and bring business into the area. But the success of these businesses has created a greater need for parking more than ever. Throughout the day and evening , it is both difficult and frustrating to find parking in order to engage in enjoying what these businesses have to offer. I find it unfair that these businesses and residential areas are inconvenienced by poor planning and implementation of city infrastructure projects.

I feel that creating bike shareways on both sides of the street, in addition to angled parking spots will not only optimize what little space is available, but create a safer and more visible area for cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Kenneth Jackson



Letter C77 – Jackson, Kenneth (2/15/2018)

C77-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C78

Morrison, Susan

From: Felicitas Jaima <fejaima@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 10:32 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C78-1 I, Felicitas Jaima, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

--

Felicitas Jaima, Ph.D.
www.felicitasrjaima.com

1

Letter C78 - Jaima, PhD, Felicitas (1/25/2018)

C78-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C79

Morrison, Susan

From: froggiebumpers@gmail.com on behalf of Sammy Jarnot <sam.jarnot@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 7:27 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway District replanning

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

As a resident of Ocean Beach (4622 LotusSt.), I am highly concerned about the possible plans to redevelop the Midway district and rezoning possibilities.

C79-1 This area is our primary shopping area for basic necessities, such as groceries and home goods. It is already very congested, and the slightest addition to traffic in the area (such as an event letting out at the Sport Arena), can snarl traffic for hours. Imagine what impact taking this area up to ten times the current residency, and bringing it up to 11,585 residential units and 27,075 possible residents would do? Unless you plan on spending millions of dollars in extending multiple freeway on ramps, public transportation, and fixing the already laughably unmaintained streets, I don't know how you expect those of us who actually already live here to maintain a basic standard of living that doesn't involve ridiculous traffic, like that we already have in areas like Sorrento Valley and Mira Mesa. Not to mention increasing the vehicle traffic exponentially by adding ten times the residential units as well as additional businesses?

C79-2 Add on to that the possibility of losing the only local sports franchise worth the price of their tickets (the Gulls) to the possibility of a new arena, and frankly, I'm not at all supportive of any of this. I have yet to see any information about this redevelopment plan that acknowledges that people already work, live and shop in this district, and we barely get the basic maintenance to make that a safe and reasonable trip for what we have now.

C79-3 When the streets actually properly drain after a heavy rain, and don't have horrible ruts in them, I might actually believe the city has any concept of redeveloping this area with the needs of its residents in mind.

--
Sammy Jarnot
sam.jarnot@gmail.com
619-733-6706

1

Letter C79 - Jarnot, Sammy (1/31/2018)

C79-1: Draft PEIR Section 5.2, Transportation and Circulation, provides evaluation of the potential impacts related to Transportation and Traffic based on future conditions for the Draft Community Plan.

C79-2: This comment does not address the adequacy of the Draft PEIR. The proposed CPU provides a land use and zoning framework for the Midway-Pacific Highway community, including the Sports Arena site however, it does not propose any development or redevelopment at that site at this time. The proposed CPU would not preclude the continuation of an arena use at the Sports Arena site, and policy LU-4.1 in the Land Use, Villages & Districts Element of the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU addresses options for the Sports Arena which include the existing Sports Arena building, a new arena, or another entertainment facility.

C79-3: Comment noted. This comment does not identify an inadequacy in the analysis presented in the Draft PEIR; however, the Urban Design Element of the Community Plan includes policies regarding green streets infrastructure that can incorporate storm water management features, and the Conservation Element of the Community Plan includes Urban Runoff Management policies that address better management of storm water.

Letter C80

Morrison, Susan

From: Sarah Jimenez <sarah.latoski@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 7:04 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Parking on Hancock St.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To whom it may concern,

C80 I, Sarah Jimenez, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Sarah Jimenez, MA
Education Specialist
San Diego State University

1

Letter C80 - Jimenez, Sarah (1/30/2018)

C80-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C81

Nic Josephs

3372 Marlesta

San Diego, CA 92111

February 12, 2018

To Whom This May Concern:

C81-1

I am concerned with the parking situation on South Hancock Street. As a member of the Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym, I often have to spend 20 to 30 minutes to find parking near my gym. As a pedestrian, I feel unsafe when walking due to cars driving in an unsafe manner because of the parking craze. There are drivers who are in such a frenzy to find parking that they will speed down the street to claim spots or do illegal u-turns with little to no regard for the pedestrians and cyclists on the road.

The family businesses here would appreciate safety for their children, and I believe that this can allow everyone to enjoy our great San Diego community.

Thank you,

Nic Josephs



Letter C81 – Josephs, Nic (2/12/2018)

C81-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar concerns and proposes parking and other improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C82

Morrison, Susan

From: Yadira Juarez <juarezyadira00@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 8:03 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway highway Community Plan, Project #561546.

Hi council member Lorie Zapf,

C82-1 I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to you in support of the South Hancock Shareway as this project will increase the safety for both cyclists and pedestrians while reducing the congestion in the street. This project also aims to provide additional parking which I would sincerely appreciate and benefit from as a Vertical Hold member.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,
Yadira Juarez
--
Yadira Juarez

SDSU MFT 2018
juarezyadira00@gmail.com

1

Letter C82 - Juarez, Yadira (2/13/2018)

C82-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C83

Morrison, Susan

From: Erin Kaese <erin@athleticmindedtraveler.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 8:22 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546 (This has to be in the subject line! Project name and project#)

Hi there,

I am writing from more than one perspective — as a Bikram Yoga School student, customer of both Culture Shock Dance and Specialty Food Produce AND as a resident of this neighborhood. I live about 1 mile from the Hancock Street businesses — in Mission Hills. I am very familiar with all activity along Hancock street. Businesses like Culture Shock, Bikram Yoga and the new Patio store are vital to this area. As I am sure you realize, there is a large homeless population in this area too. I have not had issues on this front, but my car was broken into once. I raise this topic because without the businesses along Hancock, the crime problem would be significantly worse. These businesses need customers to thrive. And customers need parking.

C83-1

Often there is a shortage of parking along Hancock Street. The congestion caused by cars hovering and waiting for parking is dangerous. Also, new customers are turned off by the lack of parking. The solution is very simple. Change the parking layout on the one side of the street to accommodate more parking spaces. There is also adequate room for a dedicated bicycle lane. As you may surmise from my email address and job title, I am a huge advocate of healthy living. Promoting safe cycling in San Diego is crucial. Across the US, cities are making bicycle commuting easier. Our business supports commuter cycling. In fact we own a Dutch style "cargo bike" and use it to shop and commute. Our family takes to its cycles whenever feasible. Better parking means less cars hovering along Hancock, better conditions for important businesses and a safer environment for cyclists.

The decision to improve the parking situation and add the bike lane is a no-brainer.

Thank you for your time.

Most Sincerely,

Erin Kaese
Managing Editor
www.athleticmindedtraveler.com
619.491.0132
Follow @healthytravel

1

Letter C83 - Kaese, Erin (1/23/2018)

C83-1: Comment noted. This letter discusses the need for increased parking and a dedicated bicycle lane along Hancock Street, similar to the parking and bicycle lane improvements proposed along Hancock Street by the Hancock Street NBA. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C84

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Plan
#561546

Dear Ms. Morrison,

C84-1 I support the South Hancock Shareway because it will provide additional parking and improve cyclist safety.

Rebecca Karpinski
student
Culture Shock Dance Studio

Letter C84 – Karpinski, Rebecca (2/16/2018)


C84-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C85

Susan Morrison,

C85-1 As San Diego's environmental planner, I'd love to address you my interest in the Midway Pacific Highway community plan, project #561546 which regards the creation of the "South Hancock Shareway". I believe it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists, while also minimizing the congestion by providing additional parking to our street. My name is Danielle, and I work at one of the facilities on the street and on several occasions have lost up to 45 minutes in traffic just looking for parking before a shift. We would greatly appreciate your support in the project.

Thank you,



Danielle Kobeissi

Letter C85 – Kobeissi, Danielle (2/13/2018)

C85-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letters B9 and C67.

Letter C86

Morrison, Susan

From: Kaushal Kulkarni <kaushal.kulkarni@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 4:14 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Project Name and Number: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C86-1

I,Kaushal Kulkarni, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses.

As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Kaushal Kulkarni

Letter C86 - Kulkarni, Kaushal (1/24/2018)

C86-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C87

Morrison, Susan

From: Michelle Landry <michellelandrym@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 1:50 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C87-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my children.

Sincerely,
Michelle Landry

1327 Inspiration Drive

La Jolla, CA 92037

858.997.7703

1

Letter C87 - Landry, Michelle (1/30/2018)

C87-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C88

Morrison, Susan

From: Judi Yeager <ejyeager@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 6:38 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C88-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,
Judi Yeager Lang

1

Letter C88 - Lang, Judi Yeager (1/30/2018)

C88-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C89

Feb 16, 2018

To whom it may concern,

C89-1

I, Victoria Lannen, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The crèation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

4095 Bonita Rd
Bonita CA 91902

Letter C89 – Lannen, Victoria (2/16/2018)

C89-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C90

Morrison, Susan

From: Francis Larocque <francislaro@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2018 9:11 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C90-1 I, Francis Larocque, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. In my opinion the creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Francis Larocque

Letter C90 – Larocque, Francis (2/19/2018)

C90-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C91

Morrison, Susan

From: Jerilyn Larson <jerilynlarson@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 4:52 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Dear Susan Morrison,

C91-1 I support the "South Hancock Shareway"with increased parking to benefit businesses.
I am a patron of Culture Shock Dance Center located at 2110 Hancock Street and would appreciate additional parking opportunities.

Best Regards,
Jerilyn Larson
858 442 0816

Letter C91 – Larson, Jerilyn (2/20/2018)

C91-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C92

Morrison, Susan

From: Marc Laurent <mlclbe@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 9:08 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway pacific highway community plan, project #561546

C92-1 I support the South Hancock shareway because it increases safety for pedestrians and cyclists, while making additional parking and it less crowded.
-Marc Laurent, customer of San Diego Circus Center

1

Letter C92 – Laurent, Marc (2/21/2018)

C92-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C93

Morrison, Susan

From: Sheryl Lehmkuhl <sdlehm@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 5:30 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Project Name: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Project No.: 561546/SCH No: 2015111013

Project Name: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Project No.: 561546/SCH No: 2015111013
Community Plan Area: Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor
Council District: 2 (Zapf)

C93-1 I am a homeowner in the Point Loma area and am concerned about the proposed number of residential units being considered in the Sports Arena area. Point Loma Area is already saturated, and traffic continues to get worse, especially along Rosecrans Blvd. I would urge you to look into the impact that such a large development would make on the community. We pay a lot to live here because it is a desirable place. Please don't make us pay a lot for an undesirable place.

Sincerely,
Sheryl Lehmkuhl

Letter C93 - Lehmkuhl, Sheryl (2/20/2018)

C93-1: Please see the response to comment C1.

Letter C94

Morrison, Susan

From: Sara Leibelshon <saraleibelshon@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2018 10:59 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

C94-1 I support the South Hancock Shareway. I dance at Culture Shock and additional parking is much needed!

Sara Leibelshon
SD resident

Letter C94 - Leibelshon, Sara (2/3/2018)

C94-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C95

Steve Lenox

PO Box 1033, Spring Valley, 91979


Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I support the South Hancock Shareway

February 13, 2018,

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C95-1 I climb at Vertical Hold in Old Town and have continuous issues with parking. Due to the small size of Vertical Hold's parking lot, we are forced to park in the street with very little room. This creates hazardous situations for everyone in the area because it creates congestion. I love climbing at this gym and feel additional street parking reserved for Vertical Hold would be extremely helpful.

Respectfully,



Steve Lenox

Letter C95 – Lenox, Steve (2/13/2018)

C95-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C96

Morrison, Susan

From: David Leung <dleung7@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2018 8:25 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hi,

I'm emailing to express my support for the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association's proposal to create the South Hancock Shareway in response to Project 561546. Instead of the project's original plan to just create bike lanes along Hancock St, I believe that the Association's proposal would not only benefit bicyclists but also residents and patrons of the many small businesses along Hancock St.

As a patron of Culture Shock Dance Center, I am often frustrated by the lack of available street parking nearby, and even when I am able to find parking, I am nervous about collisions with vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians when pulling out of the current parking spaces due to an obstructed and awkward view of the road. The Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association's proposal would provide back-in, angled parking spaces on both sides of the street, eliminating the road view issues, and also eliminating the danger of car doors opening into a bicyclist's path, as is the case with the current parallel parking provided on the northern/eastern side of the street. "Sharrow" markings and street signs would provide clear notification to motorists that the road is to be shared with bicyclists.

C96-1

The Hancock Street community is a vibrant and growing one, and the creation of the South Hancock Shareway would provide tremendous value to it at a seemingly similar cost to the creation of bike lanes alone. Please give serious consideration to this proposal when finalizing your plans for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546.

Thank you,
David Leung

1

Letter C96 – Leung, David (2/18/2018)

C96-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C97

Morrison, Susan

From: Rebecca Lewison <rlewison@mail.sdsu.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2018 10:09 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Dear Ms. Morrison and Councilmember Zapf

I am writing to you to express my strong support for the South Hancock Shareway. I am a longtime resident who uses this part of City many times per week.

This project is essential to provide San Diego residents who rely on South Hancock with a safe and livable environment. The project will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists as well as drivers, minimizing congestion and the daily frustration of not being able to park.

C97-1

We need our City planners and represented officials to advocate for this clearly overlooked part of the Pacific Highway. With the implementation of this thoughtful plan, we can improve the quality of life and safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers on Hancock Street.

--
Rebecca Lewison, PhD
Professor, Biology
Director, Institute for Ecological Monitoring & Management
San Diego State University
rlewison@mail.sdsu.edu
(619) 594 8287

1

Letter C97 - Lewison, PhD, Rebecca (2/6/2018)

C97-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Biology
College of Sciences
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego CA 92182 - 4614
Tel: 619-594-6767
Fax: 619-594-5676

Letter C98

Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

2/6/18

Dear Ms. Morrison and Councilmember Zapf

I am writing to you to express my strong support for the South Hancock Shareway. I am a longtime resident who uses this part of City many times per week.

This project is essential to provide San Diego residents who rely on South Hancock with a safe and livable environment. The project will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists as well as drivers, minimizing congestion and the daily frustration of not being able to park.

C98-1

We need our City planners and represented officials to advocate for this clearly overlooked part of the Pacific Highway. With the implementation of this thoughtful plan, we can improve the quality of life and safety of pedestrians, cyclists and drivers on Hancock Street.

I thank you for your efforts to support and implement the South Hancock Shareway

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lewison, PhD
Professor, Biology
Director, Institute for Ecological Monitoring & Management
San Diego State University
rlewison@mail.sdsu.edu

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY • BAKERSFIELD • CHANNEL ISLANDS • CHICO • DOMINGUEZ HILLS • EAST BAY • FRESNO • FULLERTON • HUMBOLDT • LONG BEACH • LOS ANGELES
MARITIME ACADEMY • MONTEREY BAY • NORTHRIDGE • POMONA • SACRAMENTO • SAN BERNARDINO • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SAN JOSÉ • SAN LUIS OBISPO • SAN MARCOS • SONOMA • STANISLAUS

Letter C98 - Lewison, PhD, Rebecca (2/6/2018)

C98-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C99

Alexander Lomibao

5155 Collwood Blvd, San Diego, CA, 92115

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I support the South Hancock Shareway


February 13, 2018,

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C99-1 My name is Lexan Lomibao and I support the "South Hancock Shareway", and I actually climb at Vertical Hold and I am one of the individuals who would be impacted with the change to the street parking .

With Gratitude,

Lexan Lomibao



Letter C99 – Lomibao, Lexan (2/13/2018)

C99-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C100

1.26.2018

To whom it may concern,

C100-1

I, Lesli Lounsbury, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

-

Letter C100 - Lounsbury, Lesli (1/26/2018)

C100-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C101

Morrison, Susan

From: Mara Martin <martintroop@hotmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 03, 2018 1:32 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: loriepzapf@sandiego.gov
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

C101-1

WE SUPPORT THE "SOUTH HANCOCK SHAREWAY"!!

This will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists, and will also minimize congestion and provide additional parking for my customers!

Thank you kindly for your consideration,

Jean-Luc Martin and Mara J. Martin
San Diego Circus Center, Owners
2050 Hancock Street, Ste A
San Diego, CA 92110

1

Letter C101 - Martin, Jean-Luc and Mara (2/3/2018)

C101-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C102

Morrison, Susan

From: Vivian McAnally <fsuviv@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 8:17 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed


To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C102-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,
Vivian McAnally

Letter C102 - McAnally, Vivian (1/30/2018)

C102-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.



Letter C103

Midway Pacific Highway
community plan.
Project #561546

I support the South Hancock Shareway!

I drive my kids on this street once or twice a week for dance class & rock climbing and its really frustrating when we cant find parking when we are on a tight schedule & trying to get to class on time!

C103-1 I also get my hair done on this street and its the same problem. It drives me crazy when people drive like a crazy person going 50 mph on that street when there are alot of kids on this street!

Thank you, I hope this can be solved and figured out!

Noelle McDaniel

Letter C103 – McDaniel, Noelle (2/13/2018)

C103-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C104

Morrison, Susan

From: Douglas Metzger <onsiteinspector@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 3:18 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: South Hancock Shareway, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C104-1 I, Douglas Metzger, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

DOUGLAS METZGER
Multi-Card Certified Special Inspector
http://constructionprojectinspection.com
Cell 619-889-1314

INTERNATIONAL CODE COUNCIL
8016624
Reinforced Concrete Special Inspector
Spray-applied Fireproofing Special Inspector
Structural Steel and Bolting Special Inspector
Prestressed Concrete Special Inspector
Soils Special Inspector
Structural Masonry Special Inspector
Structural Welding Special Inspector
Master of Special Inspection
CA Commercial Building Inspector

AMERICAN CONCRETE INSTITUTE
010346452
ACI American Concrete Institute Field Tech I Certification Program

PRECAST / PRESTRESSED CONCRETE INSTITUTE
13456
PCI Precast / Prestressed Concrete Level II

AMERICAN WELDING SOCIETY
15121411
Certified Welding Inspector

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
1000042313
Public Works Construction Projects

CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Letter C104 - Metzger, Douglas (1/24/2018)

C104-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

1142
Currently hold (5) San Diego Certificates
City Approved for Special Inspection Services
(C) = Reinforced Concrete
(M) = Structural Masonry
(FP) = Fireproofing
(W) = Structural Bolting & Welding
(PC) = Post-tension / Precast Concrete

==========

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Letter C105

Morrison, Susan

From: mizuno kaori <kaori101@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 11:50 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

C105 Kaori Mizuno
Bikram Yoga San Diego

Letter C105 - Mizuno, Kaori (1/30/2018)

C105-1: No substantive comments were provided or attached within this email; however, it has been included for the administrative record.

Letter C106

Morrison, Susan

From: Frida Kahlo <amordefridakahlo@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 11:21 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: ♥Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project 561546♥

To Whom It May Concern:

C106-1 I am a dancer at Culture Shock San Diego on Hancock Street, and I would like to add my support for the "South Hancock Shareway" in the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project 561546. We desperately need more parking and a safer street for bicyclists and pedestrians, and the "South Hancock Shareway," with its back-in, angled spaces and marked space for bicyclists, would greatly help. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Princess Mora

1

Letter C106 – Mora, Princess (2/16/2018)

C106-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C107

Morrison, Susan

From: Kristy Morgan <believeseasail@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 8:06 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing regarding The Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

I support the "South Hancock Shareway," and how it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists including minimizing congestion and providing additional parking.

C107-1

Dancing at Cutlure Shock provides a much needed outlet in the lives of many busy people. After carving the time out of an already busy schedule only to find that there are no available parking spaces can be very frustrating & disheartening. The parking congestion & safety of cyclists here is in need of attention.

Thank you for your time and efforts toward making a more functional & safer place to co-exist & connect with others.

Sincerely,

Kristy Morgan

Culture Shock Dance Studio Student

1

Letter C107 – Morgan, Kristy (2/16/2018)

C107-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C108

Feb. 8, 2018

To whom it may concern,

I, Susan Nath, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

C108-1

Regards,



Letter C108 – Nath, Susan (2/8/2018)

C108-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C109

Dear Susan Morrison,

C109-1 I am a parent of a student that attends Culture Shock dance studio twice a week. I support the South Hancock Shareway, on Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546 I believe this project will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. Thank you for your consideration in this project.

Kind Regards,

Rose Ortiz
619.417.6212

Letter C109 – Ortiz, Rose (2/10/2018)

C109-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C110

2.8.18

To whom it may concern,

I, Armando Osuna , am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

C110-1

Regards,

-

Letter C110 - Osuna, Armando (2/8/2018)

C110-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C111

Morrison, Susan

From: Sam Padilla <samkpadilla@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 1:46 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project 561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C111-1

I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child. It is not safe to park further away from the gym as there are lots of homeless camps under the overpass in which alcohol, drug use and people voiding are in plain view and not a safe area for children to be walking.
Sincerely,
Samantha Padilla

1

Letter C111 - Padilla, Samantha (1/30/2018)

C111-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C112

Morrison, Susan

From: Yesenia Padilla <yeseniatpadilla@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 8:43 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello:

C112-1 I am a regular student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I would just like to voice my support for the South Hancock Shareway. The shareway will increase safety for pedestrian and cyclists, while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking.

Thank You,

Yesenia Padilla

1

Letter C112 - Padilla, Yesenia (1/25/2018)

C112-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C113

Morrison, Susan

From: Mikaela Pearson <MPearson@spurlock-land.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 4:04 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello,

C113-1

I work along Hancock Street, and support a proposal to improve the functionality, safety and quality of the streetscape.

This can best be served by diversifying and slowing traffic. Right now, many drivers treat the street as a highway – driving at unsafe speeds due to the extra wide roadway. Street trees, bulb outs, lane thinning, increased parking and bike sharrows/bike lanes would all improve the safety of the street and the quality of life of those who occupy it.

Street trees would be especially welcome.

Thank you,

MIKAELA
PEARSON
ASLA | LEED AP

SENIOR STAFF

S P U R L O C K
Landscape Architecture
Urban Design + Planning

619.681.0090 (x)105
mpearson@spurlock-land.com

2122 Hancock Street
San Diego, California 92110
spurlock-land.com

Certified SBE/SLBE firm

Letter C113 - Pearson, Mikaela (1/24/2018)

C113-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar concerns and proposes back in angled parking, sharrows, and narrowing of the traffic corridor along Hancock Street. The Urban Design Element of the Draft Community Plan includes Urban Forestry policies that promote the planting of street trees. Increasing the urban tree canopy is also consistent with the goals of the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP).

Letter C114

Morrison, Susan

From: Michael D Perry <michael.dp1979@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 6:21 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan (Project #561546)

C114-1

I recently read that the city is considering putting in angled parking g on both sides of the street of South Hancock. I think this is a great idea to help the flow of traffic, make the street safer for residents and patrons and will provide much more parking for the local business to grow and thrive.

I support the the South Hancock share way and angle parking improvements and would be happy to meet or discuss in more detail.

v/r
Mike Perry
(619) 787-1725

1

Letter C114 – Perry, Mike (2/20/2018)

C114-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C115

Morrison, Susan

From: Will Pham <willpham92@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 5:36 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Parking on Hancock Street Support

Hello,

C115-1 I support the changes of angled parking on Hancock Street.

Sent from my iPhone

Letter C115 – Pham, Will (2/21/2018)

C115-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes angled back in parking along Hancock Street.

Letter C116

Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Dear Susan,

C116-1 I am writing to show my support for the "South Hancock Shareway." It will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. This will also help all of the local businesses flourish as customers will be more likely to return. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Lauren Phonxaya

(Former Culture Shock Dance Center Instructor & Desk Staff / Culture Shock Dance Center Student)

Letter C116 – Phonxaya, Lauren (2/20/2018)

C116-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C117

Morrison, Susan

From: Elisha Pingleton <elisha.pingleton@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 4:43 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Community Plan, Project #561546

C117-1

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,
I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.
Sincerely,

Elisha pingleton

Sent from my iPhone

1

Letter C117 - Pingleton, Elisha (1/31/2018)

C117-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C118

Morrison, Susan

From: Dr. Powell <drpowell61@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 7:14 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Desperate Need for Parking Spaces on Hancock St.

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Dear Sir/Madam:

C118-1

I fully support the South Hancock Shareway.

I attend Bikram Yoga classes every day. Sometimes I have to walk several blocks to class with heavy gear. Sometimes there is literally no place to park, and I miss class, turn around and go home after arranging my busy schedule to accommodate yoga class.

Please help us. This situation is unworkable.

It is also becoming a safety issue, as women sometimes have to walk a long distance back to their cars in the dark.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Christine Powell

1

Letter C118 - Powell, Dr. Christine (1/24/2018)

C118-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C119

Nathan Scott Prins

10717 Caminito Alvarez
San Diego, CA 92126

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546


February 13, 2018

To The City

C119-1 I am a member of the Vertical Hold climbing community, and I go to Vertical Hold multiple times per week. Vertical Hold is located at 2074 Hancock, and I find that I have to park many blocks away most days because of the crowded parking. Please consider Vertical Holds plan "South Hancock Shareway" so that we can continue to enjoy coming to the gym!

With Gratitude,

Nathan Scott Prins



Letter C119 - Prins, Nathan Scott (2/13/2018)

C119-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C120

Morrison, Susan

From: Brad Pruitt <brad.pruitt@me.com>
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 8:05 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA; CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Cc: Jim & Emma Kallett
Subject: Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C120-1 I, Brad Pruitt, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Brad Pruitt

1

Letter C120 – Pruitt, Brad (1/26/2018)

C120-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C121

Morrison, Susan

From: Christopher Puzio <chris@puzio.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 2:19 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C121-1 I, Christopher Puzio, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Christopher Puzio

1

Letter C121 - Puzio, Christopher (1/25/2018)

C121-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C122

Morrison, Susan

From: Benjamin Rademacher <rademacb@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 10:35 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello City of San Diego Planning Department,

I am writing today to share my support for the "South Hancock Shareway." My name is Benjamin Rademacher and I currently work at Vertical Hold Climbing gym located off of Hancock street. I have worked there since last June and was previously a member there since the end of 2016. I am there almost daily and have been for the last year and a half. While I enjoy what I do, finding parking in this area is a very large issue. We do have a few spots in our small parking lot which fills very quickly and I believe I shouldn't be parking in our lot when I know I will be there all day, therefore I am left to find street parking. The only time in the day I can find parking is early in the morning. Anytime after 9 am and there is a parking issue. Countless times I have arrived on Hancock street 20-30 min before my shift and have still been late to clock in due to the parking. Thanks to my understanding managers this hasn't been an issue because they too know how bad the parking is.

For me this happens to be an issue quite often and if its an issue for me it's an issue for our members and an issue for the business. The parking problem is straight up hurting many of the business's off of Hancock street. I constantly deal with frustrated members or new patrons complaining about the parking situation. Some of which have threatened to stop coming to our gym strictly based off the terrible parking situation. I firmly believe we need to have the East side of Hancock street turned into angled parking spots. This will open up many more spots on this street. This road itself is already very wide and there is so much unused space. I also believe we should have "sharrows" to serve as a bike lane.

C122-1

That being said, before any sort of bike lane is added the entire, I mean the entire road needs to be repaved. Hancock street is a cyclists nightmare, the road conditions are terrible! I used to ride my bike to work everyday to save on gas and then I didn't have to drive around looking for parking for 20 minutes. I was struck by a vehicle last August on my way to work (no fault to Hancock street) in the downtown area, where I broke my wrist, so I refuse to get back on my bike in the city of San Diego, let alone ride on the pothole filled Hancock street.

I believe the "South Hancock Shareway" is a great plan to bring more parking to the area as well as increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists alike. The businesses on and around Hancock street are suffering due to the poor road conditions and lack of parking. I hope as a community we can find a resolution to this problem. I will be attending the Hancock community cleanup on February 17th to help clean up the trash scattered along the road as well as show my support for this plan!

Respectfully,

Benjamin Rademacher

1

Letter C122 - Rademacher, Benjamin (2/9/2018)

C122-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes parking and bike lane improvements along Hancock Street. Comments regarding road conditions and repaving do not address the adequacy of the Draft PEIR, but are part of the administrative record and will be considered by the City during the decision-making process. However, Pavement conditions may be evaluated at the time of improvements and may be referred to the Transportation and Stormwater Division and the City.

Letter C123

Feb. 16. 2018

To whom it may concern,

C123-1

I, Jennifer Rivera, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

- Jennifer Rivera

Letter C123 – Rivera, Jennifer (2/16/2018)

C123-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C124

Morrison, Susan

From: Julia Robar <julia.sanfilippo@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 6:52 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,
C124-1 I, Julia Robar, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.
Regards,
Julia

--
Julia Robar, L.Ac.
AcuLife, Inc.
8950 Villa La Jolla Drive, Suite B212
La Jolla, CA 92037

p: 858-210-0969
f: 858-558-3641
www.myaculife.com

Letter C124 - Robar, Julia (1/25/2018)

C124-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C125

Morrison, Susan

From: Roberts, Stephen ALLEGIS GROUP, INC. <Stephen.Roberts2@utas.utc.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 3:21 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello,
I am writing to say that I support the "South Hancock Shareway".
My name is Stephen Roberts.
C125-1 I am a member of Vertical Hold climbing gym and I am concerned about a lack of parking on the street.
I believe that the South Hancock Shareway will increase safety for pedestrians, and will reduce traffic congestion.

Thanks,

Steve Roberts - Engineering Design – A350 XWB
UTC AEROSPACE SYSTEMS ✈

850 Lagoon Dr.,Chula Vista, CA 91910-2098 USA
Tel: 1-619-691-2289
stephen.roberts2@utas.utc.com www.utcaerospacesystems.com

1

Letter C125 – Roberts, Steve (2/15/2018)

C125-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C126

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 12, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C126-1

I've been a proud resident of San Diego for the past 9 years. Over that time, I have come to love all the activities that San Diego has to offer, including Vertical Hold rock climbing gym. I have found my closest friends here and every Monday, Wednesday and Thursday I frequent Hancock Street. Almost daily, I have been frustrated with the lack of parking, the congestion and how the street is dangerous for pedestrians.

Through the great community I have found here I've learned about the South Hancock Shareaway and how it will increase safety for pedestrians and bicyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. I think it's a fantastic idea and I strongly support its approval and hope you will consider its passage.

I hope you will take my letter into consideration, and think about the safety for all on Hancock St.

Best regards,

David

Letter C126 – Rogel, David (2/12/2018)

C126-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C127

Morrison, Susan

From: A S R quitect <asrquitect@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2018 12:22 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To whom it may concern,

C127-1 I, Alisha Stephanie Rompre , am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Alisha Stephanie Rompre

--
A. Stephanie Rompre, AIA, NCARB, CDT
Architecture | Interiors | Design
Cell 480.363.9972 | **Email** asrquitect@gmail.com

1

Letter C127 - Rompre, Alisha Stephanie (1/28/2018)

C127-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C128

Morrison, Susan

From: NATHAN ROSSMAN <nathanrossman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2018 10:32 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To Whom it May Concern:

My name is Nathan Rossman. I am a student at the Bikram Yoga College on Hancock Street. https://bikramyogasandiego.com/ I have followed this issue quite extensively and I am a supporter of better bicycle infrastructure in San Diego.

It seems like for the segment of Hancock Street in question, a sharrow could work well, especially if it's mitigated with traffic calming, ie; speed bumps. Parking is a HUGE issue for the businesses concerned along Hancock Street and definitely, the elimination of any parking would be a huge detriment.

So my two cents would be:

C128-1

- 1) Put in the angled parking to increase parking.
- 2) Add the sharrows for bicycles.
- 3) Mitigate the automobile speed to make it safer for the bicycles sharing this stretch of road.Hancock Street.

I believe some cars are using this stretch as a shortcut to get around freeway congestion on the adjacent 5 freeway, thus driving way too fast down Hancock Street. Perhaps to not impede bicycles, there could be breaks in the speed bumps to allow bicycles safe and easy passage.

That seems like a reasonable compromise and a win/win for the bikes and the businesses.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,
Nathan A Rossman

1

Letter C128 - Rossman, Nathan (2/12/2018)

C128-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes angled parking and bicycle sharrows along Hancock Street. Mitigation of automobile speed is not an environmental issue analyzed under CEQA unless it is attributed to a specific physical impact on the environment, and it is therefore not addressed as part of the Draft PEIR. However, this comment is part of the administrative record and will be considered by the City during the decision-making process.

Letter C129

Dakota Ruiz

4578 Limerick way, San Diego, 92117

RE: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I SUPPORT SOUTH HANCOCK SHAREWAY

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

I am a member at Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym on Hancock St South. As much as I enjoy climbing at this gym, parking is an issue. At busier times of the day parking and traffic gets really congested. This can be unsafe for pedestrians, drivers, and cyclists. Cars trying to pass through often have to drive around cars that are waiting for a parking spot. There are so many businesses that have frequent clientele including families. I personally have witnessed many near accidents that endangered drivers, passengers, and pedestrians due to hostile traffic conditions created directly by severe lack of parking.

C129-1

By creating bike share ways on both sides of the street, it will create safer experiences for all patrons that travel this road. Painting back-in park angled parking spots will allow drivers to view pedestrians, cyclists, and other drivers while parking. Narrower roads will slow down traffic raise awareness of crossing pedestrians and cyclists. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns. With gratitude

Dakota Ruiz



Letter C129 – Ruiz, Dakota (2/13/2018)

C129-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C130

Morrison, Susan

From: Katie Russ <katiemruss@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 4:41 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Dearing Planning Committee,

I'm writing to express my sincere support for the South Hancock Shareway project in lieu of the Midway Pacifica Highway Community Plan.

I spend no less than 60 hours a week working and recreating in the Hancock street neighborhood. I work at 1775 Hancock, in the Mission Brewery plaza and am a member of Vertical Hold Climbing Gym on Hancock St. I frequent local business like Acoustic Ale Works, Specialty Produce, Saffron Thai, Lucha Libre, Shakespeare's Pub, Karina's Seafood, and 57 Degrees, just to name a few.

C130-1

One thing is clear from frequenting these businesses, parking is a serious issue. I regularly walk up to a half mile to get to the gym (Vertical Hold), and many of my colleagues refuse to visit some of these local businesses because parking is non-existent and the walk is too far. Unfortunately, with inadequate bike lanes and bike safety parameters, using a bicycle to navigate the neighborhood is also difficult. These transportation problems are bad for business and for the neighborhood.

Thanks for your consideration and all that you do for our city!

Katie Russ
katiemruss@gmail.com
805.550.2835

Letter C130 - Russ, Katie (2/9/2018)

C130-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C131

Morrison, Susan

From: Rita S <rvs9623@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, February 17, 2018 9:26 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway redevelopment.

C131-1

If, someone actually proposed this, why would comments be necessary. Wouldn't that proposal be denied. So pathetic.
Sent from my iPhone

1

Letter C131 – S, Rita (2/17/2018)

C131-1: Comment noted. According to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15088(a), "the lead agency shall evaluate comments on environmental issues received from persons who reviewed the Draft EIR and shall prepare a written response." All comments received as a part of the Draft PEIR public review process become part of the administrative record and will be considered by the City during the decision-making process. In addition, three public hearings for the project will provide additional opportunities for the public to provide comment on the project. The decision to approve or deny the project will be made at the City Council hearing tentatively scheduled for June 26, 2018.

Letter C132

Morrison, Susan

From: esamford@cox.net
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 12:29 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: PROJECT# 561546 MIDWAY PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLAN

TO: Susan Morrison

FROM: Elizabeth Samford 2102 Hancock St suite 203 San Diego, Ca 92110

REGARDING: PROJECT# 561546 MIDWAY PACIFIC HIGHWAY COMMUNITY PLAN

C132-1

I Elizabeth Samford, business owner of Sea Elizzy renter at 2101 Hancock St support the South Hancock Shareway. It will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclist while minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. All very much needed in this area please support.

Thank you,
Elizabeth Samford / Sea Elizzy

Letter 132 - Samford, Elizabeth (2/14/2018)

C132-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C133

Omar Santana
1432 Rosecrans street apt 5
San Diego Ca. 92106

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I support South Hancock

02/13/2018

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C133-1 Hello I am a member at Vertical Hold ,when I try to park I can't find parking and when I come at night It gets super Dangerous because it gets super congested. One time a car almost runned over me gladly my instincts save me.

With gratitude, Omar Santana

Letter C133 – Santana, Omar (2/13/2018)

C133-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C134

Morrison, Susan

From: Dana Sather <DSather@spurlock-land.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 3:55 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C134-1

I, Dana Sather, am an employee of Spurlock Landscape Architects on Hancock Street. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546.

The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses.

As an employee of Spurlock Landscape Architects, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

DANA
SATHER
SDA | CDFA

PRINCIPAL | BUSINESS MANAGER

S P U R L O C K
Landscape Architecture
Urban Design + Planning

619.681.0090 (x)122
dsather@spurlock-land.com

2122 Hancock Street
San Diego, California 92110
spurlock-land.com

Certified SBE/SLBE firm

Letter C134 - Sather, Dana (1/24/2018)

C134-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C135

Culture Shock Dance Center

Dear Susan Morrison, 2.20.2018

C135-1

I am writing this letter as a business manager and a concerned citizen. I am part of the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association and support the 'South Hancock Shareway', part of the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. This project will not only benefit the businesses by providing more parking spaces, but will also alleviate the stress and anxiety for our frustrated members. Besides those obvious benefits the Shareway will also increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists and will cutback on traffic congestion.

I am very hopeful that the city will see the value for each of us who live, work and play in this very tightly packed but vibrant area of San Diego! 15 years ago, when we signed our lease and opened up shop, this area was loaded with transients and drug deals. Our determination and tenacity has grown our business and seen the arrival and growth of many others like us. We are proud of this neighborhood and want to make it more accessible to others!

Sincerely,

BS

Bridget Savant
Culture Shock Dance Center Program Development Manager

Culture Shock Dance Center
2110 Hancock St. Suite 200
San Diego, CA 92110
619-299-2110
www.cultureshockdancecenter.com

C135-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C136

NAME Steven Schillings

ADDRESS
4324 W. Point Loma Blvd Apt. J San Diego, Ca 92107

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

To The City

C136-1 My fiancé and I come to Vertical Hold at least 2-3 times a week and several times on the weekend. The only issue we have ever had is with the parking and total access to the gym as already crowded. Vertical Hold is awesome and we would love to see an improvement in the parking. Please consider Vertical Holds plan "South Hancock Shareway" so that we can continue to enjoy coming to the gym!

With Gratitude,

Steven Schillings

Letter C136 – Schillings, Steven (2/13/2018)

C136-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C137

Morrison, Susan

From: Susan Schroeder <susanschroeder5@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 3:44 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project # 561546

To Whom it May Concern:

C137-1 I have been practicing Bikram yoga for over 12 years. The parking over the past 3 years has gotten increasingly worse, specifically due to the increase in businesses there (good thing). However, parking is awful. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Associaton for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project 561546. I am also a local resident and believe this would be a good solution.

Thank you,
--
Susan Schroeder

Letter C137 - Schroeder, Susan (1/25/2018)

C137-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C138

Morrison, Susan

From: talia seider <taliaseider@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 1:48 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project 561546

Dear Ms. Morrison,

C138-1 I am writing to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which would provide much needed parking and enhance the safety of cyclists by marking the corridor a designated bike route. This would minimize congestion caused by overcrowding and the hunt for parking while also increasing pedestrian safety by reducing the walk between parking and the destination. My name is Talia Seider and I am a member of the Vertical Hold climbing gym. I have had to park down the street and around the corner to attend the gym and I appreciate your consideration of this proposal, which seems to me to be a win-win-win.

Sincerely,
Talia

Letter C138 - Seider, Talia (2/5/2018)

C138-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C139

Morrison, Susan

From: Matthew Shepard <yoga.matt.om@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 3:06 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Parking

To whom it may concern,

C139-1 I, Matthew Shepard, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Peace be with You,

Matthew William Shepard

1

Letter C139 – Shephard, Matthew (1/24/2018)

C139-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C140

Morrison, Susan

From: Michelle Shoemaker <mshoemak@pointloma.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 4:01 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: LoriZapf@sandiego.gov
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

My name is Michelle Shoemaker and I'm a long-time student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses.

C140-1

As an 8-year patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego and a 30-year local resident, I believe this is a GREAT solution. Currently every day, especially in the hectic afternoons when several fitness classes are beginning, and children are being dropped off for dance classes, and 50+ cars are trolling for parking spaces, this area get's extremely and dangerously congested. This in turn causes drivers that are in a hurry, who aren't familiar with the situation, to get angry and dangerously speed around waiting cars, which could end tragically. I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Michelle Shoemaker

Michelle Shoemaker
Director of Digital Engagement
Point Loma Nazarene University
3900 Lomaland Drive
San Diego, CA 92106

Anti-Trafficking Liaison | Center for Justice & Reconciliation
Point Loma Nazarene University

e mshoemak@pointloma.edu
c 619-933-2314

This is the day the Lord has made, let us rejoice and be glad in it .... Psalm 118:24

1

Letter C140 - Shoemaker, Michelle (1/24/2018)

C140-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C141

Sarah Shores

4340 Caminito Del Zafiro
San Diego, CA 92121

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546


February 13, 2018

To The City

C141-1 I climb at Vertical Hold (at 2074 Hancock) 3-4 times per week and regularly have trouble with parking and end up parking very far. Please consider Vertical Holds plan "South Hancock Shareway" so that we can continue to enjoy coming to the gym!

Best,

Sarah Shores



Letter C141 – Shores, Sarah (2/13/2018)

C141-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C142

Morrison, Susan

From: Laura Stacy <laurastacy1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 9:37 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C142-1

I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking.

As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking.

This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,

Laura M. Stacy

Letter C142 - Stacy, Laura 1/30/2018)

C142-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C143

Morrison, Susan

From: Michael Stutts <mstutts@francisparker.org>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 9:21 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Parking

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

C143-1

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,
I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,

Michael Stutts



Francis Parker School | San Diego, CA
www.francisparker.org | @francisparkersc | facebook.com/francisparkerschool

As Far As The Mind Can See

Letter C143 - Stutts, Michael (1/30/2018)

C143-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C144

2/18/18

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Corby Stutzman and I am a regular student at Bikram Yoga San Diego. I am writing this letter to express my full support for the parking solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546.

C144-1

Hancock street is very dangerous as cars speed down it to avoid traffic on the I-5. I am handicapped and must move slowly across the street if I cannot find parking on the east side of the street. And parking is so scarce too.

The solution proposed will not only increase parking availability, but provide more safety for pedestrians, and cyclists too.

Please take this into consideration!

Warmest Regards,
Corby Stutzman



Letter C144 – Stutzman, Corby (2/18/2018)

C144-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C145

Morrison, Susan

From: Averie Sunshine <averiesunshine@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2018 7:51 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego:

C145-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,
Averie Sunshine



Averie Sunshine
Food Blogger - Cookbook Author
averiecooks.com

New Recipes Direct to YourEmail

1

Letter C145 - Sunshine, Averie (1/31/2018)

C145-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C146

Morrison, Susan

From: Cayla S <csurovsky@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 19, 2018 9:22 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan Project #561546

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

I am a long term member over Vertical Rock Climbing Gym, located on Hancock St. South. Parking has been a consistent issue since the gym's relocation, and results in congestion, traffic, and a dangerous environment for cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers.

C146-1

I want to express my strong support for the South Hancock Shareway, it will create a safer road for all people, improving the parking situation, and keeping bikers and pedestrians out of harm's way. By adding spots and narrowing the roads, Hancock Street will be less prone to speeding drivers, as there will be more awareness to crossing pedestrians and cyclists.

I hope you take this into consideration, and thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

With gratitude,

Cayla Surovsky

Letter C146 – Surovsky, Cayla (2/19/2018)

C146-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C147

Morrison, Susan

From: tim sweet <timothy.w.sweet@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 12, 2018 10:32 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

C147-1 My name is Tim Sweet and I am an instructor at Vertical Hold climbing gym. I support the South Hancock Shareway and support how it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking.

Timothy W. Sweet
Mobile: (781) 552-1611
timothy.w.sweet@gmail.com

Letter C147 - Sweet, Timothy (2/12/2018)

C147-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C148

Morrison, Susan

From: Jennifer Plunk Terry <jenrplunk@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 10:57 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,
C148-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.
Sincerely,
Jennifer Terry

1

Letter C148 - Terry, Jennifer (1/30/2018)

C148-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C149

Morrison, Susan

From: paulteyssiersd@gmail.com on behalf of Paul Teyssier <paul@teyssier.com>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 8:08 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Dear Planners:

I am a long-time student of the Bikram Yoga College of San Diego at 2110 Hancock St #301, San Diego, CA 92110. I attend classes there often, usually 3-5 times per week. Except in very early morning and on weekends, the parking is so crowded that many cars are standing in the traffic lanes, waiting for a space to open. Others are making U-turns to look for parking, because there is no good place to turn around. Some of the through traffic speeds through. Crossing the street at night is dangerous because of that and also because there is inadequate lighting. The park-and-ride lot near the India Street offramp I-5 has recently been taken up more and more by "no parking" signs.

C149-1

I would appreciate anything you can do to alleviate the problems mentioned, **but most especially the scarcity of parking.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Teyssier
paul@teyssier.com

1

Letter C149 – Teyssier, Paul (2/21/2018)

C149-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar concerns and proposes parking and other improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C150

Morrison, Susan

From: Dyllan Thweatt <dyllan@covalentcareers.com>
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 3:15 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Good afternoon folks,

I am writing to day to put my voice in to support the South Hancock Shareway as it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists in the area as well as minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for local businesses.

C150-1

I am currently a member of Vertical Hold rock climbing gym and fitness center and am looking to make sure this space remains productive and safe for all of its visitors!

Cheers,

Dyllan Edward Thweatt
Customer Success Associate
covalentcareers.com
Email: dyllan@covalentcareers.com

Letter C150 - Thweatt, Dyllan Edward (2/5/2018)

C150-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C151

Morrison, Susan

From: Barb Tillson <barbtillson@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 8:18 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Badly needed parking on Hancock

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C151-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. I have been using the Cali Coast gym for a couple of years as early as 5 am and as late as 6 pm and there is ALWAYS a problem finding parking. I am also a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,
Barb Tillson

1

Letter C151 - Tillson, Barb (1/30/2018)

C151-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C152

Morrison, Susan

From: Kassandra Quimby Timm <kquimby@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 25, 2018 10:44 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Importance: High

To whom it may concern,

C152-1 My name is Kassandra Timm, I'm a longtime student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,
Kassandra Timm

1

Letter C152 - Timm, Kassandra (1/25/2018)

C152-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C153

January 25, 2018

Susan Morrison, Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Planning Department
1010 2nd Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower, MS 413
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

C153-1 My name is Michael Timm, I'm a longtime student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Kind regards,

Michael Timm

Letter C153 - Timm, Michael (1/25/2018)

C153-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C154

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 12, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C154-1 My name is Kiyo Tokunaga and I am a member at Vertical Hold. I come here at least 3 times a week, and every time I come here I have trouble parking. There are so many people waiting on the side of the road with their emergency lights on just waiting for someone to leave the parking spot. Cars cross over the middle double yellow lines constantly, and it's such a nightmare parking here. I'm surprised I haven't come across any accidents here yet. I fully support the South Hancock Shareway, since it will benefit so many people here. Please create more parking spaces.

Sincerely,
Kiyo Tokunaga



Letter C154 – Tokunaga, Kiyo (2/12/2018)

C154-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C155

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 12, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C155-1 Today I was scheduled to meet with some friends and family at the climbing gym. Unfortunately due to the lack of parking, some of my friends lost interest and left. This may come off as a single moment for you; however, it's becoming a trend with those in my circles. Having to worry about parking should not limit whether or not my friends choose to support the businesses in this area.

You've recently lost Amplified Ale Works. With craft beer booming in San Diego, I doubt it's due to a lack of customer base, as I know they are moving to North County. Please consider the impact on merely rotating parking spaces by 30 degrees. The Little Italy area is erupting, let's not limit this growth.

Thanks,

Vince Ton



Letter C155 – Ton, Vince (2/12/2018)

C155-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar parking concerns and proposes parking and other improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C156

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 12, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C156-1

I, Christian Torres, am a member of the vertical hold climbing gym and would like additional parking where possible. This would be great for the safety of all using this road, as less cars will be searching back and forth. This will also allow for closer parking to the actual venue that people intend to visit and save us all time from searching. This street also has a lot of kids and anything to make the street safer for the kids is greatly appreciated.

I support the South Hancock Shareway as it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists. In addition a shareway on South Hancock will also minimize congestion and provide the additional parking the street desperately needs.

With Gratitude,

Christian M. Torres



Letter C156 – Torres, Christian (2/12/2018)

C156-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C157

Mimi Tran

1538 Fern St

San Diego, CA 92102

February 12, 2018

To Whom This May Concern:

C157-1

I am writing to you to discuss my concerns with the parking situation on South Hancock Street. As a member of the Vertical Hold Rock Climbing Gym, I often have to spend 20 to 30 minutes to find parking near my gym. I often have to park a far distance and walk to the gym. As a pedestrian, I feel unsafe when walking due to cars driving in an unsafe manner because of the parking craze. There are drivers who are in such a frenzy to find parking that they will speed down the street to claim spots or do illegal u-turns with little to no regard for the pedestrians and cyclists on the road.

This is a situation that is clearly an issue for all in the community. As a member of this community, I support the South Hancock Shareway, in hopes that it increases safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Also, as a customer, I believe that it will with the parking problem.

Thank you,

Mimi Tran



Letter C157 – Tran, Mimi (2/12/2018)

C157-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C158

Morrison, Susan

From: Sharon Tran <sktran@ucsd.edu>
Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2018 8:12 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern:

I, Sharon Tran, am a regular student at the Culture Shock Dance Center on Hancock Street and I support the "South Hancock Shareway." The proposal promises safety for pedestrians and cyclists while minimizing congestion and providing additional parking.

C158-1 I have personally experienced and witnessed many incidents in which adults and children alike have nearly been hit by oncoming traffic due to the lack of crosswalks or otherwise designated paths. Additionally, congestion often occurs every half hour from 4pm to 8pm easily on a daily basis due to students arriving for class and parents picking up their children. Meanwhile, other drivers who only mean to pass the area become extremely frustrated and often swerve into the next lane to pass stopped cars along the street. This is extremely dangerous for these drivers, customers of the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association, as well as the parents and children alike crossing the street haphazardly.

I am extremely passionate about this issue and am eager to see it resolved. After 2 years of personally experiencing the inconvenience, discomfort, and danger caused by a poor parking situation in the area, I am beyond ecstatic to see this proposal executed.

Sincerely,

Sharon Tran

1

Letter C158 – Tran, Sharon (2/18/2018)

C158-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C159

Morrison, Susan

From: Mia Tuites <miatuites@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 9:07 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello,

C159-1 My name is Mia and I am in support of the South Hancock Shareway because it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion. Furthermore, I am associated with Vertical Hold and parking is already an issue at this facility, and the shareway will provide additional parking for not just those who are members at Vertical Hold, but for all the individuals who are members at the various facilities along Hancock Street.

Thank you,
Mia Tuites

1

Letter C159 - Tuites, Mia (2/9/2018)

C159-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C160

Ken Twomey
4371 Piper St
San Diego, CA, 92117

RE: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546
I SUPPORT SOUTH HANCOCK SHAREWAY

February 15, 2018

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C160-1 I strongly encourage the implementation of the South Hancock Shareway. The lack of parking on Hancock Street has been a major issue for years. I have been an employee and patron of multiple businesses on this street for years and have only seen this concern get worse. Limited parking has created a hazardous traffic environment and I believe adding designated bike lanes will only worsen the situation. The safest way to share this road with bikes is to improve the parking, implement a speed limit, and add more street lights. I have faith that city planning will reconsider bike lanes and make the most functional, safe, and efficient decision for the community on Hancock Street South.

Ken twomey



Letter C160 – Twomey, Ken (2/15/2018)

C160-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which address the Hancock Street NBA's proposal for angled parking and bicycle sharrows along Hancock Street. However, comments regarding implementing a speed limit and adding more street lights do not address the adequacy of the Draft PEIR, but are part of the administrative record and will be considered by the City during the decision-making process.

Letter C161

Morrison, Susan

From: min@uptondds.com
Sent: Sunday, January 28, 2018 4:31 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf; Lorie@p3plgemwbe02-03.prod.phx3.secureserver.net; San Diego District #2 Councilmember
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To whom it may concern,

C161-1 I, Min Upton, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Min Upton

Letter C161 - Upton, Min (1/28/2018)

C161-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C162

Feb 16 2018

To whom it may concern,

C162-1

I, Debra Valentine am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St. I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses. As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

- Debra

Letter C162 – Valentine, Debra (2/16/2018)

C162-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C163

Jonathan Perez Vargas
5367 Bonita Drive

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 13, 2018

To The City of San Diego Planning Department,

C163-1 I'm a long time member at Vertical Hold Climbing and resident of San Diego.Parking on Hancock Street South has created a hazardous environment for pedestrians, drivers, and cyclists. During busier times of the days, patrons that frequent this street find it hard to find parking. This can create hostility among people trying to get through. By creating bike shareways we can mend this problem. By adding back-in angled parking spots on boths sides of the street, drivers will be able to see pedestrians and cyclists on the road from either side of their windows. Also by creating narrower lanes we can slow down drivers and create a safer street for the pedestrians and cyclists. Thank you for taking your time to read my letter.

With Gratitude,
Jonathan Perez Vargas

Jonathan Perez Vargas

Letter C163 – Vargas, Jonathan Perez (2/13/2018)

C163-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar concerns and proposes parking and other improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C164

Morrison, Susan

From: Lily Vazquez <lilyvazque_9@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 10:18 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community (Project#561546)

C164-1 I would HIGHLY appreciate angled parking on both sides of the street to help with traffic flow & parking availability. I support the SOUTH HANCOCK SHAREWAY. It would be very beneficial, in terms of traffic, parking availability & Safety!
Please take this into consideration
Thank you for your time.
LV

1

Letter C164 – Vazquez, Lily (2/20/2018)

C164-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C165

Morrison, Susan

From: Mary Vidal <mary_vidal@my.uri.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 5:58 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Hello-

My name is Maggie Vidal and I'm writing in support of the South Hancock Shareway. I think this shareway will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists and will minimize congestion, as well as provide additional parking.

I'm invested in this effort because I frequent the Vertical Hold gym.

C165-1

Thanks for your consideration/attentiveness to this matter.

Respectfully,

--
Maggie (Mary) Vidal
(603) 809-7354 (mobile)
mary_vidal@my.uri.edu

1

Letter C165 - Vidal, Mary (2/13/2018)

C165-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C166

Morrison, Susan

From: albert vintayen <albert.vintayen@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 23, 2018 11:33 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway pacific highway community plan, project #561546

To whom it may concern:
C166-1 My name is Albert Vintayen and I'm a regular climber at vertical hold. The parking in the area is atrocious. I support the the South Hancock Shareway--I feel that it will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while minimizing congestion and provide additional parking.

Midway pacific highway community plan, project #561546

Sincerely,
Albert Vintayen

1

Letter C166 - Vintayen, Albert (1/23/2018)

C166-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C167

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 12, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C167-1 My name is Lily Voon, and I am a member at Vertical Hold on Hancock Street. Often times when I go to the gym, I have a very hard time finding parking, because everything is so congested and there just aren't enough available parking spots. I also worry about the little kids going in and out of the gymnastics building next door, because there are a lot of cars that speed through the street. There are a lot of blind spots and are prone accidents. I would like to ask the city to create angled back-in parking on both sides of the street to help with parking availability and traffic flow. Also, creating sharrows will help make our neighborhood safer for bicyclists. Finally, narrower driving lanes will help slow down traffic, which in return will make the neighborhood safer for pedestrians. Thank you for taking the time for reading this letter and taking my suggestions into consideration.

Sincerely,
Lily Voon



Letter C167 – Voon, Lily (2/12/2018)

C167-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar concerns and proposes parking and other improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C168

Morrison, Susan

From: Calvin Korn <burntpillow3@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 6:50 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Midway Pacific HIghway Community Plan, Project #561546

Kevin Wang

9830 Mira Lee Way Apt 38513

San Diego, CA 92126

February 13, 2018

Hello,

C168-1 My name is Kevin Wang and I have parking issues around Hancock Street. The parking situation is troubling already, and I believe that removing spots only make things worse. The community is centered around fitness and gets a lot of in and out traffic that needs to be supported by additional parking spots.I believe better organized angled parking spots would help parking availability and traffic flow. I also think that sharrows would make the road safer for bicyclists and narrower driving lanes would slow traffic and make it safer for pedestrians.

Best Regards,

Kevin Wang

Letter C168 - Wang, Kevin (2/13/2018)

C168-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which proposes similar improvements along Hancock Street.

Letter C169

Morrison, Susan

From: Lindsey Warnock <lindsey8148@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 8:21 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,

C169-1 I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.

Sincerely,
Lindsey Warnock

1

Letter C169 - Warnock, Lindsey (1/29/2018)

C169-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C170

Morrison, Susan

From: Allison Watelet <awatelet@qti.qualcomm.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 7:40 AM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

To the planning department of the city of San Diego,
I am writing in regards to the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. I would like to express my support for the South Hancock Shareway, which will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking. As a member of Cali Coast Elite cheerleading gym, I see young athletes crossing the street every day, while cars U-turn and drive distractedly, looking for parking. This project will directly impact me by making Hancock street safer for myself and my child.
Sincerely,
Allison Watelet

C170-1

1

Letter C170 - Watelet, Allison (1/30/2018)

C170-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C171

Morrison, Susan

From: Stephanie Wilson <runnerswilson@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 1:52 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Subject: Re:

Project Name: Midway-Pacific Highway Community
Plan Update Project No: 561546/SCH No: 2015111013
Community Plan Area: Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor
Council District 2

Hi,
I am writing in concern of the proposed project in the Sports Arena Area. I am a resident of Point Loma and feel that not only will the traffic be too great with the additional 27,000 residents, but the amount of resources these new residents will use is too great for the desert city of San Diego to support. We are in the midst of a drought and have a long history of recurring droughts. Adding new residents to the city will tax what natural resources we have. Increasing the population so greatly in this location will cause traffic nightmares, and since there are very few roads to get in or out of Point Loma, it seems like a bad idea in the event of an emergency. also, there would need to be additional fire stations, schools, etc. built to support this area. I am AGAINST this project.

C171-1

Sincerely,
Stephanie Wilson

On Mon, Feb 5, 2018 at 1:46 PM, Stephanie Wilson <runnerswilson@gmail.com> wrote:
Midway-Pacific Highway Community

Letter C171 - Wilson, Stephanie (2/5/2018)

C171-1: Comment noted. Please see the response to comment letter C1. In addition, impacts to public facilities and public safety as a result of the project are addressed in Section 5.11, Public Services and Facilities, of the Draft PEIR.

Letter C172

Morrison, Susan

From: Sarah <sarah.anne808@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 5:27 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

To whom it may concern,

I, Sarah Woodward, am a faithful student of Bikram Yoga San Diego on Hancock St.

I fully support the solution proposed by the Hancock Street Neighborhood Business Association for the Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546. The creation of a "South Hancock Shareway" will increase safety for pedestrians and cyclists while also minimizing congestion and providing additional parking for the surrounding businesses.

C172-1

As a patron of Bikram Yoga San Diego, and a local resident, I believe this is the solution we need. And I thank you for your consideration.

Regards,
Sarah Woodward

Letter C172 - Woodward, Sarah (1/24/2018)

C172-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C173

Morrison, Susan

From: Dr. Tamsin Woolley-Barker <drtamsin@drtamsin.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 1:01 PM
To: PLN_PlanningCEQA
Cc: CouncilMember Lorie Zapf
Subject: Midway Pacific Hwy Community Plan, Proj. #561546

Hello,

I am writing in support of the proposed South Hancock Shareway. I have been attending classes at organizations like the Bikram Studio and the climbing gym for many years, and the parking situation there is getting untenable. I simply can't find a spot, and often miss my classes, even when allowing for an extra 15 minutes for parking. It is clear that the area (which was not long ago a quiet industrial warehouse type of area) is becoming a gentrification hotspot, with Specialty Produce, the Cohn Group, Malashock Dance, and more, attracting a large amount of people at all times of day. I've opted for cycling in on some occasions, but the street is actually a danger to pedestrians and cyclists as it is currently, mostly because of cars driving back and forth erratically looking for non-existent parking, and then being panicked to get to class on time, and not paying attention to cyclists and pedestrians.

C173-1

The street is wide, and would certainly support the proposed angled back in spots, and painting "sharrows" on the street would help as well.

Please do support and fight for the proposed shareway. I believe it would be a great benefit to the area and the public who use it.

Thank you,
Tamsin

Letter C173 – Woolley-Barker, Tamsin (2/20/2018)

C173-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9.

Letter C174

Re: Midway Pacific Highway Community Plan, Project #561546

February 12, 2018

To the City of San Diego Planning Department,

C174-1 My name is Simeng Zeng and I am a member at Vertical Hold. I come here at least three times a week with friends too so sometimes we come with multiple cars. We always find it very hard to find parking especially on weekdays after dinner time. Some of my friends come to practice dance next door and they complaint about limited parking spaces as well. It would be great if there are more parking spaces. I believe a lot of people will be benefit from it.

Best regards,

Simeng

Letter C174 – Zeng, Simeng (2/12/2018)

C174-1: Comment noted. Please see the responses to comment letter B9, which expresses similar parking concerns and proposes parking and other improvements along Hancock Street.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section **Page**

Acronyms xi

Executive Summary 1
S.1 Proposed Project 1
S.1.1 Project Location and Setting 1
S.1.2 Project Description 2
S.2 Project Objectives 3
S.3 Areas of Controversy 3
S.4 Project Alternatives 4
S.4.1 No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan) 4
S.4.2 Alternative 1 4
S.4.3 Alternative 2 5
S.4.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative 5
S.5 Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures that Reduce the Impact 6

Chapter 1.0 Introduction 1-1
1.1 PEIR Purpose and Intended Uses 1-2
1.2 PEIR Legal Authority 1-2
1.2.1 Lead Agency 1-2
1.2.2 Responsible and Trustee Agencies 1-2
1.3 EIR Type, Scope and Content, and Format 1-4
1.3.1 Type of EIR 1-4
1.3.2 PEIR Scope and Content 1-4
1.3.3 PEIR Format 1-5
1.3.4 Incorporation by Reference 1-7
1.4 PEIR Process 1-8
1.4.1 Draft PEIR 1-8
1.4.2 Final PEIR 1-9

Chapter 2.0 Environmental Setting 2-1
2.1 Regional Location 2-1
2.2 Project Location 2-4
2.3 Existing Physical Characteristics 2-4
2.3.1 Land Use 2-4
2.3.2 Transportation and Circulation 2-7
2.3.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources 2-10
2.3.4 Geologic Conditions 2-14
2.3.5 Noise 2-15
2.3.6 Health and Safety 2-19
2.3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality 2-22
2.3.8 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character 2-25
2.3.9 Air Quality 2-27

2.3.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 2-28
2.3.11 Public Services and Facilities 2-31
2.3.12 Public Utilities 2-33
2.3.13 Biological Resources 2-41
2.3.14 Paleontology 2-48

Chapter 3.0 Project Description 3-1
3.1 Introduction 3-1
3.2 Relationship to General Plan 3-2
3.3 Project Objectives 3-3
3.4 Project Description 3-4
3.4.1 Community Plan Elements 3-5
3.4.2 Land Development Code Amendments 3-17
3.4.3 Impact Fee Study 3-19
3.5 Environmental Design Considerations 3-19
3.5.1 Sustainability 3-19
3.5.2 Villages and Districts 3-19
3.5.3 Transit 3-21
3.5.4 Recreation 3-21
3.5.5 Urban Runoff/Water Quality 3-21
3.5.6 Diversity and Affordability of Housing 3-21
3.5.7 Bicycle Network 3-21
3.5.8 Access to Outdoor and Active Spaces 3-22
3.5.9 Improved Transportation Network and Increased Alternative Modes of Transportation 3-22
3.5.10 Energy Efficiency in Buildings 3-22
3.5.11 Air Quality 3-23
3.5.12 Urban Agriculture, Urban Forestry, and Sustainable Landscape Design 3-23
3.6 Plan Projections 3-23
3.6.1 Land Use Distribution 3-23

Chapter 4.0 Regulatory Framework 4-1
4.1 Land Use 4-1
4.1.1 City of San Diego General Plan 4-1
4.1.2 Land Development Code Regulations 4-3
4.1.3 Multiple Species Conservation Program 4-5
4.1.4 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan 4-6
4.1.5 San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan 4-6
4.2 Transportation and Circulation 4-7
4.2.1 State Regulations 4-7
4.2.2 Local Regulations 4-7
4.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources 4-8
4.3.1 Federal 4-9
4.3.2 State 4-10
4.3.3 Local 4-11
4.4 Geologic Conditions 4-13

4.4.1 State 4-13
4.4.2 Local 4-13
4.5 Noise 4-14
4.5.1 State 4-14
4.5.2 Local 4-15
4.6 Health and Safety 4-20
4.6.1 Federal 4-20
4.6.2 State 4-21
4.6.3 Local 4-22
4.7 Hydrology/Water Quality 4-24
4.7.1 Federal 4-24
4.7.2 State 4-25
4.7.3 Local 4-25
4.8 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character 4-27
4.8.1 California Scenic Highways Program 4-27
4.8.2 City of San Diego General Plan 4-27
4.9 Air Quality 4-28
4.9.1 Federal Regulations 4-28
4.9.2 State Regulations 4-30
4.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 4-32
4.10.1 Federal 4-33
4.10.2 State 4-34
4.10.3 Local 4-39
4.11 Public Services and Facilities 4-40
4.11.1 Local 4-40
4.12 Public Utilities 4-42
4.12.1 State 4-43
4.12.2 Local 4-43
4.13 Biological Resources 4-45
4.13.1 Federal 4-45
4.13.2 State 4-46
4.13.3 Local 4-46
4.14 Paleontological Resources 4-47

Chapter 5.0 Environmental Analysis 5-1
5.1 Land Use 5.1-1
5.1.1 Existing Conditions 5.1-1
5.1.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.1-1
5.1.3 Impact Analysis 5.1-2
5.1.4 Significance of Impacts 5.1-25
5.1.5 Mitigation Framework 5.1-28
5.2 Transportation and Circulation 5.2-1
5.2.1 Existing Conditions 5.2-1
5.2.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.2-11
5.2.3 Impact Analysis 5.2-13
5.2.4 Significance of Impacts 5.2-29

5.2.5 Mitigation Framework 5.2-30
5.2.6 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation 5.2-35
5.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources 5.3-1
5.3.1 Existing Conditions 5.3-1
5.3.2 Methodology 5.3-1
5.3.3 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.3-4
5.3.4 Impact Analysis 5.3-5
5.3.5 Significance of Impacts 5.3-12
5.3.6 Mitigation Framework 5.3-12
5.3.7 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation 5.3-17
5.4 Geologic Conditions 5.4-1
5.4.1 Existing Conditions 5.4-1
5.4.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.4-1
5.4.3 Impact Analysis 5.4-2
5.4.4 Significance of Impacts 5.4-10
5.4.5 Mitigation Framework 5.4-11
5.5 Noise 5.5-1
5.5.1 Existing Conditions 5.5-1
5.5.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.5-6
5.5.3 Methodology 5.5-7
5.5.4 Impact Analysis 5.5-8
5.5.5 Significance of Impacts 5.5-26
5.5.6 Mitigation Framework 5.5-28
5.5.7 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation 5.5-30
5.6 Health and Safety 5.6-1
5.6.1 Existing Conditions 5.6-1
5.6.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.6-1
5.6.3 Impact Analysis 5.6-2
5.6.4 Significance of Impacts 5.6-4
5.6.5 Mitigation Framework 5.6-5
5.7 Hydrology/Water Quality 5.7-1
5.7.1 Existing Conditions 5.7-1
5.7.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.7-1
5.7.3 Impact Analysis 5.7-1
5.7.4 Significance of Impacts 5.7-4
5.7.5 Mitigation Framework 5.7-4
5.8 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character 5.8-1
5.8.1 Existing Conditions 5.8-1
5.8.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.8-1
5.8.3 Impact Analysis 5.8-1
5.8.4 Significance of Impacts 5.8-5
5.8.5 Mitigation Framework 5.8-6
5.9 Air Quality 5.9-1
5.9.1 Existing Conditions 5.9-1
5.9.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.9-1
5.9.3 Impact Analysis 5.9-4

5.9.4 Significance of Impacts 5.9-13
5.9.5 Mitigation Framework 5.9-14
5.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 5.10-1
5.10.1 Existing Conditions 5.10-1
5.10.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.10-4
5.10.3 Impact Analysis 5.10-4
5.10.4 Significance of Impacts 5.10-8
5.10.5 Mitigation Framework 5.10-9
5.11 Public Services and Facilities 5.10-1
5.11.1 Existing Conditions 5.10-1
5.11.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.10-1
5.11.3 Impact Analysis 5.10-2
5.11.4 Significance of Impacts 5.10-10
5.11.5 Mitigation Framework 5.11-11
5.12 Public Utilities 5.12-1
5.12.1 Existing Conditions 5.12-1
5.12.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.12-1
5.12.3 Impact Analysis 5.12-1
5.12.4 Significance of Impacts 5.12-5
5.12.5 Mitigation Framework 5.12-6
5.13 Biological Resources 5.12-1
5.13.1 Existing Conditions 5.13-1
5.13.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.13-3
5.13.3 Impact Analysis 5.13-4
5.13.4 Significance of Impacts 5.13-9
5.13.5 Mitigation Framework 5.13-10
5.14 Paleontological Resources 5.14-1
5.14.1 Existing Conditions 5.14-1
5.14.2 Significance Determination Thresholds 5.14-1
5.14.3 Impact Analysis 5.14-2
5.14.4 Significance of Impacts 5.14-3
5.14.5 Mitigation Framework 5.14-3
5.14.6 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation 5.14-4

Chapter 6.0 Cumulative Impacts 6-1
6.1 Introduction 6-1
6.2 Cumulative Analysis Setting and Methodology 6-2
6.2.1 Plans and Programs Evaluated for Cumulative Impacts 6-3
6.3 Assessment of Cumulative Impacts 6-3
6.3.1 Land Use 6-5
6.3.2 Transportation and Circulation 6-6
6.3.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources 6-6
6.3.4 Geologic Conditions 6-6
6.3.5 Noise 6-7
6.3.6 Health and Safety 6-7
6.3.7 Hydrology/Water Quality 6-7

6.3.8 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character 6-8
6.3.9 Air Quality and Odor 6-8
6.3.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions 6-9
6.3.11 Public Services and Facilities 6-9
6.3.12 Public Utilities 6-10
6.3.13 Biological Resources 6-11
6.3.14 Paleontological Resources 6-11

Chapter 7.0 Other Mandatory Discussion Areas 7-1
7.1 Growth Inducement 7-1
7.2 Effects Found not to be Significant 7-3
7.2.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources 7-3
7.2.2 Mineral Resources 7-4
7.2.3 Population and Housing 7-4
7.2.4 Energy 7-4
7.3 Unavoidable Significant Environmental Impacts 7-7
7.4 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes 7-7

Chapter 8.0 Alternatives 8-1
8.1 No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan) 8-4
8.1.1 Description 8-4
8.1.2 Analysis of No Project Alternative 8-11
8.2 Alternative 1 8-20
8.2.1 Description 8-20
8.2.2 Analysis of Alternative 1 8-23
8.3 Alternative 2 8-28
8.3.1 Description 8-28
8.3.2 Analysis of Alternative 2 8-31
8.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative 8-36

Chapter 9.0 References Cited 9-1

Chapter 10.0 Individuals and Agencies Consulted 10-1

Chapter 11.0 Certification 11-3
City of San Diego 11-3
PEIR Preparers 11-4
Technical Appendices Preparers 11-4

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

A	Notice of Preparation and Comment Letters
B	Transportation Impact Study
C	Mobility Study
D	Historic Context & Survey Report
E	Prehistoric Cultural Resources Report
F	Seismic and Geologic Technical Background Report
G	Noise Technical Report
H	Air Quality Technical Report
I	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Technical Report
J	Hazardous Materials Technical Study
K	Public Services Correspondence
L	Water Supply Assessment
M	Paleontological Resource Assessment
N	CPU Land Use Projections and Analysis for Sports Arena Site

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure **Page**

2-1	Regional Location	2-2
2-2	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area	2-3
2-3	Existing Land Use	2-6
2-4	Watersheds	2-23
2-5	Existing Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types	2-42
2-6	Geologic Map	2-51
3-1	Proposed Land Use Map	3-6
3-2	Proposed Community Villages and Districts	3-10
3-3	Future Roadway Classifications	3-14
3-4	Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones	3-18
3-5	Proposed Zoning	3-20
5.1-1	Local Coastal Zone	5.1-15
5.1-2	SDIA Airport Influence Area	5.1-17
5.1-3	SDIA Threshold Siting Surface Profile	5.1-19
5.1-4	SDIA Noise Contour Map	5.1-20
5.1-5	Residential Use Allowed Under the General/Community Plans Inside SDIA 70 dB CNEL	5.1-21
5.1-6	SDIA Safety Compatibility Zones	5.1-22
5.1-7	Residential Use Allowed Under the General/Community Plans Inside the SDIA Safety Compatibility Zones	5.1-23
5.1-8	SDIA Airspace Protection Boundary	5.1-24

LIST OF FIGURES
(Continued)

Figure		Page
5.1-9	SDIA Overflight Area Boundary	5.1-26
5.2-1	Existing Roadway Functional Classification	5.2-2
5.2-2	Existing and Planned Bicycle Network	5.2-10
5.2-3	Planned Transit Facilities	5.2-28
5.3-1	Cultural Sensitivity Areas – Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources	5.3-3
5.3-2	Location of Designated Historical Resources	5.3-6
5.3-3	Location of Potentially Eligible City Register Designated Historic Resources	5.3-7
5.4-1	City of San Diego Geologic Hazard and Faults	5.4-3
5.4-2	USGS Soil Slip Susceptibility	5.4-9
5.5-1	Noise Measurement Locations	5.5-2
5.5-2	Existing (2015) Traffic Noise Contours	5.5-5
5.5-3	Future (2035) Traffic Noise Contours	5.5-15
5.5-4	Airport Noise Contours	5.5-20
5.5-5	Quieter Home Program Participation for the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area	5.5-21
5.11-1	Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Open Space	5.11-4
5.13-1	Biological Study Area	5.13-2
5.13-2	MHPA and Open Space Areas	5.13-8
8-1	No Project Alternative: Adopted Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Land Use	8-8
8-2	Alternative 1 Land Use	8-21
8-3	Alternative 2 Land Use	8-30

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2-1	Existing Land Uses – Midway-Pacific Highway	2-5
2-2	Bicycle Facilities Classification System	2-9
2-3	Typical Sound Levels in the Environment and Industry	2-17
2-4	Hazardous Materials Sites in Midway-Pacific Highway	2-20
2-5	Summary of Air Quality Measurements Recorded at the San Diego–1110 Beardsley Street Monitoring Station	2-29
2-6	California GHG Emissions by Sector in 1990, 2008, and 2012	2-30
2-7	Historic Imported, Local, and Recycled Water Demands to Public Utilities Department	2-34
2-8	Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types within the Biological Study Area	2-41
2-9	Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species Documented or with Potential to Occur within the Biological Study Area	2-44
2-10	Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix	2-53
3-1	Project Components	3-1

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

Table		Page
3-2	Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Proposed Land Use Designations with Implementing Base Zones	3-7
3-3	Existing and Proposed CPU Assumed Land Use in Midway-Pacific Highway	3-24
3-4	Residential Development: Existing (2017) and at Proposed CPU	3-25
3-5	Non-Residential Development: Existing (2017) and Proposed CPU	3-25
3-6	Future Land Use Assumptions for Proposed CPU with and without Sports Arena Use	3-26
3-7	Potential Future Discretionary Actions Associated with the Proposed CPU	3-28
4-1	City of San Diego Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table NE-3)	4-16
4-2	San Diego Property Line Noise Level Limits	4-18
4-3	Airport Noise Compatibility Criteria	4-19
4-4	Ambient Air Quality Standards	4-29
4-5	Deployment Measures to Address Future Growth by Population Density per Square Mile	4-42
4-6	Deployment Measures to Address Future Growth by Population Clusters	4-42
5.1-1	Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Policies Related to Land Use	2
5.2-1	City of San Diego Roadway Segment Capacity and Level of Service	6
5.2-2	Level of Service Criteria for Intersections	7
5.2-3	Level of Service Criteria for Freeway Segment Analysis	8
5.2-4	Existing Freeway Ramp Metering	8
5.2-5	Significance Criteria for Facilities in Study Area	12
5.2-6	Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis	15
5.2-7	Summary of Intersection Analysis	19
5.2-8	Summary of Freeway Segment Level of Service	23
5.2-9	Peak Hour Ramp Metering Analysis – Horizon Year Conditions	26
5.4-1	Deterministic Seismic Hazard Parameters	5
5.4-2	Estimated Probabilistic Earthquake Ground Acceleration Parameters in the Project Area	6
5.5-1	Noise Measurements	3
5.5-2	Maximum Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment for Potential Damage and Annoyance	7
5.5-3	Increases in Ambient Noise for the Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area	9
5.5-4	Future Vehicle Traffic Noise CNEL Contour Distances for the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area	13
5.5-5	Existing Predicted Railway Noise Levels	17
5.5-6	Future (2021) Predicted Railway Noise Levels	18
5.5-7	Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment and Applicable Criteria	25
5.9-1	Air Quality Impact Screening Levels	2
5.9-2	2018 Maximum Daily Unmitigated Construction Emissions (pounds/day)	6
5.9-3	Total Operational Emissions for the Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area	8

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

Table		Page
5.9-4	Build-out Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis	9
5.10-1	GHG Emissions for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area (MT CO_2e per Year)	5
5.11-1	Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities	5
5.11-2	Summary of Existing and Proposed Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities	6
5.11-3	Midway-Pacific Highway Student Generation Rates from Existing Housing Units	8
5.11-4	Midway-Pacific Highway Potential Student Generation Rates from Future Additional Housing Units	9
6-1	San Diego Region Growth Projections for Cumulative Analysis	6-3
6-2	Planning Documents Used for Cumulative Analysis	6-4
6-3	Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Cumulative Analysis Setting	6-4
8-1	Comparison of Future Land Uses	8-3
8-2	Matrix Comparison of Project Alternatives and Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU	8-4
8-3	Issues Identified in the Adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan	8-5
8-4	Amendments to the 1991 Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan	8-7
8-5	Comparison of the No Project Alternative and the Project	8-9
8-6	No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan) Planned Circulation Improvements	8-13
8-7	Comparison of Alternative 1 and the Project	8-22
8-8	Comparison of Alternative 2 and the Project	8-29

Acronyms

$\mu g/m^3$	micrograms per cubic meter
°F	Fahrenheit
AAQS	ambient air quality standards
AB	Assembly Bill
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT	average daily traffic
af	artificial fill
AIA	airport influence area
ALUC	Airport Land Use Commission
ALUCP	Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
APCD	Air Pollution Control District
AST	aboveground storage tank
BAU	Business As Usual
BMP	Best Management Practice
BNSF	Burlington North Santa Fe
BSA	Biological Study Area
BAU	Business As Usual
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAFE	Corporate Average Fuel Economy
CalARP	California Accidental Release Prevention
CalEEMod	California Emissions Estimator Model
CalGreen	California Green Building Standards Code
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBC	California Building Code
CCAP	Climate Change Action Plan
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDC	California Department of Conservation
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CE	Conservation Element
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH_4	methane
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CIP	Capital Improvements Program
City	City of San Diego
CN	Commercial-Neighborhood
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Data Base
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO	carbon monoxide
CO_2	carbon dioxide
CPIOZ	Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone
CPU	Community Plan Update
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CRPR	California Rare Plant Rank
CTC	California Transportation Commission
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
dB	decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DEH	Department of Environmental Health
DIF	Development Impact Fee
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
DPM	diesel-exhaust particulate matter or diesel particulate matter
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
du/ac	dwelling units per acre
EB	Eastbound
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EMFAC2014	Emission Factor model
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
EMT	emergency medical technician
EO	executive order
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
EOP	edge of pavement
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESL	Environmentally Sensitive Lands
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FAR	floor area ratio
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FINDS	Facility Index System
ft	feet
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
g	gravity
GB	Green Building
GHG	greenhouse gas
GPA	Galvin Preservation Associates Inc.

gpd	gallons per day
GWP	global warming potential
H&SC	Health and Safety Code
HAZMIT	Hazard Mitigation Plan
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
HFC	hydrofluorocarbons
HMBP	Hazardous Materials Business Plan
HMD	Hazardous Materials Division
HMP	Hydromodification Management Plan
HRB	Historical Resources Board
HRR	Historical Resources Regulations
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning
Hz	hertz
I-5	Interstate 5
I-8	Interstate 8
IA	Implementing Agreement
IFS	Impact Fee Study
IP	Industrial-Park
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ISO	Independent System Operator
ITC	Intermodal Transit Center
ITS	Intelligent Transportation Systems
IWRP	Integrated Water Resources Plan
JRMP	Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan
kHz	kilohertz
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
LD	Larson Davis
LDC	Land Development Code
LDM	Land Development Manual
L_{eq}	equivalent noise level
LEV III	Low Emission Vehicle III
LID	Low Impact Development
L_{max}	maximum noise level
LOS	Level of Service
LOSSAN	Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo
LRT	Light Rail Transit
LS	less than significant
LU	land use
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCRD	Marine Corps Recruit~~ment~~ Depot
ME	Mobility Element
MHMP	Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan
MHPA	Multi-Habitat Planning Area
min	minutes

MMI	Modified Mercalli Intensity
MMRP	Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
MMT CO_2E	million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent
MOE	Measures of Effectiveness
mpg	miles per gallon
mph	miles per hour
MPL	Multiple Property Listing
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
MSL	mean sea level
MT CO_2e	metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent
MTS	Metropolitan Transit System
MW	megawatts
MWD	Metropolitan Water District
N/A	not applicable
N_2O	nitrous oxide
NA	not available
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
NB	Northbound
NCCP	Natural Conservation Community Plan
NCTD	North County Transit District
NCWRP	North City Water Reclamation Plan
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NO_2	nitrogen dioxide
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NO_X	oxides of nitrogen
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NTC	Naval Training Center
O_3	ozone
OES	Office of Emergency Services
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Pb	lead
PDO	Planned District Ordinance
PEIR	Program Environmental Impact Report
PFC	perfluorocarbons
PM_{10}	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
$PM_{2.5}$	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	parts per million
PPV	peak particle velocity
PUD	Public Utilities Department
PWD	Public Works Department
QHP	Quieter Home Program
RAQS	Regional Air Quality Strategy

RCP	Regional Comprehensive Plan for the San Diego Region
RCRA-SQG	Resource Conservation and Recovery Small Quantity Generators
RP	Regional Plan
RPS	Renewable Portfolio Standard
RTP/SCS	Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
RUWMP	Regional Urban Water Management Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
SB	Senate Bill
SB	Southbound
SBWRP	South Bay Water Reclamation Plant
SCAQMD	South Coast Air Quality Management District
SCIC	South Coastal Information Center
SCP	Site Cleanup Program
SDAB	San Diego Air Basin
SDCWA	San Diego County Water Authority
SDG&E	San Diego Gas & Electric
SDIA	San Diego International Airport
SDMC	San Diego Municipal Code
SDPL	San Diego Public Library
SDUSD	San Diego Unified School District
sec/veh	seconds per vehicle
SF_6	sulfur hexafluoride
SFHA	Special Flood Hazard Area
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SLM	Sound Level Meters
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SN	serial numbers
SO_2	sulfur dioxide
SoCalGas	Southern California Gas Company
SPAWAR	Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command
ST	Short term
STC	Sound Transmission Class
SU	significant and unavoidable
SWEEPS	Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TCM	Transportation Control Measure
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TERPS	Terminal Instrument Procedures
TIS	Transportation Impact Study
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TNM	Traffic Noise Model
TPA	Transit Priority Areas
TSS	Threshold Siting Surface

U.S.C.	United States Code
UD	Urban Design
UDC	Unified Disaster Council
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
UST	Underground Storage Tank
UWMP	Urban Water Management Plan
v/c	volume-to-capacity
VAP	Voluntary Assistance Program
veh/hr	vehicles per hour
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOC	volatile organic compounds
WB	Westbound
WBWG	Western Bat Working Group
WMA	Watershed Management Area
WMP	Waste Management Plan
WQIP	Water Quality Improvement Plan
WSA	Water Supply Assessment

S

Executive Summary

S.1 Proposed Project

S.1.1 Project Location and Setting

The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update (proposed CPU; proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU) area is located in west-central San Diego, to the north of the San Diego International Airport (SDIA), and south of Mission Bay. The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area lies between the north end of the Peninsula Community Plan area to the west and the Old Town San Diego Community Plan area to the east.

The proposed CPU area encompasses roughly 1,324 acres of relatively flat area and is composed of three main elements: the Midway area, which consists mainly of an urbanized commercial core; the narrow Pacific Highway corridor, which runs along Interstate 5 (I-5) from the southern end of the Midway area south to Laurel Street; and the Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD). The proposed CPU area is urbanized and generally characterized as a mix of commercial and industrial areas, with some residential areas.

The Midway-Pacific Highway community's overall physical structure reflects its geography and development patterns. The street system does not have a consistent grid pattern throughout the proposed CPU area. The proposed CPU area is traversed by several major streets: Sports Arena Boulevard and Midway Drive run northwest-southeast across the proposed CPU area and intersect with Camino Del Rio West and Rosecrans Street, which run southwest-northeast. Pacific Highway runs parallel to I-5 from Old Town to the southern proposed CPU boundary; and Barnett Avenue and Lytton Street connect Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway and serve as a dividing line between the Midway area and MCRD.

S.1.2 Project Description

The project includes the comprehensive update to the 1991 Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan (Community Plan), which is intended to guide development through 2035. The proposed CPU also addresses changes in conditions since 1991. It provides detailed, community-specific policy direction to implement the General Plan with respect to the distribution and arrangement of land uses (public and private); the street, multi-modal mobility, and transit network; provision of parks and public facilities; community-wide and site-specific urban design guidelines; and recommendations to preserve and enhance historic and cultural resources within the Midway-Pacific Highway community.

The proposed CPU's implementation requires adoption of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan, and other associated discretionary actions, including amendments to the General Plan to incorporate the proposed CPU as a component of the General Plan Land Use Element and incorporate the Mixed Commercial Residential land use designation, rezoning of land to be consistent with the proposed CPU, amendments to the City's certified Local Coastal Program to incorporate the proposed CPU, and amendments to the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) related to the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area to repeal existing CPIOZ areas and adopt new CPIOZ areas. The project also requires adoption of amendments to the San Diego Municipal Code to include a new Commercial--Office zone, a new Commercial--Neighborhood zone, corresponding parking requirements, and application of the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone to the community as a whole. A comprehensive update to the Impact Fee Study (IFS) (formerly known as the Public Facilities Financing Plan) is also proposed for adoption. Collectively, these actions are referred to throughout this Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) as the "project."

The intent of the proposed CPU is for the Midway-Pacific Highway community to be an attractive, vibrant, and healthy community with entertainment, employment, commercial, and housing uses. The community would contain new mixed-use and multiple-use development and a diversity of housing types located in districts and villages close to transit stops and stations, supporting the "City of Villages" General Plan concept. The community would have high-quality parks and recreational facilities including linear parks, community parks and plazas, and improved access to the nearby recreational amenities at San Diego Bay, Mission Bay and the San Diego River. A multi-modal transportation system is proposed with the project that would improve access to community land uses and transit, as well as comfort and safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders.

With regard to the San Diego Sports Arena site, the City-owned facility and surrounding City-owned properties are located in the Sports Arena Community Village identified in the proposed CPU. The project envisions the Sports Arena Community Village as a vibrant, pedestrian- and transit-oriented entertainment area that is a landmark and attraction for Midway-Pacific Highway and surrounding communities, and that incorporates a mix of entertainment, office, retail, residential, public, and park uses. The proposed CPU would allow the retention of a sports arena/entertainment use on the existing San Diego Sports Arena site in the existing San Diego Sports Arena or in a new structure, or would allow the Sports Arena use to be replaced by other land uses. For facility planning, technical evaluation, and environmental review purposes for this PEIR, two sets of future land use assumptions for the Sports Arena Community Village were prepared. The first set of future land use assumptions retains an arena use (within the existing structure, a renovated structure, or a rebuilt structure) in conjunction with infill commercial retail, office, and residential uses. The second set of assumptions replaces the Sports Arena

use with commercial retail, office, and residential uses. For the purposes of transportation, noise, and air quality analysis, the set of future land use assumptions without the San Diego Sports Arena would generate more future vehicle trips. Therefore, the future land use assumptions without the San Diego Sports Arena are analyzed in this PEIR as the proposed CPU.

The adoption of the proposed CPU would not preclude an arena use. The set of future land use assumptions with the San Diego Sports Arena have also been analyzed under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); this analysis can be found in Appendix N to this PEIR. A future specific plan or master plan for the Sports Arena Community Village would require additional analysis if the proposed development exceeded the amount of development analyzed in this PEIR.

S.2 Project Objectives

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15124, the following objectives were identified to outline the underlying purpose for the project. These objectives assisted the City as lead agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in this PEIR and will ultimately aid the lead agency in preparing findings and overriding considerations, if necessary. The primary objectives for the project are:

- Establish multiple-use villages and districts within the community;
- Enhance community identity and visual character through land use and urban design;
- Create a complete mobility system that promotes access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit, including within existing superblocks;
- Create a Bay-to-Bay pedestrian and bicycle linkage (replacing the Bay-to-Bay canal concept);
- Identify park and recreation facilities to serve the community;
- Provide housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit;
- Maintain employment uses including industrial, business park, and commercial office uses to support the City's economy;
- Improve localized water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design; and
- Identify future alternative uses for government-owned land in the community.

S.3 Areas of Controversy

Areas of controversy include planned roadway classifications, planned multi-modal mobility improvements, reuse of the Sports Arena site and other underutilized sites, and addressing the parks and recreation facilities shortfall in the community. Environmental impacts classified as significant and unavoidable that may generate controversy have been identified in the resource topics of transportation and circulation, historical and tribal cultural resources, noise, and paleontological resources, which are described in Chapters 5.2, 5.3, 5.5, and 5.14, respectively.

S.4 Project Alternatives

To fully evaluate the environmental effects of proposed projects, CEQA mandates that alternatives to the proposed project be analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the state CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of "a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project" and the evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. The alternatives discussion is intended to "focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project," even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives.

Alternatives to the proposed CPU are evaluated in Chapter 8.0 of this PEIR. The evaluations analyze the ability of each alternative to further reduce or avoid the significant environmental effects of the proposed CPU. Each major issue area included in the impact analysis of this PEIR has been given consideration in the alternatives analysis. This PEIR evaluates three alternatives to the project:: No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan); Alternative 1, and Alternative 2.

S.4.1 No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan)

Under the No Project Alternative, the adopted 1991 Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan would continue to guide development. The No Project Alternative would consist of the adopted Community Plan land use designations as they apply today, including all amendments to the Community Plan from its original adoption in 1991 to the most recent amendment in 2010. Adopted community plan land use designations are intended to transform areas from their industrial, retail, and storage-based emphasis to water-oriented retail, entertainment, office, and residential uses as construction of a planned Bay-to-Bay canal is undertaken. The planned Bay-to-Bay canal would link San Diego and Mission Bays through the Midway area of the community, to improve the image of the community and stimulate revitalization and development. Mixed-use development is encouraged in selected areas, primarily along the planned canal route, to promote redevelopment and revitalization of the area. In Midway-Pacific Highway, the areas between Sports Arena Boulevard and the Peninsula Community west of Rosecrans Street, and areas just east of Rosecrans Street and south of Sports Arena Boulevard, are identified for community commercial use, and the industrial uses northwest of Camino del Rio West are preserved. Along the Pacific Highway Corridor, industrial uses are maintained north of Sassafras Street but planned to transition to airport-related uses and commercial services south of Sassafras Street. Residential uses are concentrated on the Sports Arena site, City-owned properties adjacent to the Sports Arena site, and federal property north of Barnett Avenue. Institutional uses throughout the community are expected to remain, but alternate land use designations are identified should the institutional uses cease. The total projected population under the No Project Alternative would be 15,295 persons less than under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

S.4.2 Alternative 1

Alternative 1 incorporates the land uses proposed in the November 2013 Draft Community Plan which, compared to the adopted Community Plan (No Project Alternative), would redistribute planned residential units into mixed-use villages located close to transit. This would include locating Community Commercial – Residential Permitted, Business Park – Residential Permitted, and Mixed Commercial Residential land

uses in the Sports Arena Community Village along Sports Arena Boulevard; in the Kemper Neighborhood Village near Midway Drive; in the Dutch Flats Urban Village near the intersection of Barnett Avenue and Pacific Highway; and in the Hancock Transit Corridor between Pacific Highway and Interstate 5 northwest of Washington Street. The planned land uses under Alternative 1 would be forecasted to result in a small increase in the number of dwelling units in the community compared to the No Project Alternative.

As with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, this alternative would allow for the San Diego Sports Arena to be retained, rehabilitated or reconstructed, or replaced with other land uses. Similar to the analysis of the project throughout this PEIR, for the purposes of more conservative transportation, noise, and air quality analyses, the more intensive land use assumptions (replacing the Sports Arena with other land uses) are used in the analysis of Alternative 1 impacts. However, the adoption of this alternative would not preclude an arena use on the Sports Arena site. A future specific plan or master plan for the City-owned parcels in the Sports Arena Community Village would be required when new development is proposed for the site that would increase the existing floor area. Under this alternative, the number of dwelling units and non-residential development potential would be less than the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. The total projected population under Alternative 1 would be 13,400 persons less than under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

S.4.3 Alternative 2

Compared to the No Project Alternative (adopted Community Plan), Alternative 2 would increase planned residential density in the Sports Arena Community Village and Hancock Transit Corridor, as well as portions of the Rosecrans, Cauby, Camino del Rio, Kurtz, Lytton, and Kettner districts. It would also change the land use designation of the majority of the Kettner District from Heavy Commercial to Urban Industrial. The forecasted number of residential dwelling units under Alternative 2 would be higher than under Alternative 1 but lower than the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. Alternative 2 would also increase non-residential intensity in the Camino Del Rio and Kettner districts, which would be higher than the adopted Community Plan, Alternative 1, and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

As with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and Alternative 1, this alternative would allow for the San Diego Sports Arena to be retained, rehabilitated or reconstructed, or replaced with other land uses. Similar to the analysis of the project throughout this PEIR, for the purposes of more conservative transportation, noise, and air quality analyses, the more intensive land use assumptions (replacing the Sports Arena with other land uses) are used in the analysis of Alternative 2 impacts. However, the adoption of this alternative would not preclude an arena use on the Sports Arena site. Similar to the proposed CPU and Alternative 1, a future specific plan or master plan for the City-owned parcels in the Sports Arena Community Village would be required when new development is proposed for the site that would increase the existing floor area. The total projected population under Alternative 2 would be 3,440 persons less than under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

S.4.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives analyzed in an EIR. The guidelines also require that if the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, then another environmentally superior alternative must be identified.

Based on a comparison of the alternatives' overall environmental impacts and their compatibility with the proposed CPU's goals and objectives, Alternative 1 is the environmentally superior alternative for this PEIR. While Alternative 1 would not be able to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, it would slightly reduce impacts related to traffic circulation. At the same time, Alternative 1 would not achieve consistency with the General Plan's City of Villages strategy to the same extent as the proposed CPU because it would provide a land use plan that provides moderate rather than higher residential densities along major transit corridors. Alternative 1 would be consistent with General Plan Policy LU-A.2, which calls for the identification of sites suitable for mixed-use village development that will complement the existing community fabric or help achieve desired community character; and with General Plan Policy UD-A.10, which calls for the design or retrofit of streets to improve walkability, bicycling, and transit integration; to strengthen connectivity; and to enhance community identity. However, consistency with General Plan Policy LU-A.1(d) (Revitalize transit corridors through the application of plan designations and zoning that permits a higher intensity of mixed use development) would not be achieved to the same extent as the proposed CPU because the density of future development under Alternative 1 would be lower along most transit corridors in the proposed CPU area. Alternative 1 would also achieve consistency with the City's CAP to a lesser degree than the proposed CPU since the land use plan would not take advantage of capacity for higher residential densities along major transit corridors to the same extent as the project.

S.5 Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures that Reduce the Impact

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis including the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed CPU and proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid these impacts. Impacts and mitigation measures are organized by issue in Chapter 5.0, Environmental Analysis. Chapter 5.0 also includes discussions of proposed policies that would reduce identified impacts. Chapter 6.0, Cumulative Impacts, includes an analysis of cumulative impacts of the proposed CPU for each issue.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, all components associated with the proposed CPU are considered in this PEIR at the program level when evaluating potential impacts on the environment, including the construction of future development and supporting facilities and utilities. Impacts are identified as direct or indirect, and short-term or long-term, and are assessed on a plan-to-ground basis. The plan-to-ground analysis addresses the changes or impacts that would result from implementation of the project compared to existing ground conditions.

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Land Use			
Would the project conflict with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General Plan or Community Plan or other applicable land use plan or regulation and, as a result, cause an indirect or secondary environmental impact?	The project is consistent with the General Plan and the City of Villages strategy. Furthermore, the policies developed for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU within each of the proposed CPU elements were drafted in a manner that is consistent with the General Plan. Proposed amendments to the Land Development Code (LDC) would implement the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and would be consistent with applicable environmental goals, objectives, and guidelines of the General Plan. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would also revise the CPIOZ to rescind the existing CPIOZ and implement three new uses of CPIOZ in the community (and three sets of associated CPIOZ supplemental development requirements) pertaining to development within the Sports Arena Community Village (CPIOZ Type B), Dutch Flats Urban Village (CPIOZ Type A), and Sports Arena Boulevard streetscape enhancements (CPIOZ Type A). The proposed CPIOZ supplemental development regulations are found in the found in the proposed CPU's Land Use, Villages and District Element, and would not create any conflicts or inconsistencies with the adopted LDC. Future development in accordance with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU adjacent to the San Diego River Flood Control Channel would be required to comply with Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations and Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP)/Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Implementation of the proposed CPU is expected to result in development and redevelopment that may impact historical resources in potential conflict with the Historical Resources Regulations (HRR). Direct impacts may include alteration or demolition of historic buildings, as well as impacts to archaeological sites from grading, excavation and other ground-disturbing activities tied to construction. Given the presence of historical resources distributed throughout the proposed CPU area, implementation of the proposed CPU has the potential to result in significant impacts to historical resources in conflict with the HRR. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU also incorporates the multi-modal strategy of SANDAD's Regional Plan (RP) through the designation of high-density mixed-use villages located in proximity to transit. In addition, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies related to land use, mobility, and circulation/transportation that promote the RP's smart growth strategies. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	strategies to preserve, protect, and enhance public access to the Coastal Zone within the community and preserve coastal resources, which are consistent with the goals of the Coastal Act. The proposed CPU land use scenario would also be consistent with the goals and policies of the Port Master Plan as the proposed CPU land uses adjacent to the Port-owned properties would not conflict with the land uses in the Port Master Plan. Proposed CPU policies LU-4.76 and LU.4-84, which promote coordination of planning efforts between the City and the Port, would ensure that any land use modifications to the Port-owned properties would be consistent between the two documents. As the project would be consistent with applicable environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General Plan and other applicable plans and regulations, no indirect or secondary environmental impact would result and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
Would the project lead to the development or conversion of general plan or community plan designated open space or prime farmland to a more intensive land use, resulting in a physical division of the community?	The project would not convert open space or prime farmland as there is no open space or prime farmland located within the community. The project would not physically divide an established community. Community connectivity would be enhanced by provisions in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU that aim to improve pedestrian and transit amenities. No significant impacts have been identified; therefore, no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Project implementation would not be in conflict with the goals of the MSCP Subarea Plan or result in significant impacts on the adjacent Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). This would be assured through implementation of and strict adherence with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines incorporated into future projects as described in Section 4.1.3 of this PEIR. As such, program-level impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in land uses which are not compatible with an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)?	Although the Midway-Pacific Highway community is within the SDIA AIA, the project would not result in significant impacts associated with the four compatibility concern areas. The proposed CPU was ~~will be~~ submitted to the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for a consistency determination with the SDIA ALUCP and was deemed conditionally consistent as future projects would be required to submit project-level consistency determinations ~~prior to the proposed CPU's adoption~~. Subsequent to proposed CPU adoption, future projects that involve a land use plan amendment or rezone would be required to receive a ALUC consistency determination stating that the project is consistent with the SDIA ALUCP. As	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	a result, the project would not result in land uses that are incompatible with an adopted ALUCP. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.		
Transportation and Circulation			
Would the project result in an increase in projected traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system including roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, interchanges, or freeway ramps?	The project would result in impacts to roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments and ramp meters.	Mitigation Measures **TRANS 5.2-1** through **TRANS 5.2-16**, as described in Section 5.2, Transportation and Circulation, were identified to reduce significant impacts to intersections and roadway segments; however as discussed in Section 5.2 of this PEIR, only **TRANS 5.2-7b** is included in the proposed Impact Fee Study. Mitigation Measures **TRANS 5.2-17** through **TRANS 5.2-24** would be implemented by Caltrans to reduce impacts to freeway segments and ramp meters; however, impacts to Caltrans facilities would remain significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure that the mitigation necessary to avoid or reduce the impacts to a level below significance would be implemented prior to occurrence of the impact.	**Significant and Unavoidable**
Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?	The project would be consistent with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Additionally, the project (including the proposed IFS) would provide planned alternative transportation facilities and policies that support improvements to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources			
Would implementation of the project result in an alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of a historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, object, or site?	Implementation of the project could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning. This impact would be significant.	Mitigation Measure **HIST 5.3-1** as described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources.	**Significant and Unavoidable**
Would implementation of the project result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric archaeological resource, a religious or sacred use site, or the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Implementation of the project could adversely impact prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, including religious or sacred use sites and human remains (Impact 5.3-2). This impact would be significant.	Mitigation Measure **HIST 5.3-2** as described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources.	**Significant and Unavoidable**
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: 1. 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 2. 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	Implementation of the project could adversely impact tribal cultural resources (Impact 5.3-3). This impact would be significant.	Mitigation Measure **HIST 5.3-2** as described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources.	**Significant and Unavoidable**

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			
Geologic Conditions			
Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides?	Future projects located within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would not have direct or indirect significant environmental impacts with respect to seismic hazards because future development would be required to occur in accordance with uniformly applied development policies, including existing codes and standards. This regulatory framework includes a requirement for site-specific geotechnical investigations to identify potential geologic hazards or concerns that would need to be addressed during grading and/or construction of a specific development project. Thus, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in a substantial erosion or loss of topsoil?	SDMC Section 142.0146 requires grading work to incorporate erosion and siltation control measures in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 4 (Landscape Regulations) and the standards established in the Land Development Manual. Conformance to such mandated City grading requirements would ensure that grading and construction operations for future projects located within the proposed CPU would avoid significant soil erosion impacts. Furthermore, any development involving clearing, grading, or excavation that causes soil disturbance of 1 or more acres, or any project involving less than 1 acre that is part of a larger development plan, is subject to NPDES General Construction Storm Water Permit provisions. Additionally, any development of significant size within the City would be required to prepare and comply with an approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that would consider the full range of erosion control BMPs, including any additional site-specific and seasonal conditions. Thus, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	Future projects located in hillside areas within the project area would be required to submit a geotechnical investigation that specifically addresses slope stability. Potential hazards associated with slope instability would be addressed by the site-specific recommendations contained within geotechnical investigations as required by the SDMC or other standards. Thus, impacts related to landslide and slope instability would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Would the project 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?	Adherence to the SDMC grading regulations and construction requirements and implementation of the recommendations and standards of the City's Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports for future projects located within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would preclude significant impacts related to expansive soils. Thus, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Noise			
Would the project result in or create a significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels?	An increase in ambient vehicular traffic noise in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would result from the future development projections of the project and increases in traffic due to regional growth. A significant increase would occur adjacent to one street segment in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area that contains existing noise-sensitive land uses. The increase in ambient noise levels could result in the exposure of existing noise-sensitive land uses to an increase in noise level greater than 5 dBA, and impacts would be significant (Impact 5.5-1). For new discretionary development, there is an existing regulatory framework in place that would ensure future projects implemented in accordance with the project would not be exposed to ambient noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels in the General Plan. Thus, noise impacts to new discretionary projects would be less than significant. However, in the case of ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise would be adequately attenuated. Therefore, exterior noise impacts for ministerial projects located in areas that exceed the applicable land use and noise compatibility level would be significant (Impact 5.5-2).	Discretionary None Required Ministerial Mitigation Measure **NOISE 5.5-1**, as described in Section 5.5, Noise, was identified to reduce significant exterior noise impacts associated with ministerial projects. However, as discussed in Section 5.5 of this PEIR, **NOISE 5.5-1** is not feasible as there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise is adequately attenuated. While future discretionary projects have a framework in place that would ensure exterior noise levels are appropriately attenuated to meet the General Plan Compatibility Standards, there is no similar mechanism in place for ministerial projects. ~~Mitigation Measure **NOISE 5.5-1** as described in Section 5.5, Noise.~~	Discretionary Less than Significant Ministerial **Significant and Unavoidable**
Would the project cause exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Noise Element of the General Plan?	Freeway and Roadway Noise In the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, noise levels for all land uses would be incompatible (i.e., greater than 75 dBA CNEL) closest to the freeways and specific segments of Pacific Highway. These areas are currently developed and the project would change land use designations in some of these areas. While land uses in these areas would be exposed to	Freeway and Roadway Noise *Discretionary* None Required *Ministerial* Mitigation Measure **NOISE 5.5-1**, as described in Section 5.5, Noise, was	Freeway and Roadway Noise *Discretionary* Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	noise levels that exceed General Plan standards, Section B of the General Plan Noise Element requires future residential uses in areas above 70 dBA CNEL to include noise attenuation measures to ensure interior levels of 45 dBA CNEL and that they be located in an area where a community plan allows multi-family and mixed-use residential uses. An existing regulatory framework and review process exists for new discretionary development, requiring projects to demonstrate that exterior and interior noise levels would be compatible with City standards. Noise compatibility impacts associated with future discretionary projects implemented in accordance with the project would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations and noise standards. However, in the case of ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise is adequately attenuated. Therefore, exterior noise impacts for ministerial projects located in areas that exceed the applicable land use and noise compatibility level would be significant (Impact 5.5-3). Rail Noise Amtrak, Coaster, and freight train noise levels at the nearest planning area boundary and the nearest sensitive receptors would exceed 60 dBA L_{dn}. Although levels at these boundaries may exceed the compatibility standards of the General Plan, all sensitive receptors located within the 60 dBA L_{dn} distance buffer experience predicted existing and future traffic noise levels in excess of 70 dBA CNEL. Thus, impacts specifically from rail noise would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	identified to reduce significant exterior noise impacts associated with ministerial projects. However, as discussed in Section 5.5 of this PEIR, **NOISE 5.5-1** is not feasible as there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise is adequately attenuated. While future discretionary projects have a framework in place that would ensure exterior noise levels are appropriately attenuated to meet the General Plan Compatibility Standards, there is no similar mechanism in place for ministerial projects.~~Mitigation Measure **NOISE 5.5-1** as described in Section 5.5, Noise.~~ Rail Noise None Required	*Ministerial* **Significant and Unavoidable** Rail Noise Less than Significant
Would the project result in land uses which are not compatible with aircraft noise levels as defined by an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)?	Based on the projected airport noise contours for SDIA, there are sensitive receptors in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area that are located where noise levels due to aircraft operations exceed 60 dBA CNEL. At the project level, future development must include interior noise attenuation consistent with the Noise Element of the General Plan and the ALUCP for SDIA; therefore, impacts related to airport noise would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in the exposure of people to noise levels which exceed property line limits established in the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the Municipal Code?	Mixed-use sites and areas where residential uses are located in proximity to commercial sites would expose sensitive receptors to noise. Although noise-sensitive residential land uses would be exposed to noise associated with the operation of these commercial uses, City policies and regulations would control noise and reduce noise impacts between various land uses. In addition, enforcement of state noise regulations in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) would control impacts. With implementation of	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	these policies and enforcement of the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the SDMC, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required at the program level.		
Would the project result in the exposure of people to significant temporary construction noise?	Construction Noise Construction activities related to implementation of the project would potentially generate short-term noise levels in excess of 75 dBA Leq at adjacent properties. While the City regulates noise associated with construction equipment and activities through enforcement of noise ordinance standards (e.g., days of the week and hours of operation) and imposition of conditions of approval for building or grading permits, there is a procedure in place that allows for variance to the noise ordinance. Due to the highly developed nature of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area with sensitive receivers potentially located in close proximity to any given construction site, there is a potential for construction of future projects to expose existing sensitive land uses to significant noise levels. While future development projects would be required to incorporate feasible mitigation measures, due to the proximity of sensitive receivers to potential construction sites, the program-level impact related to construction noise would be significant (Impact 5.5-4). Vibration – Construction By use of administrative controls, such as scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with least potential to affect nearby properties, perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum and, as such, would result in a less than significant impact with respect to perception. However, due to the highly developed nature of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area with existing structures occupying the majority of parcels, pile driving within distances of existing structures listed in Table 5.5-6 has the potential to exceed damage thresholds and would be significant (Impact 5.5-5). Vibration – Operation Post-construction operational vibration impacts could occur as a result of commercial operations that are implemented in accordance with the project. The commercial uses that would be constructed under the project would include uses such as retail, restaurants, and small offices that would not require heavy mechanical equipment that would generate groundborne vibration or heavy truck deliveries. Residential and civic uses do not typically generate vibration. Thus, operational vibration impacts associated with the project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	Construction Noise Mitigation Measure **NOISE 5.5-2** as described in Section 5.5, Noise. Vibration – Construction Mitigation Measure **NOISE 5.5-3** as described in Section 5.5, Noise. Vibration – Operation None Required	Construction Noise Less than Significant with Mitigation Vibration – Construction **Significant and Unavoidable** Vibration – Operation Less than Significant

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Health and Safety			
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including when wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	The proposed CPU area is not identified in a fire hazard zone of state or local responsibility. In addition to this, adherence to existing regulations and uniformly applied development policies would reduce the risk of wildland fires from surrounding areas. Therefore, the program-level impact related to wildfires would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school?	The project would not result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter-mile of any existing or proposed school. Impacts to schools would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project be located on a site which 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 environment?	According to a search of federal, state, and local regulatory databases, 73 documented hazardous material release cases were identified within the proposed CPU area, 13 of which are open and the remaining 60 are closed cleanup program sites. Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from off-airport aircraft operational accidents?	Impacts from safety hazards related to being located within an AIA are less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Would the project result in flooding due to an increase in impervious surfaces, changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate of surface runoff?	All development is subject to drainage and floodplain regulations in the SDMC, and would be required to adhere to the City's Drainage Design Manual and Storm Water Standards Manual. Therefore, with future development, the volume and rate of overall surface runoff within the	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would be reduced when compared to existing conditions. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.		
Would the project result in a substantial increase in pollutant discharge to receiving waters and increase discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body?	New development under the project would be required to implement LID and storm water BMPs into the project design to address the potential for transport of pollutants of concern through retention or filtration. The implementation of low impact development (LID) practices and storm water BMPs would reduce the amount of pollutants transported from the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area to receiving waters. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project deplete groundwater supplies, degrade groundwater quality, or interfere with groundwater recharge?	Groundwater within the Point Loma hydrologic area of the Pueblo San Diego hydrologic unit is exempt from municipal and domestic supply beneficial use and does not support municipal and domestic supply. Groundwater within the Mission San Diego hydrologic subarea of the Lower San Diego hydrologic area of the San Diego hydrologic unit has a potential beneficial use for municipal and domestic supply. Storm water regulations that encourage infiltration of storm water runoff and protection of water quality would protect the quality of groundwater resources and support infiltration where appropriate. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and quality, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character			
Would the project result in a substantial obstruction of a vista or scenic view from a public viewing area as identified in the community plan?	Implementation of the project would not result in substantial alteration or blockage of public views or scenic highways from critical view corridors, designated open space areas, public roads, or public parks; new development within the community would take place within the constraints of the existing urban framework and development pattern, thereby not impacting public view corridors and viewsheds along public right-of-way. Therefore, public view impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in a substantial alteration (e.g., bulk, scale materials or style) to the existing or planned (adopted) character of the area?	The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies that would encourage residential and mixed-use development that would be consistent with and improve the existing neighborhood character, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Would the project result in the loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or stand of mature trees as identified in the community plan? (Normally, the removal of non-native trees within a wetland as part of a restoration project would not be considered significant.)	There are protective measures for the existing olive tree located west of the intersection of Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street, and the implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would prevent the loss of existing mature trees except as required because of tree health or public safety. Implementation of the project would not result in the loss of any distinctive or landmark trees, or any stand of mature trees; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in a substantial change in the existing landform?	Implementation of the project would result in less than significant impacts related to landform alteration as the area is already largely developed. Thus, impacts related to landform alteration would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project create substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?	Impacts relative to lighting and glare would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Air Quality			
Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	The net increase in construction and operational emissions under the project over the adopted Community Plan would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants that would exceed any of the thresholds. Thus, emissions associated with the project are already accounted for in the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS), and adoption of the project would not conflict with the RAQS. Thus, impacts related to conflicts with applicable air quality plans would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	The project would not exceed any of the significance thresholds. Thus, construction emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation is required. The project would not significantly increase air pollutants in the region, would not further increase the frequency of existing violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) or California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), or would not result in new exceedances. Therefore, operational air quality impacts associated with implementation of the project would be less than significant. Thus, no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Regarding impacts to sensitive receptors (Issue 3), implementation of the project would not result in any carbon monoxide (CO) hotspots. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains policies related to the siting of land uses and air quality, and implementation of the project is consistent with the goals of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) handbook. Thus, air quality impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	The project does not propose land uses associated with generation of adverse odors. Further, San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) rules prohibit the emission of any material which causes a nuisance to a considerable number of persons or endangers the comfort, health, or safety of the public. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
Would the project generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Potential impacts related to GHG emissions from implementation of the project would be less than significant, as the increase in GHG emissions from the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would be attributable to the more intensive land uses per implementation of the CAP and City of Villages strategy. Thus, the project would be consistent with the CAP and would result in a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases?	The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would implement the General Plan's City of Villages strategy and include policies for the promotion of walkability and bicycle use, polices promoting transit-supportive development, and is thus consistent with the CAP and the General Plan. Impacts related to conflicts with applicable plans and policies addressing GHG emissions would be less than significant. Thus, no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
Public Services and Facilities			
Would the project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered public facilities (including police protection, parks or other recreational facilities, fire/life safety protection, libraries, or schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives?	Police Protection Regarding police protection, implementation of the project would result in an increase in overall population. However, the proposed increase in population would not require that SPDP expand or construct new facilities. Therefore, impacts related to the expansion/construction of new facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Parks and Recreation Regarding park and recreational facilities, there is an existing and projected deficit in population-based parks and recreational facilities, which is an adverse impact but not considered significant at the program level. Implementation of the project would provide policy support for increasing the acreage of population-based parks and recreational facilities in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, but does not propose design and construction of new facilities. The effects of these policies have been analyzed throughout this PEIR. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact related to parks and recreation facilities, and no mitigation is required. Fire/Life Safety Protection Regarding fire/life safety protection, implementation of the project would result in an increase in overall population. However, the proposed increase in population would not require that the Fire-Rescue Department expand or construct new facilities. Therefore, impacts related to the expansion/construction of new facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Libraries Since the project does not include the construction of library facilities and facility needs would be met within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, impacts related to library facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. Schools Regarding school facilities, future residential development that occurs in accordance with the project would be required to pay school fees as outlined in Government Code Section 65995, Education Code Section 53080, and Senate Bill 50 to mitigate any potential impact on district schools. The City is legally prohibited from imposing any additional	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	mitigation related to school facilities through implementation of Senate Bill 50, and the school district would be responsible for potential expansion or development of new facilities. Therefore, impacts to schools would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.		
Public Utilities			
Would the project use excessive amounts of water beyond projected available supplies?	Based on the findings of the WSA, there is sufficient water supply to serve existing and projected demands of the project, and future water demands within the Public Utilities Department (PUD) service area in normal and dry year forecasts during a 20-year projection. Therefore, less than significant impacts to water supply are anticipated for implementation of the project. No mitigation is required. For impacts related to Water Distribution facilities, see the threshold below.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain service ratios, or other performance objectives?	<u>Storm Water</u> Future projects would be required to exercise strict adherence to existing storm water regulations and conformance with General Plan and proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies. Project-specific review under the Municipal Storm Water Permit would assure that significant adverse effects related to the storm water system and the installation of storm water infrastructure would be avoided. In addition, the proposed CPU does not identify any specific storm water infrastructure improvements that are proposed for construction in conjunction with implementation of the project, and the location and extent of future facilities is not known at this time; therefore, no impacts can be identified. Thus, impacts related to storm water facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required. <u>Sewer</u> Sewer line upgrades are administered by the Public Works Department (PWD) and are handled on a project-by-project basis. Because future development under the project would likely increase demand, there may be a need to increase sizing of existing pipelines and sewer mains. However, the proposed CPU does not identify any specific sewer infrastructure improvements that are proposed in conjunction with the project, and the location and extent of future facilities is not known at this time; therefore, no impacts can be identified. Thus, impacts associated with sewer facilities as a result of the project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. <u>Water Facilities</u> As future development takes place in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1
Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
	CPU area, demand for water is likely to increase and create a potential need to increase sizing of existing pipelines, mains, and treatment facilities. However, the proposed CPU does not identify any specific water infrastructure improvements that are proposed in conjunction with the project, and the location and extent of future facilities is not known at this time; therefore, no impacts can be identified. Thus, impacts to water distribution and treatment facilities would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
	<u>Communications Systems</u> As future development takes place in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, demand for communications systems is likely to increase and create a potential need for expansion of facilities. However, the proposed CPU does not identify any specific communications systems infrastructure improvements that are proposed in conjunction with the project, and the location and extent of future facilities is not known at this time; therefore, no impacts can be identified. Thus, impacts to communications systems would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
Would the project result in impacts to solid waste management, including the need for construction of new solid waste infrastructure; or result in a land use plan that would not promote the achievement of a 75 percent waste diversion as targeted in AB 341 and the City's Climate Action Plan?	To ensure that waste generation and recycling efforts during construction and post-construction future land use occupancy and operation (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.) are addressed, a Waste Management Plan (WMP) shall be prepared for any project proposed under the project exceeding the 60 tons or more threshold for projects of 40,000 square feet or more. Implementation of these WMPs would ensure that future development project impacts would be less than significant. Ministerial projects and discretionary projects that would fall below the 60 ton threshold, would be required to comply with the SDMC sections addressing construction and demolition debris, waste and recyclable materials storage, and recyclable materials (and in the future, organic materials) collection. Therefore, at this program level of review, the project would not require increased landfill capacity, and impacts associated with solid waste would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Biological Resources			
Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or	Implementation of the project would result in land use changes that would affect primarily developed areas. Thus, impacts to sensitive species would not be anticipated to occur. Therefore, based on the lack of sensitive species anticipated to occur in the developable areas of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area in addition to the regulatory framework in	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
special status species in the MSCP or other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	place that protects sensitive species, impacts to wildlife species would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact on any Tier I Habitats, Tier II Habitats, Tier IIIA Habitats, or Tier IIIB Habitats, as identified in the Biology Guidelines of the Land Development manual, or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?	Implementation of the project would result in land use changes that would affect developed areas, which are not considered sensitive vegetation communities. Although the San Diego River is adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, development and growth would be located south of I-8, and vegetation communities along the San Diego River, north of I-8, would not be indirectly impacted by activities associated with the project. Impacts to sensitive habitats would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact on wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, riparian, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Implementation of the project would not result in direct impacts to wetlands (riparian scrub), as area where this habitat occurs are outside of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Although the San Diego River is adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, development and growth would be located south of I-8, and wetland habitat within and along the San Diego River, north of I-8, would not be indirectly impacted by activities associated with the project. No impacts to wetlands are expected; therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, including linkages identified in the MSCP Plan, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area does not include wildlife corridors and thus, no impact to wildlife corridors would occur. In addition, wildlife corridors adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would not be impacted. The San Diego River, north of I-8, functions as a local and regional wildlife corridor; however, development and growth would be located south of I-8. Indirect impacts associated with development and growth in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would not extend north of I-8. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than Significant
Would the project result in a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or	The project would be consistent with the City's MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines and SDMC (Section 142.0740) requirements relative to lighting adjacent to the MHPA. Additionally, in complying with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines requirements, landscape plans for future projects	None Required	Less than Significant

Table S-1 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts			
Environmental Issue	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level After Mitigation
other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan, either within the MSCP plan area or in the surrounding region?	would require that grading would not impact environmentally sensitive land, that potential runoff would not drain into MHPA land, that toxic materials used on a development do not impact adjacent sensitive land, that development includes barriers that would reduce predation by domestic animals, and that landscaping does not contain exotic plants/invasive species. In addition, the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines directs development so that any brush management activities are minimized within the MHPA, and contains requirements to reduce potential noise impacts to listed avian species. Compliance with the City's MHPA Land Adjacency Guidelines and adherence to the policies in the Conservation Element of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would reduce potential impacts of the project to less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
Paleontological Resources			
Would the project result in development that requires over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation in a high resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit or over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit?	The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is underlain by the Mount Soledad and Bay Point Formations, which are all assigned a high paleontological resource sensitivity. However, the majority of the project site is underlain by artificial fill, which has zero resource sensitivity. Because of high sensitivity for paleontological resources within the Mount Soledad and Bay Point formations, grading into these formations could potentially destroy fossil resources. Therefore, implementation of future discretionary and ministerial projects within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area within these formations has the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.	Mitigation Measure **PALEO 5.14-1** as described in Section 5.14, Paleontological Resources.	Discretionary Projects Less than Significant with Mitigation Ministerial Projects **Significant and Unavoidable**

This page intentionally left blank.

1

Chapter 1.0 Introduction

This ~~draft~~ final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update (proposed CPU; proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU) and other associated discretionary actions (collectively referred to throughout this PEIR as the "project") has been prepared on behalf of the City of San Diego (City) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq. and California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title14, Section 15000, et seq.) and in accordance with the City's Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (EIR Guidelines; City of San Diego 2005) and the City's California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds (Significance Determination Thresholds) (2016).

The project analyzed within this PEIR includes a number of legislative actions to be considered by the City Council but primarily is a comprehensive update of the 1991 Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU reflects Citywide policies and programs developed in the City of San Diego General Plan Update of 2008 (General Plan) and is consistent with the General Plan. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains nine elements, as well as an Introduction and Implementation section. The elements are as follows: Land Use, Villages and Districts; Mobility; Urban Design; Economic Prosperity; Public Facilities, Services and Safety; Recreation; Conservation; Noise; and Historic Preservation.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains a specific vision embodied in its guiding principles, as well as key goals. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU also contains policies and recommendations related to a range of topics included in each section such as multi-modal mobility, urban design, environmental conservation, recreation opportunities, neighborhood character, and historic preservation, in accordance with the general goals stated in the General Plan. The proposed CPU serves as the basis for guiding a variety of other future implementing actions, such as parkland acquisitions and joint use agreements, and multi-modal mobility improvements.

1.1 PEIR Purpose and Intended Uses

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15121, the purpose of this PEIR is to provide public agency decision-makers and members of the public with detailed information about the potential significant environmental effects of the project, possible ways to minimize its significant effects, and reasonable alternatives that would reduce or avoid any identified significant effects. This PEIR is informational in nature and is intended for use by decision-makers, Responsible or Trustee Agencies as defined under CEQA, other interested agencies or jurisdictions, and the general public. The PEIR includes recommended mitigation measures which, when implemented, would lessen project impacts and provide the City, the lead agency as defined in Article 4 of the CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15050 through 15051), with ways to substantially lessen or avoid significant effects of the project on the environment, whenever feasible. Alternatives to the proposed CPU are presented to evaluate alternative land use scenarios, policies, and/or regulations that would further reduce or avoid significant impacts associated with the project.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, a PEIR may serve as the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for subsequent activities or implementing actions, including future development of public and private projects, to the extent it contemplates and adequately analyzes the potential environmental impacts of those subsequent projects. If, in examining future actions for development within the proposed CPU area, the City finds no new effects could occur, or no new mitigation measures would be required other than those analyzed and/or required in the PEIR, the City can approve the activity as being within the scope covered by this PEIR, and no new environmental documentation would be required. If additional analysis is required, it can be streamlined by tiering from this PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15152, 15153, and 15168 (e.g., through preparation of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, Addendum, or EIR).

1.2 PEIR Legal Authority

1.2.1 Lead Agency

The City of San Diego is the lead agency for the project pursuant to Article 4 (Sections 15050 and 15051) of the CEQA Guidelines. The lead agency, as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15367, is the public agency that has the principal responsibility and authority for carrying out or approving a project. On behalf of the lead agency, the City's Planning Department conducted a preliminary review of the project and decided that an EIR was required. The analysis and findings in this document reflect the independent, impartial conclusions of the City.

1.2.2 Responsible and Trustee Agencies

State law requires that all EIRs be reviewed by Responsible and Trustee Agencies. A Responsible Agency, defined pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15381, includes all public agencies other than the lead agency that have discretionary approval power over the project. A Trustee Agency is defined in Section 15386 of the CEQA Guidelines as a state agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by a project that are held in trust for the people of the state of California. Implementation of the project would require subsequent actions or consultation from Responsible or

Trustee Agencies. A brief description of some of the primary Responsible or Trustee Agencies that may have an interest in the project is provided below.

1.2.2.1 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has jurisdiction over development in or affecting the navigable waters of the United States. All permits issued by the USACE are subject to consultation and/or review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Drainages occurring within the proposed CPU area may contain streams and wetlands, which may be classified as jurisdictional waters of the United States. No permits from USACE are required at this time; however, future development projects, particularly improvements to infrastructure such as water and sewer lines that could occur with implementation of the project, may require review and/or USACE permits in the future.

1.2.2.2 California Department of Transportation

The proposed CPU area is adjacent to California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) facilities, including Interstate 5 (I-5) and Interstate 8 (I-8). No permits from Caltrans are required at this time; however, Caltrans approval would be required for any encroachments or construction of facilities in a Caltrans right-of-way associated with future projects within the proposed CPU area.

1.2.2.3 San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

The San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates water quality through the Federal Clean Water Act Section 401 certification process and oversees the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CAS0109266. The RWQCB is responsible for implementing permitting, compliance, and other activities to reduce pollutants in municipal, construction, and industrial storm water runoff, including overseeing the development and implementation of Water Quality Improvement Plans (WQIPs) as required by the Regional Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit for the San Diego region, which includes the City, as well as ensuring that all other MS4 permit requirements are met. No permits from the RWQCB are required at this time; however, future development projects within the proposed CPU area may require review and/or Section 401 certifications.

1.2.2.4 San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority operates the San Diego International Airport (SDIA). The Airport Authority also serves as San Diego County's Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) and is responsible for land use planning as it relates to public safety surrounding the region's airports. As a Responsible Agency, the Airport Authority, acting as the ALUC, would review future development proposals within the proposed CPU area and make "consistency determinations" with the provisions and policies set forth in the SDIA Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) up until the time the ALUC determines the proposed CPU and zoning consistent with the ALUCP for SDIA. Future development projects within the proposed CPU area would be subject to the noise, safety, overflight, and airspace protection policies in the ALUCP for SDIA, which also include the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 77 requirement to provide notification to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) as addressed in the ALUCP for SDIA.

1.2.2.5 San Diego Unified Port District

The San Diego Unified Port District (Port) has jurisdiction over the tidelands and submerged lands within San Diego Bay and maintains and controls those tidelands and submerged lands for public benefit. As a tool to allow the Port to regulate its lands, the Port adopts a Master Plan that provides planning and land policies for the physical development of tidelands and submerged lands. The Port has land management authority over the Port-owned parcels in the Kettner District south of Vine Street in the southeastern portion of the proposed CPU area as shown in Figure 3-1.

1.3 EIR Type, Scope and Content, and Format

1.3.1 Type of EIR

This EIR has been prepared as a Program EIR (PEIR), as defined in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. In accordance with CEQA, this PEIR examines the environmental impacts of the proposed CPU, which comprise a series of actions. The combined actions can be characterized as one large project for the purpose of environmental review in this PEIR and are herein collectively referred to as the "project." The PEIR focuses on the physical changes in the environment that would result from adoption and implementation of the project, described in Chapter 3.0, Project Description, including anticipated general impacts that could result during future construction and operation.

1.3.2 PEIR Scope and Content

The scope of analysis for this PEIR was determined by the City as a result of initial project review, as well as consideration of comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) circulated November 4, 2015, and a scoping meeting held on November 18, 2015, at the San Diego Continuing Education Center West City Campus, 3249 Fordham Street, Room 205, San Diego, California 92110. The NOP for analysis of the project, related letters received, and comments made during the scoping meeting are included as Appendix A of this PEIR. Through these scoping activities, the project was determined to have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts to the following subject areas:

- Land Use
- Transportation and Circulation
- Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources
- Geologic Conditions
- Noise
- Health and Safety
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Public Services and Facilities
- Public Utilities
- Biological Resources
- Paleontological Resources

It should be noted that the NOP for the PEIR included the project as well as the proposed CPU for the Old Town Community Plan area. The environmental analysis for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU has been separated from the analysis of the Old Town Community Plan Update. The Old Town Community Plan Update is analyzed in a separate PEIR, which will be circulated for public review

separately. The State Clearinghouse number assigned with issuance of the NOP (SCH # 2015111013) is being used for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU PEIR and a new State Clearinghouse number will be assigned for the Old Town CPU PEIR at the start of public review.

The intent of this PEIR is to determine whether implementation of the project would have a significant effect on the environment through analysis of each issue identified during the scoping process. The Environmental Analysis for the project is presented in the Environmental Analysis chapter in this PEIR (Sections 5.1 through 5.14). Each environmental issue area presented in this chapter includes presentation of threshold(s) of significance for the particular issue area under evaluation based on the CEQA Guidelines and the City's Significance Determination Thresholds (2016); identification of an issue statement; an assessment of any impacts including cumulative impacts; a summary of any project impacts; and recommendations for mitigation measures and mitigation monitoring and reporting, as appropriate, for each significant issue area.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, all phases, or in the case of this project, discretionary actions associated with the proposed CPUs, are considered at the program-level in this PEIR when evaluating potential impacts on the environment, including the construction of future development and supporting facilities and infrastructure. Impacts are identified as direct or indirect, and short-term or long-term, and are assessed on a plan-to-ground basis. The plan-to-ground analysis addresses the changes or impacts that would result from implementation of the project compared to existing ground conditions. In some cases, the proposed CPU is also compared with the current Community Plan to provide context and background for the analysis.

The PEIR includes all mandatory contents of EIRs as required pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15120 through 15132. A Cumulative Impacts analysis is presented within each specific environmental issue area of Chapter 6.0. Chapter 7.0, Other Mandatory Discussion Areas, presents a brief discussion of potential growth-inducing impacts, environmental effects that were evaluated as part of the initial scoping and review process for the project and were found not to be potentially significant, and unavoidable significant environmental impacts and significant irreversible environmental changes.

Chapter 8.0 of this PEIR includes a discussion of Alternatives that could avoid or reduce potentially significant environmental effects associated with implementation of the project. Alternatives discussed in the PEIR include the No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2. For the purposes of this PEIR, the No Project Alternative would be the continued implementation of the adopted Community Plan with the same land uses as identified in that Community Plan.

1.3.3 PEIR Format

The format and order of contents of this PEIR follow the direction in the City's EIR Guidelines. A brief overview of the various chapters of this PEIR is provided below:

- Executive Summary (CEQA Guidelines Section 15123). Provides a summary of the PEIR, a brief description of the project, identification of areas of controversy, issues to be resolved by the decision-makers, and inclusion of a summary table identifying significant impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and significance of impact after mitigation. A summary of the project

alternatives and comparison of the potential impacts of the alternatives with those of the project is also provided.

- Chapter 1.0, Introduction. Contains an overview of the legal authority, purpose, and intended uses of the PEIR, as well as its scope and content.

- Chapter 2.0, Environmental Setting (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125). Provides a description of the project's regional context, location, and existing physical characteristics and land use within the proposed CPU area. An overview of available public infrastructure and services, as well as relationship to relevant plans, is also provided in this chapter. The Environmental Setting chapter is detailed, providing background information relevant to each environmental issue area further addressed in Sections 5.1 through 5.14. Within the proposed CPU impact analysis chapter, the applicable environmental setting discussion contained in Chapter 2.0 is referenced to avoid repetition.

- Chapter 3.0, Project Description (CEQA Guidelines Section 15124). Provides a detailed discussion of the project, including background, objectives, key features, and environmental design considerations.

- Chapter 4.0, Regulatory Framework. Provides a summary of the applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and requirements relevant to each issue area.

- Chapter 5.0, Environmental Analysis (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126). This chapter provides a detailed community-specific evaluation of potential environmental impacts associated with the project for environmental issues determined through the initial review and public scoping processes to be potentially significant. Chapter 5.0 begins with the issue of land use, followed by the remaining issues in order of significance. The analysis of each issue begins with a reference to the environmental setting and regulatory framework provided in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively, and a statement of specific thresholds used to determine significance of impacts, followed by an evaluation of potential impacts. If significant impacts are identified, feasible mitigation measures to avoid or reduce any significant impacts are identified. Where mitigation measures are required, a statement regarding the significance of the impact after mitigation is provided.

- Chapter 6.0, Cumulative Impacts (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130). Provides a detailed discussion of the project's incremental effects. According to Section 15065, "cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effect of past projects, the effect of other current projects, and effects of probable future projects as defined in Section 15130.

- Chapter 7.0, Other Mandatory Discussion Areas.

    - Effects Found Not to Be Significant. Identifies all of the issues determined in the scoping and preliminary environmental review process to be not significant for the project, and briefly summarizes the basis for these determinations. For the project, it was determined that environmental issues associated with agriculture, mineral resources, and population and housing would not be significant, and, therefore, are summarized in Chapter 7.0.

  - Growth Inducement (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)). Evaluates the potential influence the project may have on economic or population growth within the proposed CPU area, as well as the region, either directly or indirectly.
  - Significant Unavoidable Impacts/Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes/Energy Conservation (CEQA Guidelines Sections 15126(b), 15126(c), and 15126.4 (a)(1)) provides a summary of any significant unavoidable impacts of the project as detailed in Chapter 7.0. This chapter also describes the potentially significant irreversible changes that may be expected and addresses the use of nonrenewable resources and energy use anticipated during project implementation.

- Chapter 8.0, Alternatives (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). Provides a description of alternatives to the project, including the No Project (Adopted Community Plan) Alternative, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2.
- Chapter 9.0, References. Lists all of the reference materials cited in the PEIR.
- Chapter 10.0, Individuals and Agencies Consulted (CEQA Guidelines Section 15129). Identifies all of the individuals and agencies contacted during preparation of the PEIR.
- Chapter 11.0, Certification. Identifies all of the agencies, organizations, and individuals responsible for the preparation of the PEIR.

Technical reports, used as a basis for much of the environmental analysis in the PEIR, have been summarized in the PEIR, and are included as appendices to this PEIR. The technical reports prepared for the project and their location in the PEIR are listed in the table of contents. Availability of the Draft PEIR and the technical appendices is discussed in Section 1.4.1, Draft PEIR.

1.3.4 Incorporation by Reference

As permitted by CEQA Guidelines Section 15150, this PEIR has referenced several technical studies and reports. Information from these documents has been briefly summarized in this PEIR, and their relationship to this PEIR is described. These documents are included in Chapter 9.0, References Cited, are hereby incorporated by reference, and are available for review at the City Planning Department, located at 1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1200, San Diego, California 92101. Included within the list of materials incorporated by reference into this PEIR are the following:

- City of San Diego General Plan (City of San Diego 2008a)
- City of San Diego Program Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan (Final PEIR) (City of San Diego 2007)
- City of San Diego Housing Element FY2013-FY2020 (City of San Diego 2013)
- City of San Diego Municipal Code (City of San Diego 2008b)
- City of San Diego Climate Action Plan (City of San Diego 2015)
- Appendix N: CPU Future Land Use Projections and Analysis for Sports Arena Site

1.4 PEIR Process

The City, as lead agency, is responsible for the preparation and review of this PEIR. The PEIR review process occurs in two basic stages. The first stage is the Draft PEIR, which offers the public the opportunity to comment on the document, and the second stage is the Final PEIR.

1.4.1 Draft PEIR

In accordance with San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 128.0306 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15105, the Draft PEIR is distributed for review to the public and interested and affected agencies for a review period of 45 days. The purpose of the review period is to allow the public an opportunity to provide comments "on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided and mitigated" (Section 15204, CEQA Guidelines). SDMC Section 128.0307 allows the Planning Director to approve requests for additional public review time from the affected officially recognized community planning group, in this case the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Planning Group. Approval of additional review time shall not exceed 14 calendar days.

The Draft PEIR and all related technical studies are available for review during the public review period at the offices of the Planning Department, located at 1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1200, San Diego, California 92101, and on the Planning Department website for CEQA Policy and Review:

http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/ceqa/

The Midway-Pacific Highway CPU website is:

https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpu/oldtownmidway

Electronic copies of the Draft PEIR are also available at the following public libraries:

- San Diego Central Library
  330 Park Boulevard
  San Diego, California 92101

- Ocean Beach Library
  4801 Santa Monica Avenue
  San Diego, California 92107

- Point Loma/Hervey Library
  3701 Voltaire Street
  San Diego, California 92107

- Mission Hills Library
  925 W. Washington Street
  San Diego, California 92103

1.4.2 Final PEIR

Following the end of the public review period, the City, as lead agency, will provide written responses to comments received on the Draft PEIR per CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. All comments and responses have been ~~will be~~ considered in the review of the PEIR. Detailed responses to the comments received during public review, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), Findings of Fact, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for impacts identified in the PEIR as significant and unavoidable have been ~~will be~~ prepared and compiled as part of the PEIR finalization process. The culmination of this process is a public hearing where the City Council will determine whether to certify the Final PEIR, which includes the MMRP, Findings, and Statement of Overriding Considerations, as being complete and in accordance with CEQA. ~~The~~ This Final PEIR will be available for public review at least 14 days before the City Council public hearing to provide commenters the opportunity to review the written responses to their comment letters.

This page intentionally left blank.

2

Chapter 2.0
Environmental Setting


At the time of the release of the NOP on November 4, 2015, the PEIR was to discuss the potential impacts of implementing two specific CPUs (i.e., Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town San Diego). Subsequent to the issuance of the NOP, the analysis of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU was separated from the Old Town San Diego CPU analysis. This chapter discusses the Midway-Pacific Highway community's setting at the time of the release of the NOP.

2.1 Regional Location

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located in west-central San Diego, to the north of SDIA, and south of Mission Bay (Figures 2-1 and 2-2). The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area lies between the north end of the Peninsula Community Plan area to the west and the Old Town San Diego Community Plan area to the east.

The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area was historically an area of tidal marshes and flats where the San Diego River flowed alternately into San Diego Bay and Mission Bay. Early attempts at developing the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area were impeded by these swamp-like conditions. Eventually, the San Diego River mouth was channelized to flow into the Pacific Ocean between the two bays. Development of the area was based largely around regional transportation improvements including railways and highways, military development, and aviation.

Major transportation corridors traverse the community, connecting Downtown San Diego to other communities in the City, as well as the region. Transportation development in the area began with the California Southern Railroad and a local electric street railway system. As the use of the automobile increased in the San Diego area, construction of highways began in the proposed CPU area, including what would be designated in 1925 as US Highway 101, and later I-5 and I-8.



Source: Esri; SanGIS; SANDAG.

4.5 2.25 0 4.5 Miles

Scale: 1:285,120 ; 1 in = 4.5 miles

Figure 2-1
Regional Location

Path: P:_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\920 GIS\922_Maps\CommunityPlan\Midway_Regional.mxd, 8/17/2017, paul.moreno



Source: SANDAG 2014; City of San Diego 2017

2,000 1,000 0 2,000 Feet

Scale: 1:30,000 ; 1 inch = 2,500 feet

Figure 2-2
Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area

Path: P:_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\920 GIS\922_Maps\CommunityPlan\Midway_Community_Plan_Area.mxd, 8/17/2017, paul.moreno

The proposed CPU area is urbanized and generally characterized as a mix of commercial and industrial areas, with some residential areas. Commercial development of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area began in 1912 with the Mission Brewery. Modern commercial and industrial buildings were constructed over time in vacant lots or to replace older commercial and residential buildings. Military development also began in the early 20th century with the development of the Naval Training Center (NTC) and the Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD). The Ryan Field flight school opened in 1922 and was used to train Army pilots during World War II (WWII). Development of the area during WWII was heavily associated with and influenced by aviation and military-related industries, and included the Consolidated Aircraft factory and the federal Frontier Housing development for factory workers. Following WWII, the area was bisected from Uptown and Old Town by the development of I-5. Automobile-oriented development patterns along with relaxed urban design requirements and the reuse of former federal property resulted in superblocks and a lack of uniformity in the built environment throughout the Midway-Pacific Highway area.

2.2 Project Location

The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area encompasses roughly 1,324 acres of relatively flat area and is composed of three main elements: the Midway area, which consists mainly of an urbanized commercial core; the narrow Pacific Highway corridor, which runs along I-5 from the southern end of the Midway area south to Laurel Street; and MCRD. The San Diego River functions as the northern boundary of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area. SDIA provides the southern boundary for MCRD, as well as the western boundary for the Pacific Highway corridor. I-5 forms the eastern boundary of the proposed CPU area.

Midway's overall physical structure reflects its geography and historical development patterns. The street system does not have a consistent grid pattern throughout the proposed CPU area. The proposed CPU area is traversed by several major streets: Sports Arena Boulevard and Midway Drive run northwest-southeast across the proposed CPU area and intersect with Camino Del Rio West and Rosecrans Street, which run southwest-northeast. Pacific Highway runs parallel to I-5 from Old Town to the southern proposed CPU boundary; and Barnett Avenue and Lytton Street connect Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway and serve as a dividing line between the Midway area and MCRD.

2.3 Existing Physical Characteristics

2.3.1 Land Use

2.3.1.1 Existing Land Uses


The Midway-Pacific Highway community has a limited number of vacant parcels. As shown in Table 2-1, military land uses comprise approximately 447 acres or 34 percent of the approximately 1,324 total acres within the community and is the predominant land use type within the Midway-Pacific Highway community. Transportation accounts for approximately 312 acres or approximately 24 percent of the total acreage in the community. Retail commercial uses cover approximately 184 acres or approximately 14 percent of the total area within the community.

Table 2-1 Existing Land Uses – Midway-Pacific Highway	
Land Use	Acres
Residential	
Single-Family Residential	0.8
Multi-Family Residential	81.1
Total	81.9
Commercial and Office	
Office Commercial	38.8
Retail Commercial	183.9
Visitor Commercial	19.0
Stadium/Arena	33.2
Parking (Airport-Related and Other Stand-Alone)	18.9
Total	293.8
Industrial	
Total	126.1
Institutional and Educational	
Education	11.2
Institutional	43.0
Total	54.2
Military	
Total	447.1
Transportation and Utilities	
Transportation	312.0
Utilities	3.1
Total	315.1
Vacant	
Total	5.8
Total Acreage	**1,324.0**

The existing land uses and distribution are depicted in Figure 2-3, summarized in Table 2-1, and discussed below.

a. Residential

Existing residential land uses make up a small percentage of land use acreage in the community. Residential land use types include multi-family dwellings such as apartments or town homes, as well as single-family unattached homes. Currently, there are 1,970 multi-family dwelling units and 12 single-family residences within the proposed CPU area. Residential densities vary throughout the community. Low-Medium Residential density is located in the southwest corner of the Midway area, between Barnett Avenue and Rosecrans Street, near Lytton Street. Medium Residential density areas are located in small pockets at the northwest corner of the intersection of Hancock Street and Sports Arena Boulevard, as well as along the south side of Kenyon Street. Medium-High Residential density is located adjacent to the Low-Medium density area near Lytton Street, as well as adjacent to the Medium-High density pocket along Kenyon Street, and near Midway Drive and Cauby Street. There is also a very small area of High and Very High Residential density between Hancock Street and Kurtz Street near Noell Street.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP; Kennedy and Tan, 2008

0 1,600 3,200 Feet

Figure 2-3
Existing Land Use

b. Commercial/Mixed Use

Existing commercial land uses are the primary land use type within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Commercial land uses in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area consist of retail commercial, visitor commercial, and office commercial land uses. These areas are located primarily in the center of the Midway area surrounding the Sports Arena, mainly along Sports Arena Boulevard, Midway Drive, and Rosecrans Street. Other commercial land uses are located in the Pacific-Highway corridor along Hancock Street and Pacific Highway.

c. Institutional

Existing institutional uses provide public or private facilities that serve a public benefit. These uses may serve the community or a broader area. Major institutional land uses within the community include the County of San Diego's Health Services Complex, Veterans Village of San Diego, the San Diego Community College District's West City Continuing Education Center, Fire Station No. 20, and several public and private schools. Libraries and police facilities that serve the area are located outside of the proposed CPU area.

d. Parks and Open Space

Parks and open space areas fulfill a variety of important purposes in the community including active and passive recreation, conservation of resources and protection of views, and providing visual relief in a built-out urban environment. There are no existing public parks or open space areas within the proposed CPU area.

2.3.1.2 Adopted Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan

The adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan (adopted Community Plan [City of San Diego 1991]) covers approximately 800 acres including the Midway area and the Pacific Highway corridor of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, but does not encompass MCRD. The adopted Community Plan provides more detailed land use, design, roadway, and implementation policies and information than found in the General Plan. The adopted Community Plan identifies key issues in the community and enumerates a set of goals and objectives to achieve the community's vision. Specific policies to implement the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan's vision are contained in its elements: Bay-to-Bay Connection; Commercial Land Use; Industrial Land Use; Multiple Use; Institutional Land Use; Residential Land Use; Circulation; Community Facilities and Services; Conservation of Environmental Quality; Cultural and Heritage Resources; and Local Coastal Area. The Local Coastal Area Element includes policies and recommendations to meet the requirements of the California Coastal Act (Coastal Act) within the portion of the community that is within the Coastal Zone. The adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan would be replaced by the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

2.3.2 Transportation and Circulation

Portions of the Midway-Pacific Highway community have a grid-like street network with small blocks that was carried through from the neighboring communities of Old Town San Diego and Uptown. The Old

Town San Diego traditional grid pattern is featured northeast of Kurtz Street and is bisected by I-5 and Camino Del Rio West. The Pacific Highway corridor of the proposed CPU area reflects the grid pattern from the adjacent Uptown community. The area southwest of Kurtz Street contains large "superblocks" with auto-oriented commercial uses and the San Diego Sports Arena, which impede pedestrian and north-south vehicle travel. The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area is identified in the General Plan's Land Use and Street System Map (contained in the Land Use and Community Planning Element, Figure LU-2). Traffic circulation patterns within the Midway-Pacific Highway community are reflective of the fact that freeways form or traverse the eastern (I-5) and northern (I-8) edges of the community. Truck transport of goods occurs within the proposed CPU area on these freeways and on local roads.

2.3.2.1 Roadways and Access

Freeway and/or highway access in the vicinity of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area is provided via I-5, which is a north-south route, and I-8, which is an east-west route. These highways improved regional accessibility and contributed to the area's focus on automobile-oriented commercial uses.

Major roadways within the proposed CPU area generally run in a northeast-southwest and northwest-southeast direction. The most prominent roadways are Sports Arena Boulevard, Midway Drive, Rosecrans Street, Camino Del Rio West, and Pacific Highway. Traffic on many of the major roadway segments within the proposed CPU area currently meets acceptable levels as defined by City thresholds. However, traffic in the southeastern portion of the Midway area generally creates lower levels of service on those roadways.

2.3.2.2 Public Transportation

The City works with local agencies to provide transportation systems for its residents and visitors. Bus (including Rapid Bus) and light rail transit service, as well as commuter rail, is provided by the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD). The proposed CPU area is served by the San Diego Trolley (light rail transit) and bus service operated by MTS.

a. Rapid Bus

Rapid Bus is corridor-level service providing fast and frequent transit services designed to take advantage of both freeway improvements, such as High Occupancy Vehicle and managed lanes, and arterial improvements in order to serve longer distance regional trips. The Rapid Bus service on arterials will operate on arterial roadways and provide limited-stop, high-speed service along key corridors throughout the region, supplementing existing local bus service. Future Rapid Bus service is planned to serve the proposed CPU area as identified in the San Diego Association of Governments' (SANDAG) San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan (RP).

b. Light Rail Transit (LRT)

LRT is a type of transit vehicle and service that uses steel wheels and operates over railroad tracks. LRT systems generally serve stations averaging 1 mile apart, are not remotely controlled, and can operate in a separated right-of-way or on public streets. The San Diego Trolley is an LRT system operated by MTS.

The Trolley, which runs parallel to I-5, has transit stops adjacent to and within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area.


2.3.2.3 Heavy Rail

The Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad operates at night along separate tracks paralleling the trolley tracks. Amtrak operates the Pacific Surfliner passenger train that runs from the Santa Fe Depot in Downtown San Diego to San Luis Obispo in Central California. NCTD operates the Coaster, which takes passengers from the city of Oceanside to the Santa Fe Depot. The Pacific Surfliner passenger train and NCTD Coaster have stops adjacent to the proposed CPU area.

2.3.2.4 Bicycle Facilities

Types of bicycle facilities, as classified for the purposes of mobility planning, include bicycle paths (Class I), bicycle lanes (Class II), bicycle routes (Class III), and cycle tracks (Class IV). Table 2-2 shows the existing bicycle facilities and classifications within the proposed CPU area. Discussion of existing bicycle facilities in the community can be found in Section 5.2.1.6(b) of this PEIR.

Table 2-2
Bicycle Facilities Classification System



Source: City of San Diego 2017a

2.3.2.5 Pedestrian Facilities

Types of pedestrian routes, as classified for the purposes of mobility planning, include district sidewalks, corridor sidewalks, connector sidewalks, neighborhood sidewalks, and ancillary pedestrian facilities. Discussion of existing pedestrian facilities in the community can be found in Section 5.2.1.6(c) of this PEIR.

2.3.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

A Tribal Cultural Resource is defined as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object, which is of cultural value to a Tribe, and is either on or eligible for listing in the national, state or a local historic register, or the lead agency, at its discretion, chooses to treat the resource as a Tribal Cultural Resource (Public Resources Code Section 21074).

Historical resources are physical features, both natural and constructed, that reflect past human existence and are of historical, archaeological, scientific, educational, cultural, architectural, aesthetic, or traditional significance. These resources may include such physical objects and features as archaeological sites and artifacts, buildings, groups of buildings, structures, districts, street furniture, signs, cultural properties, and landscapes. Historical resources in the San Diego region span a timeframe of at least the last 10,000 years and include both the prehistoric and historic periods. For purposes of the PEIR, historical resources consist of archaeological sites and built environment resources determined as significant under CEQA.

Archaeological resources include prehistoric and historic locations or sites where human actions have resulted in detectable changes to the area. This can include changes in the soil, as well as the presence of physical cultural remains. Archaeological resources can have a surface component, a subsurface component, or both. Historic archaeological resources are those originating after European contact. These resources may include subsurface features such as wells, cisterns, or privies. Other historic archaeological remains include artifact concentrations, building foundations, or remnants of structures.

2.3.3.1 Prehistory

The prehistoric cultural sequence for what is now San Diego County is generally thought of as three basic periods: Paleoindian, locally characterized by the San Dieguito complex; Archaic, characterized by the cobble and core technology of the La Jollan and Pauma complexes; and Late Prehistoric, marked by the appearance of ceramics, small arrow points, and cremation burial practices. Late Prehistoric materials in southern San Diego County, known as Yuman I and Yuman II, are believed to represent the ancestral Kumeyaay.

By the time Spanish colonists began to settle in Alta California in 1769, the areas that are now part of the Midway-Pacific Highway community were within the territory of the Kumeyaay people, a group of exogamous, nontotemic territorial bands with patrilineal descent. The Kumeyaay had a hunting and gathering economy based primarily on various plant resources. During prehistoric occupation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, the area was covered in mud and salt marsh flats. The area was dominated by California cordgrass (*Spartina foliosa*) as well as Pacific pickleweed (*Sarcocornia pacifica*), coastal saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*), and alkali health (*Frankenia salina*) (Holland 1986). Grass seeds were most likely the primary food source, supplemented by other seeds and nuts. Small game was

a major source of protein, but deer were hunted as well. Coastal bands ate a great deal of fish, taking them with lines, nets, and bows and arrows. Balsas or reed boats were used. Shellfish and other littoral resources were important to coastal people, too. Settlements were moved seasonally to areas where wild foods were in season.

Villages and campsites were generally located in areas where water was readily available, preferably on a year-round basis. The San Diego River, which is located along the northern boundary of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area, provided an important resource not only as a reliable source of water, but as a major transportation corridor through the region. Although the actual location of the Native American village of *Kosti/Cosoy*/*Kosaii*/*Kosa'aay* is unknown, it has been described as being near the mouth of the San Diego River, and also reported by Bancroft in 1884 that a site called *Cosoy*/*Kosaii*/*Kosa'aay* by the Native Americans was in the vicinity of Presidio Hill and Old Town, located approximately 0.5 mile east of the community of Midway-Pacific Highway. Several investigations have identified possible locations for the village of *Cosoy*/*Kosaii*/*Kosa'aay*, but the actual site has never been found. One possible location for *Kosti/Cosoy/Kosaii/Kosa'aay* has been mapped by the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) as within the community of Midway-Pacific Highway, based on information listed on site forms as recorded by Malcolm Rogers in 1912. Seven tribal cultural and archaeological resources have been recorded within the Midway-Pacific Highway community. These resources consist of one prehistoric campsite, one prehistoric village site with an associated burial ground, one possible location for the ethnographic village of Kosti/Cosoy/Kosaii/ Kosa'aay, two historic dumps, one historic refuse deposit, and one complex of brick kilns and factory features associated with the Vitrified Products Corporation. These resources were identified during records searches using the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) ~~and~~ at the SCIC at San Diego State University, and the San Diego Museum of Man. An updated records search of the CHRIS was conducted by qualified City staff in 2014 prior to distribution of materials to all culturally affiliated California Native American tribes identified by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in accordance with Senate Bill 18 (SB 18). The updated records search did not identify any newly recorded archaeological sites within the proposed CPU area. Additionally, a Sacred Lands File check was conducted by the ~~Native American Heritage Commission (~~NAHC~~)~~, which concluded that no sacred lands have been identified within the vicinity of the proposed CPU area.

2.3.3.2 History

Spanish colonization of Alta California began in 1769. Camp was initially set up near present-day Downtown San Diego; however, the settlement was soon moved closer to the San Diego River, near the Kumeyaay village of *Kosti/Cosoy/Kosaii/Kosa'aay*. By 1774, the San Diego mission was moved up the river valley to present-day Mission Valley, while the presidio remained on Presidio Hill. The settlement continued to expand throughout the late 1700s and early 1800s to include more permanent structures and agricultural installations. There are no known or potential historic resources from this Spanish Period in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The La Playa Trail ran through the Midway area, generally corresponding to present-day Rosecrans Street. It was the main link between Old San Diego, the mission, and the La Playa ship landing (present-day Point Loma peninsula), and was also known to be an ancient Kumeyaay path. The San Diego Historical Society (now known as the San Diego History Center) initiated a program of marking the 12-mile trail in the early 1930s. Rose Hanks designed a 4-foot-high concrete marker that was placed in six locations. Olive trees were planted next to the markers and at

half-mile intervals staggered from the left to the right side of the trail. One such marker is located west of the intersection of Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street (GPA 2017).

In 1822, Mexico won its independence from Spain, and San Diego became part of the Mexican Republic. By 1835, San Diego had a population of nearly 500 residents and was granted official pueblo status. During the period of Mexican rule, San Diego adopted the rancho system of large agricultural estates and there was a rise of the civilian pueblo. Tension with the Native Americans, coupled with political and economic instability, led to a sharp population decline in San Diego, down to about 150 people by 1840. San Diego's pueblo status was rescinded, and it was made a sub-prefecture of the Los Angeles pueblo. There are no known or potential existing historic resources from the Mexican Period in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area.

By the mid-19th century, San Diego had approximately 650 residents. However, new arrivals were transforming the small Mexican community into a growing commercial center. In 1867, Alonzo Erastus Horton acquired nearly 1,000 acres of land 2 miles south of "Old Town" where Downtown San Diego sits today. Dubbed "New San Diego," Horton orchestrated the creation of a new city center, relocating the City's first bank, main newspaper, and several government buildings to this site. Thus, Old Town was supplanted as the City's primary commercial center. The arrival of the railroad in the 1880s linked San Diego with the eastern United States and sparked its first building boom. By 1887, San Diego's population had spiked to 40,000, and a large tract of new development began to appear on the hills immediately adjacent to Downtown.

By 1892, substantial infrastructure improvements were underway, including public utilities, street paving, sewer systems, and the electrification of the streetcar system. These improvements would be critical to the development of new suburbs surrounding Downtown and the 1,400-acre City Park (Balboa Park), including the present-day communities of North Park, Hillcrest, University Heights, and Golden Hill.

Early attempts at the development of the present-day proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area were impeded due to the swamp-like conditions of the area. The San Diego River naturally switched back and forth between emptying into Mission Bay and emptying into San Diego Bay. In 1853, a dike was built just south of the present flood control channel so that Mission Bay became the outlet for the San Diego River. Settlers began coming to the Midway area in the 1850s, but the settlement area did not take off as it did in Old Town and present-day Downtown San Diego. The Pacific Highway corridor was bypassed for residential development, and so it became a transportation corridor for railroads, streetcars, and automobiles. In 1887, San Diego became home to the first electric street railway system in the western United States. The streetcar line that ran through the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area was generally parallel to the Santa Fe Railroad line until it turned south around Witherby Street to connect to Barnett Avenue. Pacific Highway was also one of the first paved roads in the area.

In the late 19th and 20th centuries, a few isolated residential and commercial buildings were developed, including Mission Brewery, one of the earliest businesses in the area. Mission Brewery is designated San Diego Historical Resources Board Site #232 and is also listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Mission Brewery Bottling Plant is designated San Diego Historical Resources Board Site #1040.

The military presence in San Diego began in 1901 with the establishment of the Navy Coaling Station in Point Loma. William Kettner is credited with the expansion of the military presence during the 1920s. Both NTC and MCRD were built in the early 1920s. Construction on the low-lying Dutch Flats area was

accomplished only after a massive dredging and filling operation. Both of these institutions had a profound influence over the development of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The development of the aerospace industry in San Diego also began in the Dutch Flats area. In 1922, T. Claude Ryan opened up a flying school, called Ryan Field, in the Dutch Flats area, which led to the opening of an aircraft manufacturing plant. The first regularly scheduled airline in America, the San Diego – Los Angeles Airline, operated out of this field beginning in 1925. During WWII, the school trained thousands of Army pilots. Ryan also had contracts with the Navy to build aircraft. Now gone, Ryan Field was located near the intersection of Midway Drive and Barnett Avenue.

In 1928, the San Diego Municipal Airport – Lindbergh Field was opened. The airport was the first federally certified airport to serve all types of aircraft, including seaplanes. The original terminal was located on the northeastern side of the field, along Pacific Highway. The Army Air Corps took over the airport in 1942 and expanded the airport significantly. In 1935, the Consolidated Aircraft manufacturing company moved to San Diego, creating thousands of jobs, and brought about the establishment of smaller firms as well. This increase in jobs, combined with the influx of military personnel and defense workers caused the population to skyrocket, and created a huge demand for housing. The federal government provided money to build massive numbers of defense housing units in San Diego. One such development was located at the intersection of Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street.

After WWII II, small warehouses and industrial buildings began to fill in the undeveloped areas along the Pacific Highway corridor. The Consolidated Aircraft plant continued to be a strong visual element and economic force in the area. The Midway area gave way to commercial strip and shopping center development that mainly catered to nearby residential and visitor populations. Streets were widened, removed, and renamed to facilitate the movement of automobiles. I-5 and I-8 were constructed, which formed rigid barriers between the neighborhoods on the north and east. Commercial business continued to be oriented toward the automobile and mainly consisted of freestanding buildings surrounded by large surface parking lots. Multi-family residential complexes also began appearing in the Midway area during the 1960s. The greatest change to the proposed CPU area in the 1960s was the construction of the International Sports Arena for professional basketball and hockey teams.

Transportation improvements, early industries, and the presence of the airport and military shaped the development of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area in the late 19th and early 20th centuries; however, large portions of the area remained undeveloped. The Pacific Highway corridor was used for defense industries during WWII. Post-war development of the proposed CPU area consisted mainly of small warehouses and commercial buildings that were constructed randomly throughout the area.

Some of the key historical themes in the evolution of the Midway-Pacific Highway community include:

- Transportation Improvements and Early Industrial Development: 1882–1914
- Military, Aerospace, and Related Industrial Development: 1901–1953
- Postwar Commercial and Residential Development: 1945–1970

2.3.4 Geologic Conditions

2.3.4.1 Soils and Geologic Formations

The Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is underlain by surficial soil deposits and two bedrock geologic formations. The mapped surficial soils chiefly include artificial fill and old paralic deposits (Qop unit 6). The geologic formations include the San Diego Formation and the Mt. Soledad Formation. During review of the geologic conditions of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, it was noted that very small portions of the project site were mapped as the San Diego Formation (Wilson Geosciences Inc. 2012). Because the mapped San Diego Formation makes up such a small amount of the proposed CPU area, it is not discussed further below.

a. Artificial Fill

The majority of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is underlain by both engineered and non-engineered artificial fill. These deposits are generally poorly to well consolidated, poorly sorted and permeable, sand, silt, gravel, and clay derived from the local bays and river beds. The artificial fill deposits are locally underlain by young alluvium and bay deposits in the Midway area. Artificial fill and young alluvial deposits are susceptible to liquefaction, settlement, dynamic consolidation, slope instability, and poor foundation characteristics (Kennedy and Tan 2008).

b. Old Paralic Deposits Unit 6 (Bay Point Formation)

The second most common deposit within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is old paralic deposits unit 6 (or Bay Point Formation). These deposits are mostly poorly sorted, moderately permeable, reddish-brown, interfingered strandline, beach, estuarine, and colluvial deposits composed of siltstone, sandstone, and conglomerate. These deposits are possibly susceptible to liquefaction, settlement, dynamic consolidation, and slope instability, and have poor to very good foundation characteristics (Kennedy and Tan 2008).

c. Mt. Soledad Formation

A very small portion of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is underlain by the Mt. Soledad Formation. The Mt. Soledad Formation is characterized as massive, light-brown, medium-grained sandstone. It is not susceptible to liquefaction; is possibly susceptible to settlement, dynamic consolidation, and slope instability; and likely possesses good to excellent foundation characteristics (Kennedy and Tan 2008).

2.3.4.2 Faulting and Seismicity

a. Geologic Hazard Category

There is an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone within the City along portions of the Rose Canyon Fault Zone; however, the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone boundaries do not currently extend into the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The General Plan Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element states that the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area has a low to moderate relative risk

related to geologic conditions. The Rose Canyon Fault Zone strands are considered active and have the potential for surface fault rupture. Surface fault rupture investigations may be required for certain projects or subdivision maps in Geologic Hazard Category 12 areas (City of San Diego 2008). The City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study, Geologic Hazards and Faults (2008), maps the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area as having a low to high potential for liquefaction (Geologic Hazard Category 31 and 32), and having low to moderate risk of slope instability (Geologic Hazard Category 52 and 53). Portions of the Pacific Highway corridor are designated Geologic Hazard Category 12 along the fault zone.

b. Faulting

The active Rose Canyon Fault Zone passes through the southern Midway area and the Pacific Highway corridor (Kennedy and Tan 2008). The Rose Canyon Fault Zone contains segments with both strike-slip (lateral) and dip-slip (vertical) senses of movement in the vicinity of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Within the Rose Canyon Fault Zone are two identified fault strands within the vicinity of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, the Mission Bay and the Old Town fault strands, each with differing levels of degree of activity and damage-generating potential.

In a study performed in the 1990s, it was determined that at least three significant earthquakes occurred during the Holocene epoch (approximately the last 10,000 years) in the Rose Canyon Fault Zone north of Mission Bay, and probably up to six such events occurred (Rockwell 2011). The fault zone shows geomorphic features indicating recent activity, such as offset and linear drainages, scarps, pressure ridges, and sag ponds. Late Holocene activity on the Old Town fault has been demonstrated by recent paleoseismic investigations in Old Town (Rockwell, et al. 2012; Singleton et al.; 2017), and for planning purposes, fault traces within the Rose Canyon Fault Zone should be considered active unless specifically demonstrated otherwise. Conclusive findings about the Mission Bay fault have not been made, but similar considerations should be taken into account (Wilson Geosciences Inc. 2012).

Additionally, a fault branching to the northeast off of the Point Loma fault runs toward the extreme northwest portion of the Midway area. This smaller fault displaces the Bay Point formation about 3 meters, and as such, the Point Loma fault is considered potentially active.

2.3.4.3 Groundwater

Groundwater depth is expected to be near sea level (roughly 10 to 20 feet deep) over most of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Local groundwater levels can change in response to changes in precipitation and runoff, and water quality is subject to impacts of seawater intrusion. Groundwater is mainly found in the young alluvium, San Diego Formation, and Mt. Soledad Formation within the proposed CPU area (Wilson Geosciences Inc. 2012).

2.3.5 Noise

2.3.5.1 Existing Noise Environment

Noise-sensitive receptors are land uses for which the associated primary activities, whether indoor or outdoor, are susceptible to disruption by loud noise events. The most common noise-sensitive uses include residences, hospitals, nursing facilities, intermediate care facilities, educational facilities, libraries,

museums, places of worship, child-care facilities, and certain types of passive recreational parks and open space. Existing noise sources in the proposed CPU area include motor vehicle and stationary sources. Stationary noise sources include industrial and commercial operations. Noise from these sources can conflict with existing noise-sensitive receptors.

2.3.5.2 Fundamentals of Noise

Sound propagation (i.e., the passage of sound from a noise source to a receiver) is influenced by several factors, including the distance from the source, geometric spreading, ground absorption, and atmospheric effects, as well as shielding by natural and/or man-made features. Noise is unwanted or disturbing sound.

The noise descriptors used in the environmental analysis (Section 5.5) are the decibel (dB), A-weighted decibel (dBA), 1-hour average-equivalent noise level (L_{eq}), and the community noise equivalent level (CNEL). L_{eq} is the average dBA sound level over a 1-hour period. A-weighting is a frequency correction that often correlates well with the subjective response of humans to noise. Similar to L_{eq}, the CNEL is a 24-hour average A-weighted decibel sound level. However, CNEL also incorporates a 5 dBA penalty to sound levels occurring between 7:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m., and a 10 dBA penalty to sound levels occurring between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. The additional 5 dBA and 10 dBA penalties during evening and nighttime hours, respectively, are intended to account for the added sensitivity of humans to noise during these time periods. For example, although a noise level of 60 dBA is typically considered acceptable during the day, during rest hours that same 60 dBA noise level may be considered a nuisance. CNEL values are typically used in land use planning to evaluate the compatibility of adjacent land uses.

The subsections below further describe elements and measures of noise.

a. Frequency and Hertz

A continuous sound can be described by its frequency (pitch) and its amplitude (loudness). Frequency relates to the number of pressure oscillations per second. Low-frequency sounds are low in pitch, like the low notes on a piano, whereas high-frequency sounds are high in pitch, like the high notes on a piano. Frequency is expressed in terms of oscillations, or cycles, per second. Cycles per second are commonly referred to as hertz (Hz). High frequencies are sometimes more conveniently expressed in units of kilo-hertz (kHz) or thousands of hertz. The extreme range of frequencies that can be heard by the healthiest human ear spans from 16 to 20 Hz on the low end to about 20,000 Hz (or 20 kHz) on the high end.

b. Sound Pressure Levels and Decibels

The amplitude of a sound determines its loudness. Loudness of sound increases and decreases with its amplitude. Sound pressure levels are described in units called the decibel. Decibels are measured on a logarithmic scale that quantifies sound intensity in a manner similar to the Richter scale used for earthquake magnitudes. Thus, a doubling of the energy of a noise source, such as doubling of traffic volume, would increase the noise level by 3 dB; a halving of the energy would result in a 3 dB decrease.

c. A-weighted Decibels

The human ear is not equally sensitive to all frequencies within the sound spectrum. Human hearing is limited not only in the range of audible frequencies but also in the way the ear perceives the sound in that range. In general, the healthy human ear is most sensitive to sounds between 1,000 Hz and 5,000 Hz, and it perceives a sound within that range as more intense than a sound of higher or lower frequency with the same magnitude. To approximate the frequency response of the human ear, a series of sound level adjustments is usually applied to the sound measured by a sound level meter.

The A-scale weighting network approximates the frequency response of the average healthy ear when listening to most ordinary sounds. When people make judgments of the relative loudness or annoyance of a sound, their judgments correlate well with the A-scale sound levels of those sounds. Noise levels for traffic noise reports are typically reported in terms of A-weighted decibels. All sound levels discussed in the PEIR analysis (Section 5.5) are A-weighted. Examples of typical noise levels for common indoor and outdoor activities are depicted in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3
Typical Sound Levels in the Environment and Industry

Common Outdoor Activities	Noise Level [dBA]	Common Indoor Activities
—	110	Rock band
Jet fly over at 300 m (1000 feet)	100	—
Gas lawn mower at 1 m (3 feet)	90	—
Diesel truck at 15 m (50 feet), at 80 km/hr (50 mph)	80	Food blender at 1 m (3 feet) Garbage disposal at 1 m (3 feet)
Noisy urban area, daytime Gas lawn mower at 30 m (100 feet)	70	Vacuum cleaner at 3 m (10 feet)
Commercial area Heavy traffic at 90 m (300 feet)	60	Normal speech at 1 m (3 feet)
Quiet urban daytime	50	Large business office Dishwasher next room
Quiet urban nighttime	40	Theater, large conference room (background)
Quiet suburban nighttime	30	Library
Quiet rural nighttime	20	Bedroom at night, concert hall (background)
—	10	Broadcast/recording studio
Lowest threshold of human hearting	0	Lowest threshold of human hearting

m = meter(s)
Source: Caltrans 2013

Under controlled conditions in an acoustics laboratory, the trained, healthy human ear is able to discern changes in sound levels of 1.5 dBA under certain conditions. Outside such controlled conditions, the average healthy ear can barely perceive changes of 3 dBA, a change of 5 dBA is readily perceptible, and an increase (decrease) of 10 dBA sounds twice (half) as loud.

d. Noise Descriptors

The two noise metrics used in the analysis (Section 5.5) are the L_{eq} and the CNEL.

Equivalent Noise level (Leq)

The L_{eq} is also referred to as the time-average sound level. It is the equivalent steady state sound level, which in a stated period of time would contain the same acoustical energy as the time-varying sound level during the same time period. The period of time averaging may be specified; $L_{eq}(3)$ would be a 3-hour average. When no period of time is specified, a 1-hour average is assumed. The 1-hour A-weighted equivalent sound level is the energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 1-hour period. It is important to understand that noise of short duration, that is, times substantially less than the averaging period, is averaged into ambient noise during the period of interest. Thus, a loud noise lasting many seconds or a few minutes may have minimal effect on the measured sound level averaged over a 1-hour period.

Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)

People are generally more sensitive and annoyed by noise occurring during the evening and nighttime hours. Thus, the CNEL was introduced. The CNEL scale represents a time-weighted 24-hour average noise level based on the A-weighted sound level. CNEL accounts for the increased noise sensitivity during the evening (7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. and nighttime hours (10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.) by adding 5 dBA and 10 dBA, respectively, to the average sound levels occurring during these hours.

2.3.5.3 Vibration

Groundborne vibration consists of oscillatory waves that propagate from the source through the ground to adjacent structures. The frequency of a vibrating object describes how rapidly it is oscillating. The number of cycles per second of oscillation is the vibration frequency, which is described in terms of hertz. The normal frequency range of most groundborne vibration that can be felt generally ranges from a low frequency of less than 1 Hz to a high of about 200 Hz.

While people have varying sensitivities to vibrations at different frequencies, they generally are most sensitive to low-frequency vibration. Vibration in buildings caused by construction activities may be perceived as motion of building surfaces or rattling of windows, items on shelves, and pictures hanging on walls. Vibration of building components can also take the form of an audible low-frequency rumbling noise, which is referred to as groundborne noise.

Vibration energy spreads out as it travels through the ground, causing the vibration level to diminish with distance away from the source. High-frequency vibrations reduce much more rapidly than low frequencies, so that low frequencies tend to dominate the spectrum at large distances from the source. When vibration encounters a building, the overall vibration level is typically reduced; however, under certain circumstances, vibration can be amplified due to structural resonances of the floors and walls.

Vibration levels are usually expressed as a single-number measure of vibration magnitude, in terms of velocity or acceleration, which describes the severity of the vibration without the frequency variable. The peak particle velocity (PPV) is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of the vibration signal, usually measured in inches per second. Since it is related to the stresses experienced by buildings, PPV is often used in monitoring of blasting vibration. Although PPV is appropriate for evaluating the potential of building damage, it is not suitable for evaluating human response since it takes some time for the human body to respond to vibrations.

2.3.6 Health and Safety

A hazardous material is any item or agent (biological, chemical, radiological, and/or physical) that has the potential to cause harm to humans, animals, or the environment, either by itself or through interaction with other factors. Hazardous materials are defined and regulated in the United States primarily by laws and regulations administered by USEPA, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), and the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Each agency has its own definition of a "hazardous material." Some common definitions are included below.

2.3.6.1 Hazardous Materials

Hazardous materials are substances with certain physical or chemical properties that could pose a substantial present or future hazard to human health or the environment when improperly handled, disposed, or otherwise managed. Title 22 of the CCR, Division 4.5, Chapter 11, Article 3 groups hazardous materials into the following four categories based on their properties: toxic (causes human health effects), ignitable (has the ability to burn), corrosive (causes severe burns or damage to materials), and reactive (causes explosions or generates toxic gases). Hazardous materials are commonly used in commercial, agricultural, and industrial applications as well as in residential areas to a limited extent.

2.3.6.2 Hazardous Waste

A hazardous waste is any waste that may (1) cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness, or (2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or the environment, due to factors including, but not limited to, carcinogenicity, acute toxicity, chronic toxicity, bio-accumulative properties, or persistence in the environment, when improperly treated, stored, transported, or disposed of, or otherwise managed (California Health and Safety Code, Section 25141). Hazardous materials and wastes can result in public health hazards if improperly handled; released into the soil or groundwater; or released into the air through vapors, fumes, or dust.

2.3.6.3 Hazardous Materials Sites

Hazardous materials are used for a variety of purposes including service industries, various small businesses, medical uses, schools, and households. Many chemicals used in household cleaning, construction, dry cleaning, film processing, landscaping, and automotive maintenance and repair are considered hazardous. Businesses that handle/generate hazardous materials within the City are monitored by USEPA. Small-quantity hazardous waste generators include facilities such as automotive repair, dry cleaners, and medical offices.

A search of federal, state, and local environmental regulatory agency databases was conducted in order to identify sites within the Midway-Pacific Highway community that may have been impacted by hazardous materials or wastes (Ninyo & Moore 2012). The search identified 73 documented release cases within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area; 13 properties in the proposed CPU area were identified as open (Table 2-4) and 60 were closed. The cases were listed under the following site categories:

- Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)
- Statewide Environmental Evaluation and Planning System Underground Storage Tank (SWEEPS UST)
- Spills, Leaks, Investigations, and Cleanup (SLIC) Region from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Facility Index System (FINDS)
- Voluntary Assistance Program (VAP)
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Small Quantity Generators (RCRA-SQG)
- NPDES permits

Under the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the Site Cleanup Program (SCP) regulates and oversees the investigation and cleanup of "non-federally owned" sites where recent or historical unauthorized releases of pollutants to the environment, including soil, groundwater, surface water, and sediment, have occurred. Sites in the program are varied and include, but are not limited to, pesticide and fertilizer facilities, rail yards, ports, equipment supply facilities, metals facilities, industrial manufacturing and maintenance sites, dry cleaners, bulk transfer facilities, refineries, and some brownfields. These releases are generally not from strictly petroleum underground storage tanks (USTs). The types of pollutants encountered at the sites are plentiful and diverse and include solvents, pesticides, heavy metals, and fuel constituents to name a few.

Table 2-4
Hazardous Materials Sites in Midway-Pacific Highway

Site	Address	Program/Site Type	Status
Texaco station (presently operated by Shell)	3711 West Camino Del Rio	LUST Cleanup Site	Open
Former Arco station (redeveloped with a restaurant)	3720 W Camino Del Rio	SWEEPS UST Site	Open
Former Poor Boy Rental facility (redeveloped with a commercial building)	3148 Midway Drive	SWEEPS UST Site	Open
NISE-West/SPAWAR – Old Town Campus (formerly Air Force Plant #19)	4296, 4301 and 4635 Pacific Highway	Military Cleanup Site	Open (currently undergoing cleanup)
Sunbelt Towing Inc.	4370 Pacific Highway	LUST Cleanup Site	Open
Loma Portal Head Start Preschool	2905 Cadiz Street	SLIC Site	Open
Arco facility	2940 Lytton Street	FINDS Site	Open
VVSD facility	4141 Pacific Highway	VAP	Open
Former Pacific Plating facility	2182 Hancock Street	RCRA-SQG Site	Open
Old Town Trolley	2115 Kurtz Street	NPDES	Open
Pacific Services Dry Cleaners	4085 Pacific Highway	SLIC Site	Open
Kenneth Golden	3485 Noell Street	SWEEPS UST Site	Open
Baron-Blakeslee Division of Purex	3596 California Street	SWEEPS UST Site	Open

Source: Ninyo & Moore 2012 (Appendix J)

Properties with open cases represent a moderate to high risk of encountering impact during potential future redevelopment. Closed release cases represent a low to moderate risk of encountering impact during potential future redevelopment. However, cases closed in the 1990s may not meet current standards and may require additional investigation and/or remediation prior to redevelopment.

2.3.6.4 Wildfire Hazards

Extended droughts characteristic of the City's Mediterranean climate result in large areas of dry vegetation, particularly in late summer and fall, when Santa Ana winds blow in from the desert and dry out the vegetation. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is highly urbanized and does not contain undeveloped land.

Current City regulations require that brush management zones be established adjacent to development to reduce the risk from wildland fires. The purpose of such a program is to reduce the risk of wildfire while minimizing visual, biological, and erosion impacts to natural areas. Since the Midway-Pacific Highway does not contain undeveloped brush land and is not adjacent to wildland brush, the brush management zones do not apply.

2.3.6.5 Emergency Preparedness

The County of San Diego Office of Emergency Services (OES) coordinates the overall County response to disasters. OES is responsible for notifying appropriate agencies when a disaster occurs; coordinating all responding agencies; ensuring that resources are available and mobilized; developing plans and procedures for response to and recovery from disasters; and developing and providing preparedness materials for the public.

The OES staffs the Operational Area Emergency Operations Center (EOC), a central facility that provides regional coordinated emergency response, and also acts as staff to the Unified Disaster Council (UDC), its governing body. The UDC, established through a joint powers agreement among all 18 incorporated cities and the County of San Diego, provides for coordination of plans and programs countywide to ensure protection of life and property.

In 2010, the County and 18 local jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, adopted the Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MHMP). The MHMP is a countywide plan that identifies risks and ways to minimize damage by natural and manmade disasters. The plan is a comprehensive document that serves many purposes, including creating a decision tool for management, promoting compliance with state and federal program requirements, enhancing local policies for hazard mitigation capability, and providing interjurisdictional coordination.

The City of San Diego's disaster prevention and response activities are conducted in accordance with U.S. Department of Homeland Security Office of Domestic Preparedness requirements and incorporate the functions of planning, training, exercising, and execution. The City's disaster preparedness efforts include oversight of the City's EOC, including being responsible for maintaining the EOC in a continued state of readiness, training City staff and outside agency representatives in their roles and responsibilities, and coordinating EOC operations when activated in response to an emergency or major event/incident.

2.3.6.6 Aircraft Hazards

The State of California requires that the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, as the ALUC, prepare an ALUCP for each public-use airport and military air installation in San Diego County. An ALUCP contains policies and criteria that address compatibility between airports and future land uses that surround them by addressing noise, overflight, safety, and airspace protection concerns to minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards within the airport influence area (AIA) for each airport over a 20-year horizon. The City of San Diego implements the adopted ALUCPs with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Overlay Zone. The City has agreed to submit discretionary and ministerial projects within the AIA for SDIA to the ALUC for consistency determinations until the ALUC determines that the City's land use plans and zoning are consistent with the ALUCP for SDIA. SDIA is located within 1 mile and southwest of the proposed CPU area and has general aviation, commercial, and military flights. The proposed CPU area is located within SDIA's AIA Review Areas 1 and 2 and the City's Airport Approach Overlay Zone.


2.3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

2.3.7.1 Drainage

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located on relatively flat land close to sea level and was historically an area of tidal marshes and flats where the San Diego River alternatively flowed into San Diego Bay and Mission Bay before being channelized. The northern portion of the area drains to the San Diego River, while the southern portion of the proposed CPU area drains to San Diego Bay (City of San Diego 2017a).

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area lies within two regional watersheds. The northernmost portion of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located within the San Diego River watershed in the Mission San Diego hydrologic subarea 907.11, part of the Lower San Diego hydrologic area, which is part of the San Diego hydrologic unit (RWQCB 2016) (Figure 2-4). With a land area of approximately 434 square miles, the San Diego River watershed is home to approximately 520,000 residents and contains portions of the cities of San Diego, El Cajon, La Mesa, Poway, and Santee and several unincorporated areas. Approximately 44 percent of the San Diego River watershed is currently undeveloped. Important hydrologic resources in the watershed include five water storage reservoirs, a large groundwater aquifer, extensive riparian habitat, coastal wetlands, and tide pools (Project Clean Water 2016). This area within the proposed CPU area is subject to the San Diego River Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan (see Section 4.7.3).

The southern portion of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located within the San Diego Bay watershed in the Pueblo San Diego hydrologic unit, mainly in the San Diego Mesa hydrologic area, Lindbergh hydrologic subarea (908.21), with a portion also in the Point Loma hydrologic area (908.10) (RWQCB 2016). The San Diego Bay watershed encompasses approximately 440 square miles and is home to approximately 1,030,000 residents. The Pueblo San Diego hydrologic unit is the smallest within San Diego County, and the most intensively developed, with nearly 500,000 residents and only about 25 percent of its land left undeveloped. The watershed contains the smallest proportion of unincorporated area (0.3 percent) of the hydrologic units within the county. Due to the high level of existing urbanization in the watershed, only small amounts of additional land are projected for development over the next 15



Source: SANDAG 2014; City of San Diego 2017; California Interagency Watershed Mapping Committee 2004

2 1 0 2 Miles

Scale: 1:126,720; 1 inch = 2 miles

Figure 2-4
Watersheds

Path: P:_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\920 GIS\922_Maps\CommunityPlan\Midway_watersheds_85x11.mxd, 9/28/2017, augellop

years (Project Clean Water 2016). This area within the proposed CPU area is subject to the San Diego Bay Watershed Management Area Water Quality Improvement Plan (see Section 4.7.3).

2.3.7.2 Water Quality

Urban runoff is surface water runoff generated from developed or disturbed land associated with urbanization. The increase in impervious surfaces and fewer opportunities for infiltration within the landscape increase storm flows and provide a source for sediment and other pollutants to enter receiving waters. Urban runoff is a major component of urban flooding and is a particular problem for management of watersheds. Urban runoff is the largest pollution source of Southern California's coastal beaches and near-shore waters. Urban runoff control programs typically focus on managing the effect that new impervious surfaces have on stream channels but may also provide remediation of existing problems. The northern portion of the community is within the Mission San Diego hydrologic subarea 907.11, which includes the San Diego River, and the southern portion is within the Lindbergh hydrologic subarea 908.21 and the Point Loma hydrologic area 908.10, and ultimately discharges into San Diego Bay.

a. San Diego River

The San Diego River generally flows to the west along the northern boundary of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and discharges into the Pacific Ocean just north of the Ocean Beach community. The San Diego River has been listed as an "impaired" body under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act due to fecal coliform, low dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, total dissolved solids, and toxicity. Major impacts to this watershed include surface water quality degradation, habitat degradation and loss, sediment, invasive species, eutrophication, and flooding. Sources of impacts include urban runoff, agricultural runoff, mining operations, sewage spills, and sand mining.

b. San Diego Bay

The majority of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU drains to San Diego Bay. The beneficial uses of the inland surface waters in the Pueblo San Diego watershed are limited to contact (potential use activities involving a significant risk with ingestion of water, including wading by children and swimming) and non-contact (aquatic recreation pursuits not involving a significant risk of water ingestion, including fishing and limited body contact incidental to shoreline activity) recreation, warm freshwater habitat, and wildlife habitat. The San Diego Bay receiving waters support an extensive array of beneficial uses (RWQCB 2016).

The existing coastal beneficial uses identified for San Diego Bay include industrial service supply; navigation; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; commercial and sport fishing; preservation of biological habitats of special significance; estuarine habitat; wildlife habitat; rare, threatened, or endangered species; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; spawning; reproduction; and/or early development; and shellfish harvesting (RWQCB 2016).

The watershed drainage consists of a group of relatively small local creeks and pipe conveyances, many of which are concrete-lined and drain directly into San Diego Bay. The creeks in the watershed are highly impacted by urban runoff, and Chollas Creek and the mouth of the creek in San Diego Bay are listed as 303(d)-impaired water bodies for various trace metals parameters and aquatic toxicity. Several sites in

San Diego Bay that are impacted by runoff from the Pueblo San Diego watershed have been identified as hot spots by California's Bay Protection Toxic Cleanup Program (Project Clean Water 2016).

2.3.7.3 Groundwater

Groundwater within the San Diego Bay watershed was determined to have a beneficial use for municipal and domestic supply, as well as industrial process and service supply. Groundwater within the Mission San Diego area of the Lower San Diego portion of the San Diego hydrologic unit has a potential beneficial use for municipal and domestic supply and existing beneficial uses for agricultural supply, industrial service supply, and industrial process supply (RWQCB 2016).

2.3.8 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

2.3.8.1 Existing Context and Urban Form

a. Neighborhood Centers and Nodes

Urban design is influenced by land use; the Midway area consists of an urbanized commercial core with neighborhood, community, and region-serving retail centers, limited stay and business motels, institutional facilities, and military installations. The area is made up of wide streets, flat topography, and a mixture of large and small commercial buildings. Some multi-family residential buildings exist in the western portion of the community. The Pacific Highway corridor contains predominantly older industrial buildings. The buildings are large-scale, with a group of smaller-scale industrial buildings in the northern portion of the corridor. The southern portion contains unscreened airport serving parking lots and parking structures. MCRD is separated from the rest of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area with gates and security fencing. MCRD contains facilities needed to train new recruits into Marines.

In the 1960s, a large number of automobile-related commercial buildings, such as automobile showrooms, service stations, and garages, were constructed throughout the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Some of these buildings are still in existence today. Other commercial buildings include restaurants, retail buildings, shopping centers, motels, gas stations, branch banks, grocery stores, and automobile dealerships. The commercial development in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is mostly concentrated in the Midway area.

Residential buildings are concentrated in a portion of the Midway area northwest of Rosecrans Street, near Lytton Street. Most of the single-family residences are one-story and have no particular style. The original residential buildings constructed in the 1950s were usually mixed with commercial and industrial buildings. Most of the original residential buildings have since been demolished, so those that remain are isolated. The two most common types of multi-family housing in the area are "dingbats" and apartment complexes. Dingbats are two-story apartment buildings with parking tucked under the second story. They are rectangular, and the entry to the units is from the exterior. There are several large multi-family complexes throughout the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, including the rent-restricted Orchard Apartments for seniors along Sports Arena Boulevard and the Gateway military family apartments along Lytton Street. More recently, the Cabrillo at the Bay townhomes were built adjacent to the former Cabrillo Hospital. Along Hancock Street in the Pacific Highway corridor, the Loft 2015 and Mission Apartments are the most recently built apartments.

The San Diego International Sports Arena opened in 1966 as a sports and concert venue. The arena quickly became a focal point in the community, and spurred the surge of restaurants that opened in the surrounding area.

The Pacific Highway corridor and northeast portion of the Midway area comprise mainly multi-use warehouses and light manufacturing buildings. Generally, the multi-use warehouse buildings were designed without an architect. Most were constructed with reinforced concrete or steel-framed structures. They are generally utilitarian in design and box-like in shape and have flat or gable roofs. Some of the warehouses have loading docks, while others have large sliding doors that allow cars and trucks to drive directly into the building. Light manufacturing buildings tend to be more substantial in size than the warehouses. Similar to the warehouses, the manufacturing buildings have reinforced concrete or steel-framed structures. While the warehouses have solid exterior walls, the manufacturing buildings have large steel-framed windows, and often have repeating rows of north-facing clerestory windows that create a sawtooth roof shape.

The street system does not have a consistent grid pattern throughout the proposed CPU area. The portion of the Midway area northeast of Kurtz Street features an older, traditional grid pattern extended from the adjacent Old Town. The Pacific Highway corridor also features a grid pattern extended from the adjacent Uptown Community. The proposed CPU area is traversed by several major streets, which bisect these grid-like development patterns. Sports Arena Boulevard and Midway Drive run northwest-southeast across the proposed CPU area and intersect with Camino Del Rio West and Rosecrans Street, which run southwest-northeast. Pacific Highway runs parallel to I-5 from Old Town to the southern CPU boundary, and Barnett Avenue and Lytton Street connect Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway and serve as a dividing line between the Midway area and MCRD.

The lack of urban design requirements and haphazard development patterns have created an inconsistent visual character throughout the community.

b. Built Form and Development

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area's physical form and architectural character are a product of its history. The two most common types of industrial buildings present in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are multi-use warehouses such as the building at 1929 Hancock Avenue and light manufacturing buildings like the one at 3430 Hancock Avenue. They are mostly concentrated in two areas: the Pacific Highway corridor and the northeast portion of the Midway area. Multi-family housing is generally in the form of two-story apartment complexes. The area also contains large commercial retail buildings. Infill development and the replacement and modification of buildings have occurred during past decades.

c. Views and Vistas

Due to its relatively flat, low-lying topography, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area does not have prominent view corridors. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area does not contain any designated scenic vistas.

2.3.9 Air Quality

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located within the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD), between 0.3 mile and 2.4 miles northeast of San Diego Bay. Air quality conditions and local climate are described in this section.

2.3.9.1 Climate

The San Diego region, including the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, is influenced by proximity to the Pacific Ocean and semi-permanent high-pressure systems that result in warm, dry summers and mild, occasionally wet winters. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is subject to frequent offshore breezes. The mean annual temperature at SDIA, recorded near Downtown San Diego and Midway-Pacific Highway, is 64 degrees Fahrenheit (°F). The average annual precipitation for the area is approximately 10 inches, falling primarily from November through April. Winter mean low temperatures average 49°F, and summer mean high temperatures average 74°F based on the measurements taken at SDIA.

The dominant meteorological feature affecting the region is the Pacific High Pressure Zone, which produces the prevailing westerly to northwesterly winds. These winds tend to blow pollutants away from the coast toward the inland areas. Consequently, air quality near the coast is generally better than what occurs at the base of the coastal mountain range.

Fluctuations in the strength and pattern of winds from the Pacific High Pressure Zone interacting with the daily local cycle produce periodic temperature inversions that influence the dispersal or containment of air pollutants in the SDAB. Beneath the inversion layer, pollutants become “trapped” as their ability to disperse diminishes. The mixing depth is the area under the inversion layer. Generally, the morning inversion layer is lower than the afternoon inversion layer. The greater the change between the morning and afternoon mixing depths, the greater the ability of the atmosphere to disperse pollutants.

Throughout the year, the height of the temperature inversion in the afternoon varies between approximately 1,500 and 2,500 feet above mean sea level (MSL). In winter, the morning inversion layer is about 800 feet above MSL. In summer, the morning inversion layer is about 1,100 feet above MSL. Therefore, air quality generally tends to be better in the winter than in the summer.

The prevailing westerly wind pattern is sometimes interrupted by regional “Santa Ana” conditions. A Santa Ana occurs when a strong high pressure develops over the Nevada to Utah area and overcomes the prevailing westerly coastal winds, sending strong, steady, hot, dry northeasterly winds over the mountains and out to sea.

Strong Santa Ana winds tend to blow pollutants out over the ocean, producing clear days. However, at the onset or during breakdown of these conditions or if the Santa Ana is weak, local air quality may be adversely affected. In these cases, emissions from the South Coast Air Basin to the north are blown out over the ocean, and low pressure over Baja California draws this pollutant-laden air mass southward. As the high pressure weakens, prevailing northwesterly winds reassert themselves and send this cloud of contamination ashore in the SDAB. When this event does occur, the combination of transported and locally produced contaminants produce the worst air quality measurements recorded in the basin.

2.3.9.2 Existing Air Quality

Air quality at a particular location is a function of the kinds, amounts, and dispersal rates of pollutants being emitted into the air locally and throughout the basin. The major factors affecting pollutant dispersion are wind speed and direction, the vertical dispersion of pollutants (which is affected by inversions), and the local topography.

Air quality is commonly expressed as the number of days in which air pollution levels exceed state standards set by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) or federal standards set by USEPA. The San Diego APCD maintains 11 air quality monitoring stations located throughout the greater San Diego metropolitan region. Air pollutant concentrations and meteorological information are continuously recorded at these 11 stations. Measurements are then used by scientists to help forecast daily air pollution levels.

The air quality monitoring station nearest the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is the San Diego–Beardsley Street monitoring station at 1110 Beardsley Street, which monitors the following pollutants: ozone, carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO_2), particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM_{10}), and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter ($PM_{2.5}$). The sulfur dioxide (SO_2) monitors were decommissioned in 2012, as this pollutant is less of a concern in the SDAB. Table 2-5 provides a summary of measurements of ozone, CO, SO_2, NO_2, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$ collected at the Beardsley Street monitoring station for the years 2012 through 2016.

2.3.9.3 Regional Background Toxic Air Pollutants

The San Diego APCD samples for toxic air contaminants at the El Cajon and Chula Vista monitoring stations only. Excluding diesel particulate emissions, data from these stations indicate that the background cancer risk in 2008 due to air toxics was 135 in one million in Chula Vista and 150 in one million in El Cajon. There is no current methodology for directly measuring diesel particulate concentrations. Based on CARB estimates, diesel particulate emissions could add an additional 420 in one million to the ambient cancer risk levels in San Diego County.

Thus, the combined background ambient cancer risk due to air toxics in the urbanized areas of San Diego County could potentially range from around 555 to 570 in one million. As such, diesel particulate matter is the air toxic of primary concern on a regional basis.

2.3.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area is currently a source of anthropogenic greenhouse gas (GHG), with emissions generated by vehicular traffic and by the energy use, water use, and solid waste management practices of existing development.

Table 2-5
Summary of Air Quality Measurements Recorded at the San Diego–1110 Beardsley Street Monitoring Station

Pollutant/Standard	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Ozone					
Days State 1-hour Standard Exceeded (0.09 ppm)	0	0	0	0	0
Days Federal 8-hour Standard Exceeded (0.075 ppm)[a]	0	0	0	0	0
Days State 8-hour Standard Exceeded (0.07 ppm)	0	0	2	0	0
Max. 1-hr (ppm)	0.071	0.063	0.093	0.089	0.072
Max. 8-hr (ppm)	0.065	0.053	0.072	0.067	0.061
Carbon Monoxide [b]					
Days Federal 8-hour Standard Exceeded (35 ppm)	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Days State 8-hour Standard Exceeded (20 ppm)	0	NA	NA	NA	NA
Max. 1-hr (ppm)	2.6	3.0	2.7	2.6	2.2
Max. 8-hr (ppm)	1.81	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nitrogen Dioxide					
Days Federal 1-hour Standard Exceeded (0.10 ppm)	0	0	0	0	0
Days State 1-hour Standard Exceeded (0.18 ppm)	0	0	0	0	0
Max 1-hr (ppm)	0.065	0.072	0.075	0.062	0.073
Annual Average (ppm)	0.013	0.014	0.013	0.014	NA
Sulfur Dioxide [c]					
Days State 24-hour Standard Exceeded (0.04 ppm)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Max 24-hr (ppm)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Annual Average (ppm)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
PM_{10}					
Days State 24-hour Standard Exceeded (50 $\mu g/m^3$)	0	1	0	1	1
Days Federal 24-hour Standard Exceeded (150 $\mu g/m^3$)	0	0	0	0	0
Max. Daily—Federal ($\mu g/m^3$)	45	90	40.0	53.0	49.0
Max. Daily—State ($\mu g/m^3$)	47	92	41.0	54.0	51.0
Federal Annual Average ($\mu g/m^3$)	21.8	24.9	23.3	23.0	21.9
State Annual Average ($\mu g/m^3$)	22.2	25.4	23.8	23.2	NA
$PM_{2.5}$					
Days Federal 24-hour Standard Exceeded (35 $\mu g/m^3$)	1	1	1	0	0
Max. Daily—Federal ($\mu g/m^3$)	39.8	37.4	36.7	33.4	34.4
Max. Daily—State ($\mu g/m^3$)	39.8	37.4	37.2	44.9	34.4
Federal Annual Average ($\mu g/m^3$)	11.0	10.3	10.1	9.3	NA
State Annual Average ($\mu g/m^3$)	NA	10.4	10.2	10.2	NA

Source: CARB 2017; SDAPCD 2015a, 2015b, 2016
NA = not available; ppm = parts per million; $\mu g/m^3$ = micrograms per cubic meter
[a] On October 1, 2015, the national 8-hour ozone primary and secondary standards were lowered from 0.075 to 0.070 ppm.
[b] Eight-hour carbon monoxide averages are available at San Diego-1110 Beardsley Street station between 2005 and 2012.
[c] The SO_2 monitor was decommissioned on June 30, 2011.

2.3.10.1 State and Regional GHG Inventories

a. CARB Inventory

CARB performs statewide GHG inventories. The inventory is divided into nine broad sectors of economic activity: agriculture, commercial, electricity generation, forestry, high global warming potential (GWP) emitters, industrial, recycling and waste, residential, and transportation. Emissions are quantified in

million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent (MMT CO_2E). Table 2-6 shows the estimated statewide GHG emissions for the years 1990, 2008, and 2012.

Table 2-6
California GHG Emissions by Sector in 1990, 2008, and 2012

Sector	1990[1] Emissions in MMT CO_2E (% total)[2]	2008[3] Emissions in MMT CO_2E (% total)[2]	2012 Emissions in MMT CO_2E (% total)[2]
Sources			
Agriculture	23.4 (5%)	37.99 (8%)	37.86 (8%)
Commercial	14.4 (3%)	13.37 (3%)	14.20 (3%)
Electricity Generation	110.6 (26%)	120.15 (25%)	95.09 (21%)
High global warming potential	--	12.87 (3%)	18.41 (4%)
Industrial	103.0 (24%)	87.54 (18%)	89.16 (19%)
Recycling and Waste	--	8.09 (2%)	8.49 (2%)
Residential	29.7 (7%)	29.07 (6%)	28.09 (6%)
Transportation	150.7 (35%)	178.02 (37%)	167.38 (36%)
Forestry (Net CO_2 flux)	-6.69	--	--
Not Specified	1.27	--	--
TOTAL	426.6	487.10	458.68

Source: California Energy Commission (CEC) 2014; CARB 2007, 2014
[1] 1990 data were retrieved from the CARB 2007 source.
[2] Percentages may not total 100 due to rounding.
[3] 2008 and 2012 data were retrieved from the CARB 2014 source.
[4] Reported emissions for key sectors. The inventory totals for 2008 and 2012 did not include Forestry or Not Specified sources.

As shown in Table 2-6, statewide GHG source emissions totaled approximately 427 MMT CO_2E in 1990, 487 MMT CO_2E in 2008, and 459 MMT CO_2E in 2012. Many factors affect year-to-year changes in GHG emissions, including economic activity, demographic influences, environmental conditions such as drought, and the impact of regulatory efforts to control GHG emissions. CARB has adopted multiple GHG emission reduction measures, and most of the reductions since 2008 have been driven by economic factors (recession), previous energy-efficiency actions, and the Renewables Portfolio Standard. Transportation-related emissions consistently contribute the most GHG emissions, followed by electricity generation and industrial emissions. The forestry sector is unique because it not only includes emissions associated with harvest, fire, and land use conversion (sources), but also includes removals of atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO_2; sinks) by photosynthesis, which is then bound (sequestered) in plant tissues.

b. City of San Diego CAP Inventory

A San Diego regional emissions inventory prepared as part of the City of San Diego's Climate Action Plan (CAP) reported GHG emissions totaling approximately 13 MMT CO_2E in 2010. Similar to the statewide emissions, transportation-related GHG emissions contributed the most Citywide, followed by emissions associated with energy use.

2.3.11 Public Services and Facilities

Existing public services and facilities, including parks, recreation centers, libraries, schools, fire, emergency medical, and police, serve the residents and businesses within Midway-Pacific Highway and surrounding communities. The following provides a discussion of the existing and planned public services and facilities that are, or will be, available to the proposed CPU area.

a. Police Protection

Police services are provided by the San Diego Police Department (SDPD). The SDPD does not staff individual stations based on population ratios. The goal Citywide is to maintain a ratio of 1.45 officers per 1,000 population, which the SDPD is currently meeting based on a 2010 census-estimated residential population of 1,376,173. The SDPD currently uses the following five-level priority dispatch system: Priority E (Emergency), One, Two, Three, and Four.

Police protection for the Midway-Pacific Highway community is provided by the Western Division of the SDPD and lies within the Midway District (611). Western Division is located at 5215 Gaines Street, serving a population of 129,709 people and encompassing 22.7 square miles (City of San Diego 2017b). The Western Division serves the neighborhoods of Hillcrest, La Playa, Linda Vista, Loma Portal, Midtown, Midway District, Mission Hills, Mission Valley West, Morena, Ocean Beach, Old Town, Point Loma Heights, Roseville-Fleetridge, Sunset Cliffs, University Heights, and Wooded Area. The Western Division is currently staffed with 81 sworn personnel and two civilian employees. The Citywide goal is to maintain 1.48 officers per 1,000 population ratio. The SDPD is currently reaching a staffing ratio of 1.3 sworn officers per 1,000 residents based on the 2016 estimated residential population of 1,391,676. The 2016 average response times for the Western Division were 6.1 minutes for emergency calls, 11.8 minutes for Priority 1 calls, 30 minutes for Priority 2 calls, 83.1 minutes for Priority 3 calls, and 156 minutes for Priority 4 calls (Appendix K). The SDPD's Citywide response time goals are 7 minutes for emergency calls, 12 minutes for Priority 1 calls, 30 minutes for Priority 2 calls, 90 minutes for Priority 3 calls, and 90 minutes for Priority 4 calls (City of San Diego 2015).

b. Parks and Recreation

The proposed CPU area does not currently have any park spaces within its boundaries. The proposed CPU area is currently served by parks in surrounding community plan areas, such as Mission Bay Park, Presidio Park, and NTC Park at Liberty Station. NTC Park is located near the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area in Point Loma and provides open space, a children's' playground, park benches, and parking lots. Three regional parks are located close to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area: Balboa Park, Presidio Park, and Mission Bay Park. Balboa Park encompasses 1,200 acres north of Downtown San Diego and includes over 17 museums, performing arts venues, gardens, trails, a children's playground, and the San Diego Zoo. Presidio Park, located in the Old Town San Diego community plan area, encompasses approximately 40 acres and includes Junípero Serra Museum, picnic areas, small venue space, restrooms, monuments, and open lawn space for active and passive recreation. Mission Bay Park is located just north of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and houses many boat launches, bayside boardwalks, children's playgrounds, designated swimming areas, areas for water sports, and basketball and volleyball courts. Mission Bay Park consists of over 4,600 acres and has 27 miles of shoreline.

c. Fire Protection

The proposed CPU area is within the service area of the City of San Diego's Fire-Rescue Department. San Diego is the eighth largest city in the United States and the second largest city in the State of California. In addition to residents and employment population to protect, Fire-Rescue also has responsibilities for the majority of the region's annual tourism count of about 34 million. (Citygate 2017 report, Volume 2, Standards of Response coverage) The primary fire stations that serve the area are Fire Station No. 8, at 3974 Goldfinch Street; Fire Station No. 20, at 3305 Kemper Street; and Fire Station No. 3, at 725 W. Kalmia Street. All fire department engines and trucks are full Advanced Life Support units and are equipped and capable of managing medical emergencies. The future planned Liberty Station Fire Station will also assist with response times for the proposed CPU area.

Emergency medical services are also provided to the Midway-Pacific Highway community and throughout the City through a public/private partnership between the City's Emergency Medical Services (EMS) and Rural Metro Corporation, which provides additional personnel and some ambulances. EMS has ambulances, paramedics, and emergency medical technicians (EMTs) who respond to emergency calls. Calls are prioritized from Level 1 (most serious) to Level 4 (non-emergency).

Fire stations are equipped to respond to calls within established standards based on speed and weight of attack (Citygate 2017). Speed calls for first-due, all-risk intervention units (engines, trucks, and/or rescue ambulances) strategically located across a community respond in effective travel time. These units are tasked with controlling moderate emergencies without the incident escalating to a second alarm or greater size, which unnecessarily depletes departmental resources as multiple requests for service occur. Weight is about multiple unit response for serious emergencies such as a room and contents structure fire, multiple patient incident, a vehicle accident with extrication required, or a heavy rescue incident. In these situations, enough firefighters must be assembled within a reasonable timeframe to safely control the emergency, thereby keeping it from escalating to greater alarms (Citygate 2017). The science of fire crew deployment is to spread crews out across a community to keep emergencies small with positive outcomes, without spreading the crews so far apart that they cannot amass together quickly enough to be effective in major emergencies (Citygate 2017). Access and water supply issues for specific projects in the proposed CPU area are addressed as developments are proposed.

d. Libraries

Library services are provided by the San Diego Public Library (SDPL) and its branch locations. Per the City's Guiding Principles for Library Facilities (July 2001), the minimum branch library size should be 15,000 square feet. The Library System Improvements Program for the SDPL originally included a new Central Library (completed in 2014) and 23 branch libraries. Nine libraries have been completed with new construction or expansion. Three branches are in the SDPL 5-year plan for either expansion or new construction: Mission Hills/Hillcrest, Skyline Hills, and San Ysidro. Others are in planning and design phases, are on hold due to lack of funding, or the projects will be closed until funding is identified.

The Midway-Pacific Highway community is served by the Point Loma/Hervey Library in the Peninsula community and the Mission Hills Library in the Uptown community. The Point Loma/Hervey Library is a 26,000-square-foot facility constructed in 2003. A new 15,000-square-foot facility will replace the current 3,850-square-foot Mission Hills Library located at 925 West Washington Street, which was built in 1961 prior to the minimum standard of 15,000 square feet for branch libraries (City of San Diego 2017c). The

new Mission Hills Library site, which the City has acquired, is located at the southwest corner of Washington and Front Streets. General Plan policies PF-J.3 and PF-J.5 support libraries that serve larger areas to maximize capital efficiencies.

e. Schools

The Midway-Pacific Highway community is located within the jurisdiction of the San Diego Unified School District (SDUSD). The Midway-Pacific Highway community is served by two elementary schools (Dewey Elementary School and Grant Elementary School), three middle schools (Dana Middle School, Correia Middle School, and Roosevelt Middle School), and two high schools (Point Loma High School and San Diego High School). Dewey Elementary School is the only public school located in the Midway-Pacific Highway community. Also located in the Midway-Pacific Highway community are the Saint Charles Borromeo Academy, a private school that serves students from pre-kindergarten to eighth grade, and the San Diego Community College District's West City Continuing Education Center that provides job training and adult education services.

In 2012, voters approved funding of two bond measures, Propositions S and Z, to fund repairs and to renovate and revitalize schools within the SDUSD. Bond projects build off improvements that were started with Proposition MM funding and include classroom technology, safety and security upgrades, Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) upgrades, new/renovated facilities, temporary classrooms replaced by permanent classrooms, air conditioning, upgrades to ADA improvements in athletic facilities, turf fields, and other capital improvements at traditional and charter schools throughout the district.

All development projects within the City are required to pay school fees in accordance with the requirements of the SDUSD, and as mandated by state law, to accommodate the needs of public schools serving existing and future students.

2.3.12 Public Utilities

The Midway-Pacific Highway community is served by a variety of public facilities and services, including utilities such as water and sewer, and solid waste services. Many of the infrastructure needs for these services are managed through the City's Capital Improvements Program (CIP). The City conducts a biannual review of public services, facilities, and utilities implementation in conjunction with the budget/CIP review cycle. As part of this review process, the City assesses the need for new or expanded services and public facilities in order to provide appropriate services and infrastructure commensurate with population increase.

Public utilities include public water, energy, sewer, storm water, and solid waste collection and recycling that are available to serve the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. A description of the existing conditions of each of these public utilities is provided below. Potential impacts to public utilities from implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU are discussed in Section 5.12.

a. Water Supply

City of San Diego

The City of San Diego Public Utilities Department (PUD) provides water service to more than 1.3 million residents over 404 square miles of developed land in the south-central portion of San Diego County, including the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. In the past, the City relied on water from Metropolitan Water District (MWD) for 95 percent of its supply. During years of drought, this made the City extremely vulnerable to water supply shortages, such as in 1991 when a drought forced MWD to cut its deliveries to San Diego by 30 percent. As a result, the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) has implemented a strategy to aggressively diversify its water supply portfolio through the introduction of new local and imported water supplies, so that by 2014 MWD deliveries accounted for around 49 percent of the total supply with new sources and conservation efforts accounting for the remaining 51 percent.

SDCWA secured new imported water supplies through a long-term (45- to 75-year) water conservation and transfer agreement with the Imperial Irrigation District, which provided approximately 100,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River in 2014 and will double this amount by 2021. SDCWA has a separate 110-year agreement to receive approximately 80,000 acre-feet of water from the Colorado River by lining parts of the Coachella Canal and All-American Canal.

SDCWA is also in the final stages of executing a $3.1 billion CIP that involves 50 different projects, including new reservoirs, pipelines, pumping stations, a new regional water treatment facility, and a project to raise the San Vicente Dam to allow for additional local storage. Other strategies involve collaboration with SDCWA's 24-local member retail agencies, and include promoting water conservation through water use efficiency programs, and the introduction of supplies from groundwater, recycled water, and seawater desalination. Additional information about SDCWA water supply diversification projects is provided in SDCWA's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP).

The City PUD receives the majority of its water supply from MWD through SDCWA. Historic imported water deliveries from SDCWA to the PUD and local surface water, conservation savings, and recycled water deliveries are shown in Table 2-7. Additional information can be found in the City's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan.

Table 2-7
Historic Imported, Local, and Recycled Water Demands to Public Utilities Department

Fiscal Year	Imported Water (acre-feet)	Local Surface Water (acre-feet)	Conservation[1] (acre-feet)	Recycled Water (acre-feet)	Groundwater (acre-feet)	Total[2] (acre-feet)
1990	233,158	22,500	--	--	--	255,658
1995	162,404	59,204	8,914	--	--	230,342
2000	207,874	39,098	17,410	3,250	--	267,632
2005	204,144	26,584	29,410	4,294	--	264,432
2010	188,337	13,117	34,317	12,173	500	248,444

[1] Conserved water is from savings and is not a direct supply.
[2] Total includes water supplied and conserved.
Source: City of San Diego (Appendix L)

The City water system consists primarily of nine surface water reservoirs with over 408,000 acre-feet of storage capacity, three water treatment plants, 31 treated water storage facilities, and more than 3,213 miles of transmission and distribution lines. The local surface raw water storage facilities are connected directly or indirectly to the City's water treatment operations: Otay Water Treatment Plant, Alvarado Water Treatment Plant, and Miramar Water Treatment Plant. These three plants have a total capacity of 294.4 million gallons per day.

The City's two recycled water facilities, North City Water Reclamation Plan (NCWRP) and South Bay Water Reclamation Plant (SBWRP), were built to treat wastewater to a level approved for landscaping irrigation, manufacturing, and other specified non-potable uses. These recycled water facilities not only provide water to City residents and businesses, but also to other jurisdictions and water districts, including the City of Poway and the Olivenhain Municipal Water District. As part of the City's water resource strategy, the Water Purification Demonstration Project is examining the use of advanced water purification technology to provide additional water supply. The Demonstration Project will determine the feasibility of a full-scale reservoir augmentation project, which would diversify San Diego's water supply and reduce its dependence on imported water.

The PUD emphasizes the importance of water conservation to minimize water demand and avoid excessive water use. The PUD's Water Conservation Program, established in 1985, accounts for approximately 73,000 acre-feet of potable water savings per year. These savings have been achieved through creation of a water conservation ethic and implementation of programs, policies, and ordinances designed to promote water conservation practices, including irrigation management. In accordance with SDMC Section 147.04, all residential, commercial, and industrial buildings, prior to a change in ownership, are required to be certified as having water-conserving plumbing fixtures in place. The PUD also examines new water saving technologies and annually checks progress toward conservation goals, working collaboratively with the MWD and SDCWA to formulate new conservation initiatives.

The City developed a Long-Range Water Resources Plan (2002–2030) to address the projected need for additional water supplies. This plan detailed existing water supplies, new water supply opportunities, objectives and performance measures, and ultimately conclusions and recommendations. The plan is to be implemented in three phases to meet the City's growing demands and to make adjustments as necessary. The three phases are 2010, 2020, and 2030.

The 2015 UWMP addresses the City's water system, water supply sources, and historic and projected water use, and provides a comparison of water supply to water demands during average, single-dry, and multiple-dry year periods. The UWMP was prepared in accordance with the Urban Water Management Act (as amended, California Water Code, Sections 10610 through 10656), which requires every urban water supplier that provides water for municipal purposes to more than 3,000 connections or supplying more than 3,000 acre-feet of water annually to adopt and submit a plan every 5 years to the California Department of Water Resources.

In accordance with the Conservation Element of the General Plan (Policy CE-A.11), development projects shall implement sustainable landscape design such as planting "deciduous shade trees, evergreen trees, and drought-tolerant native vegetation, as appropriate, to contribute to sustainable development goals" and using "recycled water to meet the needs of development projects to the maximum extent feasible" to aid in water conservation (City of San Diego 2008).

The Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is served by existing 6-inch- to 36-inch-diameter public water mains located in a grid pattern within the connecting streets. Water is distributed to businesses and residences through private water lines that connect to the public water main via public water service meters.

Metropolitan Water District of Southern California

MWD was formed in 1928 to develop, store, and distribute supplemental water in Southern California for domestic and municipal purposes. MWD is a wholesale supplier of water to its member agencies, which include SDCWA. It obtains supplies from local sources as well as the Colorado River via the Colorado River Aqueduct, which it owns and operates, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta via the State Water Project. Planning documents such as the Regional Urban Water Management Plan (RUWMP) and Integrated Water Resources Plan (IWRP) help ensure the reliability of water supplies and the infrastructure necessary to provide water to Southern California.

The MWD's 2010 RUWMP documents the availability of these existing supplies and additional supplies necessary to meet future demands, includes the resource targets included in the IWRP, and contains a water supply reliability assessment that includes a detailed evaluation of the supplies necessary to meet demands over a 25-year period in average, single-dry year, and multiple-dry year periods. MWD's recently adopted IWRP (2010) identifies a mix of resources (imported and local) that, when implemented, will provide 100 percent reliability for full-service demands. Service demands will be met through the attainment of regional targets set for conservation, local supplies, State Water Project supplies, Colorado River supplies, groundwater banking, and water transfers through year 2035.

San Diego County Water Authority

SDCWA purchases water from MWD that is delivered to the region through two aqueducts. Of MWD's 26 cities and member agencies, SDCWA is the largest member agency in terms of deliveries and purchases, with about 25 percent of all the water that MWD delivered in fiscal year 2007. As a retail member agency of SDCWA, the PUD purchases water from SDCWA for retail distribution within its service area. As discussed above, in 2014, MWD deliveries accounted for around 49 percent of the total supply with new sources and conservation efforts accounting for the remaining 51 percent.

The SDCWA's 2015 UWMP was adopted by the SDCWA Board on June 23, 2016, in accordance with state law and the RUWMP. The plan contains a water supply reliability assessment that identified a diverse mix of imported and local supplies necessary to meet demands over the next 25 years in average, single-dry year, and multiple-dry year periods. The UWMP documents that no shortages are anticipated within its service area. SDCWA also prepared an annual water supply report for use by its members that provides updated documentation on existing and projected water supplies.

b. Water, Sewer, and Storm Water Infrastructure

Wastewater in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is managed by the PUD Wastewater Branch, which operates the two components of the City's wastewater system: the Metropolitan Sewerage System and the Municipal Wastewater Collection System. The metropolitan system treats wastewater for a service area of 450 square miles, stretching from Del Mar and Poway in the north to Alpine and Lakeside in the east and the border of Mexico in the south. The service area includes the City of San

Diego and 15 other cities and districts. The system serves a population of about 2.2 million and treats an average of 180 million gallons of wastewater per day.

The Municipal Wastewater Collection System is responsible for the collection and conveyance of wastewater from residences and businesses in the City of San Diego, serving a 330-square-mile area with a population of 1.3 million people. The Municipal Wastewater Collection System consists of over 2,894 miles of sewer lines, nine major pump stations, and 75 smaller pump stations. Wastewater is conveyed via the pump stations to North City Water Reclamation Plant, the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant, and the South Bay Water Reclamation Plant. Treated effluent is discharged to the Pacific Ocean through the Point Loma Ocean Outfall or the South Bay Ocean Outfall.

The largest pump stations in the collection system are Pump Stations #1 and #2. Pump Station #1, located on East Harbor Drive, collects all of south San Diego's wastewater and has an average daily flow of 75 million gallons. It sends the wastewater flow north via the 8-mile South Metro Interceptor to Pump Station #2, which is located on North Harbor Drive. The average daily flow into Pump Station #2 is approximately 180 million gallons. This station pumps the wastewater to the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant through two 87-inch force mains.

The Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant, located on the coast, processes approximately 175 million gallons a day of wastewater generated by 2.2 million residents and workers. The plant has a treatment capacity of 240 million gallons per day. The plant discharges to the Point Loma Ocean Outfall, a 4.5-mile-long outfall that ends at a depth of 320 feet. The current modified NPDES permit for the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant and outfall was renewed in 2010.

The PUD also operates the Metro Biosolids Center, a state-of-the-art regional biosolids treatment facility, which turns waste into dewatered biosolids that are currently used as soil amendments, landfill, and landfill cover, but also may be used to promote growth of agricultural crops. Skim from the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant is transported through the 17-mile Miramar Sludge Pipeline for treatment at the Biosolids Center along with solids from the North City Water Reclamation Plant. Any remaining wastewater from the treatment process is returned to the Point Loma Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The San Diego PUD anticipates that planned improvements to the wastewater system will increase capacity to serve a population of 2.9 million, or 340 million gallons of wastewater per day, by the year 2050. Beginning in 2007, the City increased water and sewer rates to replace and improve both the water and sewer systems infrastructure. Some pipelines have been in operation for a hundred years and need to be replaced. The City of San Diego Water Department's Capital Improvement Program Guidelines and Standards provide the framework for the design and construction of new water facilities and address water efficiency, conservation, recycled and reclaimed water, cost effectiveness, and timely construction.

The City also monitors and maintains the water and sewer system on an ongoing basis because of the age of the water and sewer infrastructure in the older communities. In a continuing replacement program, outmoded concrete sewer mains and cast iron water mains are being replaced on a Citywide basis through the annual CIP. Replacement is currently scheduled based on breaks or blockages in the mains.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located within the City's PUD service area. The PUD serves more than 1.3 million residents in the City and in certain surrounding areas, including both retail and wholesale customers. The PUD relies on imported water as its major water supply source and is a

member agency of SDCWA, which is in turn a member agency of MWD. The PUD currently purchases approximately 85 to 90 percent of its water from SDCWA, which supplies the water (raw and treated) through two aqueducts consisting of five pipelines. In addition, the PUD uses three local supply sources to meet or offset potable demands: local surface water, conservation, and recycled water. The PUD water system extends over 404 square miles, including 324 square miles in the City, and includes potable and recycled water facilities.

The Transportation and Storm Water Department is responsible for the operation and maintenance of streets, sidewalks, and storm drains; leads efforts to protect and improve the water quality of rivers, creeks, bays, and the ocean; performs traffic and transportation system engineering; manages the utilities undergrounding program; and plans and coordinates work in the public right-of-way. Storm drains are designed to handle normal water flow, but occasionally flooding will occur during heavy rain. Storm drain infrastructure within the community's streets often discharges into the natural canyon areas, causing erosion. Storm water pollution affects people as well as aquatic plant and animal life. Oil and grease from parking lots and roads, leaking petroleum storage tanks, pesticides, cleaning solvents, and other toxic chemicals can contaminate storm water and be transported into receiving waters.

While storm drain infrastructure within public streets in the community still needs to be upgraded, new regulations require storm water flow to be controlled within individual sites. The City's Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System Permit (MS4 Permit), issued by the San Diego RWQCB, requires all development and redevelopment projects to implement storm water source control and site design practices to minimize the generation of pollutants. Additionally, the permit requires new development and significant redevelopment projects that exceed certain size threshold to implement Structural Storm Water Best Management Practices (Structural BMPs) to reduce pollutant in storm water runoff and control runoff volume. There is also an increased reliance on Low Impact Development (LID) strategies to meet the MS4 Permit and total maximum daily load (TMDL) requirements. Examples of LID techniques include bioretention cells, green roofs, permeable pavement, infiltration basins, and biofiltration planters.

c. Solid Waste and Recycling

The City provides refuse, recycling, and yard waste collection services to some residents per the People's Ordinance (SDMC Section 66.0127), adopted in 1919. These services are provided without a fee primarily to single-family homes, and also some multi-family facilities, using General Fund monies. Residences on private streets, commercial land uses, and certain multi-family residences are not served by the City, and must obtain the services of one of the City's franchised haulers.

Solid waste generated in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is collected by private franchised haulers and taken to one of three active landfills permitted to accept solid waste: West Miramar Sanitary Landfill (Miramar Landfill), Otay Landfill, and Sycamore Sanitary Landfill (Sycamore Landfill). Miramar Landfill and Sycamore Landfill are located within the City. Otay Landfill is located within an unincorporated area within the City of Chula Vista. The Greenery at the Miramar Landfill provides the majority of organic waste processing capacity. Based on projected generation rates, the San Diego region is anticipated to exceed the ability of existing infrastructure to manage waste. The State requires infrastructure to divert commercial waste per the 2011 Assembly Bill (AB) 341, and requires 15 years of organic waste processing capacity per AB 1826 (2014).

Per AB 341, 75 percent of waste must be diverted from disposal in landfills. Of the remaining 25 percent of residuals requiring disposal, 15 years of disposal capacity is the target. West Miramar Landfill (WML) is permitted to receive 8,000 tons per day and, on average, it receives less than 1,000,000 tons per year. The anticipated closure date for WML is 2030. Sycamore Landfill is permitted to receive a maximum of 5,000 tons per day and is expected to operate until 2031. Otay Landfill is permitted to receive 6,700 tons per day and is expected to serve the region through 2021 (CalRecycle 2017).

d. Roadways

The City's Public Works Department provides a full range of engineering services for the City's capital investment in various types of infrastructure, including roadways, and provides traffic engineering services to the communities. The department is responsible for the planning, design, project management, and construction management of public improvement projects, and also for providing traffic operations and transportation engineering services.

Operation and maintenance of roadways are managed by the Streets Division of the City's Transportation and Storm Water Department. The Streets Division is responsible for the maintenance of roadways, bridges, sidewalks, traffic control devices, street lighting, and urban forestry.

e. Energy

Electricity

San Diego Gas & Electric (SDG&E) is the owner and operator of electricity transmission, distribution, and natural gas distribution infrastructure in San Diego County, and currently provides gas and electric services to the Midway-Pacific Highway community. SDG&E is regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). CPUC sets the gas and electricity rates for SDG&E and is responsible for making sure that California utilities customers have safe and reliable utility service at reasonable rates, protecting utilities customers from fraud and promoting the health of California's economy.

There are two major operating power plants in San Diego County: the Encina Power Plant and the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. However, it should be noted that the reactors at the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station have been offline since January 2012, and the station is set to undergo decommissioning. There are also a number of smaller generating plants in the county used as backup during times of peak power demand. These in-region assets are currently capable of generating approximately 2,360 megawatts (MW) of electricity, about 55 percent of the region's summer peak demand. However, San Diego's older in-region resources typically run at partial capacity (1,628 MW) due to air quality, high fuel cost, and other reasons. Power generation and power use are not linked geographically. Electricity generated is fed into the statewide grid and is generally available to any users statewide. SDG&E purchases electricity from this statewide grid through various long-term contracts.

Along with traditional utilities, private generating companies, and state agencies, the California Independent System Operator (ISO) is a component of the state's electricity industry. The ISO is a not-for-profit public benefit organization that operates the state's wholesale power grid. The California ISO strives to make sure California's electricity needs are met.

Natural Gas

Natural gas is imported into the San Diego region by pipeline after being produced at any of several major supply basins located from Texas to Alberta, Canada. Although the San Diego region has access to all of these basins by interstate pipeline, the final delivery into the SDG&E system is dependent on just one Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) pipeline that enters San Diego County from Orange County located along I-5.

Natural gas consumption by sector varies somewhat each year. In general, power plants account for the highest percentage of natural gas consumption in the San Diego region. Residential consumption of natural gas for heating and cooking is the second highest percentage, followed by cogeneration, commercial and industrial consumption, and natural gas fueled vehicles.

Solar Energy

In San Diego, solar energy can be used as an alternative to fossil-fuel energy via private on-site installation/generation or through earmarked purchase of green power from SDG&E. The California Energy Commission (CEC) mandated SDG&E to provide 20 percent of its total energy from solar or other renewable energy sources by the year 2010. While SDG&E missed this goal in 2010, the *Renewables Portfolio Standard Quarterly Report, 1st and 2nd Quarter 2012*, issued by CPUC, states that SDG&E, the region's primary energy provider, "served 20.8 percent of its 2011 retail sales with Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS)-eligible renewable energy," thereby meeting the 2010 goal. SDG&E was also ahead of schedule in meeting a 25 percent goal by 2016, as well as the long-term goal of 33 percent by 2020, by achieving 36.4 percent RPS procurement in 2014. SDG&E is also well on the way to meeting the state's new RPS target of 50 percent renewable by 2030, set in 2015, with 43.1 percent RPS procurement under contract for 2020.

Currently, there are no mandated standards or ordinances requiring reliance on alternative energy by new developments. However, the City's CAP establishes a goal to achieve 100 percent renewable energy on the Citywide electrical grid by 2035. Additionally, Title 24 of the California Public Resources Code does contain mandated energy efficiency requirements for all new developments.

f. Communications

Communications systems for telephone, computers, and cable television are serviced by utility providers such as AT&T, Cox, Spectrum (formerly Time Warner), and other independent cable companies. In addition, television services are available from the two satellite services, Direct TV and Dish. Facilities are located above and below ground within private easements. In recent years, the City has initiated programs to promote economic development through the development of high-tech infrastructure and integrated information systems. The City also works with service providers to underground overhead wires, cables, conductors, and other overhead structures associated with communication systems in residential areas in accordance with proposed development projects. Individual development projects consisting of more than four lots are subject to SDMC Section 144.0240, which requires privately owned utility systems and service facilities to be placed underground.

2.3.13 Biological Resources

2.3.13.1 Vegetation Communities

Seven vegetation communities/land cover types occur within the Biological Study Area (BSA), the 500-foot buffer from the proposed CPU area, as shown in Figure 2-5. Table 2-8 lists acreages per vegetation community/land cover type. A general description of each vegetation community and land cover type present within the BSA is provided below.

Table 2-8
Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types within the Biological Study Area

Vegetation Community/ Land Cover Type	MSCP Wetland/ Upland Tier Category	Midway-Pacific Highway CPU (acres)	500-Foot Buffer (acres)	Total within BSA (acres)
Riparian and Wetlands Habitat				
Southern Coastal Salt Marsh	Wetland		35.94	35.94
Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest	Wetland		6.07	6.07
Alkali Seep	Wetland		5.08	5.08
Other Land Cover Types				
Urban/Developed	Tier IV	1,307.47	509.81	1,817.28
Intensive Agriculture (nursery)	Tier IV	4.02		4.02
Nonwetlands or Other Waters				
Shallow Bay	N/A[1]	11.08	19.93	31.02
Open Water	N/A[1]		22.21	22.21
	Totals	**1,322.57**	**599.03**	**1,921.61**

Source: City of San Diego 2017a; County of San Diego 2015
Note: Totals may not add due to rounding
[1] Non Wetlands and Other Waters are not categorized under the City's MSCP

Riparian and Wetland Habitat


Wetland vegetation communities are dominated by plant species adapted to soils that have periods of prolonged saturation. Wetland vegetation communities are considered sensitive and regulated by USACE, USFWS, CDFW, RWQCB, and the City of San Diego. Several wetland communities occur within the BSA and are described below.

Southern Coastal Salt Marsh

Southern coastal salt marsh is an association of herbaceous and suffrutescent, salt-tolerant hydrophytes that form a moderate to dense cover and can reach a height of 1 meter (3 feet). There are approximately 35.94 acres of southern coastal salt marsh in the 500-foot buffer, located to the north and west of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, along the San Diego River.

Southern Arroyo Willow Riparian Forest

Southern arroyo willow riparian forest is a winter-deciduous riparian forest habitat dominated by moderately tall, broadleafed trees and by arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepsis*). The canopy of this habitat is closed or nearly closed, and the understory is composed of shrubby willows.



Source: SANDAG 2014; City of San Diego 2017

2,000 1,000 0 2,000 Feet

Scale: 1:30,000 ; 1 inch = 2,500 feet

Figure 2-5
Existing Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types

Path: \\ussdg1fp001.na.aecomnet.com\DATA\projects_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\920 GIS\922_Maps\CommunityPlan\Midway_vegetation.mxd, 8/17/2017, paul.moreno

Approximately 6.07 acres of southern arroyo willow riparian forest is located in the 500-foot buffer area in the northeast corner of the BSA, along the San Diego River.

Alkali Seep

Alkali seep habitat consists of low-growing perennial herbs, usually forming complete cover. This permanently moist or alkaline habitat type grows throughout the year in areas with milder winters and consists of relatively few species.

There are about 5.08 acres of alkali seep located in the 500-foot buffer, along the San Diego River to the north of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area.

Other Land Cover Types

Urban/Developed

Urban/developed areas have been constructed upon or otherwise physically altered to an extent that native vegetation is no longer supported. Developed land is characterized by permanent or semi-permanent structures, pavement or hardscape, and landscaped areas that often require irrigation. The majority of areas within the project site and much of the 500-foot buffer are considered developed (Figure 2-5). This includes buildings, roads, parking lots, and landscaping of nonnative vegetation.

Intensive Agriculture

Intensive agricultural land cover is typically characterized by dairies, commercial nurseries, and chicken ranches. There is a small commercial nursery in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area of about 4.02 acres. This nursery is surrounded entirely by urban/developed areas.

Non Wetlands and Other Waters

Shallow Bay

Shallow bay habitats are characteristic of water less than 4 feet deep, where light penetrates to the sea floor. Eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) is a characteristic species; however, these habitats are often unvegetated.

There are approximately 31.02 acres of shallow bay habitat within the BSA—11.08 acres in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and 19.93 acres in the 500-foot buffer. The area of shallow bay habitat is located in the southwest portion of the proposed CPU area and the BSA in a channel extending north from San Diego Bay (Figure 2-5).

Open Water

Open water habitat may consist of marine, freshwater, or brackish water habitat that is largely unvegetated and may comprise rocky outcropping, sandy beaches, or mudflats. There are approximately 22.21 acres of open water habitat in the 500-foot buffer, located to the north and west of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, along the San Diego River.

2.3.13.2 Jurisdictional Resources

The project area occurs almost entirely within urban/developed habitat. Riparian and wetland habitats within the San Diego River in the 500-foot buffer north of the proposed CPU area (i.e., outside of the proposed CPU area) could potentially fall under CDFW and USACE jurisdiction. These features would also qualify as wetland habitat under the City's Biology Guidelines (City of San Diego 2012). The shallow bay habitat located in the southwest section of the proposed CPU area could potentially fall under CDFW and USACE jurisdiction as jurisdictional water. Portions of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are within the Coastal Zone and therefore subject to an existing approved Local Coastal Plan or would require Coastal Development Permit issuance from the California Coastal Commission for any impacts to jurisdictional resources.

2.3.13.3 Sensitive Plants

Based on a review of California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) and a review of the habitat within the BSA, 10 special-status plant species have been documented or have potential to occur within the BSA (Table 2-9). Several of the species documented within the BSA represent historic locations that no longer contain suitable habitat for plants within the BSA and populations are likely extirpated. Species not expected to occur within the BSA or with low or moderate potential to occur within the BSA are summarized in Table 2-9 and not further discussed in this text. One special-status plant species, spiny rush (*Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii*), with high potential to occur within the BSA is detailed below.

Table 2-9
Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species Documented or with Potential to Occur within the Biological Study Area

Species	Status[1]	MSCP Covered (Yes/No)[3]	General Habitat (Unitt 2004; Lightner 2011; Osborne and ICF International 2014; WBWG 2017)	Potential for Occurrence within the Biological Study Area
Plants				
beach goldenaster *Heterotheca sessiliflora* ssp. *sessiliflora*	CRPR 1B.1	No	Beach, dunes, mud flats; elevation <200 feet.	**Low potential to occur;** BSA is highly developed habitat lacking appropriate habitat.
Brand's star phacelia *Phacelia stellaris*	CRPR 1B.1	No	Open areas, coastal sage scrub; elevation <400 feet.	**Low potential to occur;** BSA is highly developed habitat lacking coastal sand dunes.
coast wooly-head *Nemacaulis denudata* var. *denudate*	CRPR 1B.2	No	Coastal sand dunes; elevation <100 feet.	**Low potential to occur;** BSA is highly developed habitat lacking coastal sand dunes.
Coulter's goldfields *Lasthenia glabrata* ssp. *coulteri*	CRPR 1B.1	No	Grassland, scrub, chaparral, burned habitat; elevations <6,500 feet.	**Low potential to occur;** BSA is highly developed habitat; species may occur in the BSA buffer along the San Diego River corridor.

Table 2-9
Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species Documented or with Potential to Occur within the Biological Study Area

Species	Status[1]	MSCP Covered (Yes/No)[3]	General Habitat (Unitt 2004; Lightner 2011; Osborne and ICF International 2014; WBWG 2017)	Potential for Occurrence within the Biological Study Area
decumbent goldenbush *Isocoma menziesii* var. *decumbens*	CRPR 1B.2	No	Marshes, river mouths, valleys, disturbed fields; elevations <3,500 feet.	**Moderate potential to occur;** common species in coastal salt marshes and may occur in the BSA buffer along the San Diego River corridor.
estuary sea-blite *Suaeda esteroa*	CRPR 1B.2	No	Coastal salt marshes; elevations <50 feet.	**Low/moderate potential to occur;** common species in coastal salt marshes and may occur in the BSA buffer along the San Diego River corridor.
light gray lichen *Mobergia calculiformis*	CRPR 3	No	Diverse variety of substrate.	**Low potential to occur;** species unlikely to occur in the BSA.
Nuttall's acmispon *Acmispon prostratus*	CRPR 1B.1	No	Hard sand beaches; elevations <500 feet.	**Moderate potential to occur;** may occur in the BSA where the appropriate substrate is present.
Nuttall's scrub oak *Quercus dumosa*	CRPR 1B.1	No	Coastal chaparral and urban canyons, at elevations <1,500 feet.	**Moderate potential to occur;** species may occur in developed habitats, less likely in the wetland-type habitats of the BSA buffer.
spiny rush *Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii*	CRPR 4.2	No	Wet alkaline places, coastal marshes, river valleys, and by desert creeks, at elevations <3,000 feet.	**High potential to occur;** species very likely along wetland habitats in the BSA and BSA buffer.
Wildlife				
American Peregrine Falcon *Falco peregrinus anatum*	CFP; SSC;	yes	Nest sites on cliff ledges, previously constructed nests, and human-made structures such as buildings, cranes, and bridges.	**Low potential to occur;** rare species in San Diego, and the BSA is highly developed and lacking suitable habitat.
Belding's Savannah Sparrow *Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi*	CE	yes	Nest sites on or near the ground in dense marsh vegetation.	**High potential to occur;** Habitat is present within the San Diego River.
California Least Tern *Sternula antillarum browni*	FE; CE	yes	Nest sites consist of a scrape in sand or dirt.	**Low potential to occur;** species may use the BSA during winter or for foraging; however, breeding is unlikely in the BSA.

Table 2-9
Special-Status Plant and Wildlife Species Documented or with Potential to Occur within the Biological Study Area

Species	Status[1]	MSCP Covered (Yes/No)[3]	General Habitat (Unitt 2004; Lightner 2011; Osborne and ICF International 2014; WBWG 2017)	Potential for Occurrence within the Biological Study Area
Least Bell's Vireo *Vireo bellii pusillus*	FE; CE	yes	Nest sites predominantly occur on coastal slopes, willows, and mulefat.	**Low potential to occur;** species may use the BSA during winter or for foraging; however, breeding is unlikely in the BSA.
Light-footed Ridgway's Rail *Rallus obsoletus levipes*	FE; CE; CFP	yes	Nest sites predominate in tidal marshes dominated by cordgrass.	**High potential to occur;** species recorded as breeding in 1997 (Unitt 2004); habitat is present within the San Diego River.
Mexican Long-tongued Bat *Choeronycteris Mexicana*	SSC	no	Roosting occurs at entrances of caves, mines, rock crevices, and abandoned buildings.	**Low potential to occur;** highly developed habitat provides little habitat for foraging and roosting.
Western Snowy Plover *Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*	FT; SSC	yes	Nest sites in sand or dried mud scrapes.	**Low potential to occur;** species may use the BSA during winter or for foraging; however, breeding is unlikely in the BSA.

Source: CDFW 2017
[1]FE = USFWS Endangered Species
FT = USFWS Threatened Species
CE = CDFW Endangered Species
CFP = CDFW Fully Protected Species
SSC = CDFW Species of Special Concern
CRPR: California Rare Plant Rank:
1B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
2B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere
3: Plants about which more information is needed – review list
4: Plants of limited distribution – a watch list
Decimal notations: .1 – Seriously endangered in California, .2 – Fairly endangered in California, .3 – Not very endangered in California

Spiny Rush (*Juncus acutus* subsp. *leopoldii*)

Spiny rush has a high potential to occur in any wetland or water habitat. This perennial grass-like herb is native to California and is currently included on the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants at CRPR 4 – *Plants of Limited Distribution – a Watch List* (CNPS 2017). In the BSA, spiny rush has high potential to occur in the buffer area along the San Diego River corridor and along the shallow bay habitat of San Diego Bay, in the southwest corner of the BSA (Figure 2-5).

2.3.13.4 Sensitive Wildlife

Based on a review of CNDDB data and a review of the habitat within the BSA, seven special-status wildlife species have been documented or have potential to occur within the BSA (Table 2-9). Several of the species documented within the BSA are historical locations that no longer have habitat within the BSA and the populations are likely extirpated. Species not expected to occur within the BSA or with low or moderate potential to occur within the BSA are summarized in Table 2-9 and not further discussed in this text. Two special-status wildlife species, Light-footed Ridgway's Rail (*Rallus obsoletus levipes*) and Belding's Savannah Sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi*) have high potential to occur in the BSA.

Light-footed Ridgway's Rail (*Rallus obsoletus levipes*)

Light-footed Ridgway's Rail is federally and state listed as endangered and is a covered species under City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The species is restricted to coastal salt marshes in Southern California, such as San Dieguito and Los Peñasquitos Lagoons, where vegetation is dominated by cordgrass and pickleweed. Habitat for this species occurs within the San Diego River north of I-8. The most recent CNDDB location occurred in 2007, near the mouth of the San Diego River at the Morena Boulevard overpass (CDFW 2017).

Belding's Savannah Sparrow (*Passerculus sandwichensis beldingi*)

Belding's Savannah Sparrow is a state-listed endangered species and is a covered species under the City's MSCP. Belding's Savannah Sparrow is a resident from Santa Barbara County to northern Baja California. Its preferred habitat is pickleweed-dominated coastal salt marsh associations. Habitat for this species occurs within the San Diego River north of I-8. The closest known CNDDB location occurred in 2001, in the San Diego River control channel west of I-5 (CDFW 2017).

2.3.13.5 Wildlife Movement

Habitat connectivity is essential for the persistence of healthy and genetically diverse animal communities (Crooks and Sanjayan 2006). Wildlife corridors or linkages are linear landscape features that allow for species movement over time between two areas of habitat that would otherwise be disconnected (Beier and Noss 1998; Beier et al. 2008; Lidicker and Peterson 1999). Regional corridors (or landscape linkages) link two or more large areas of natural open space, and local corridors (or dispersal corridors) allow resident animals to access critical resources (food, water, and cover) in areas that might otherwise be isolated. At a minimum, corridors promote local colonization or recolonization of distinct habitats, potentially increase genetic variability within and between populations, and maintain appropriate predator/prey relationships. Wildlife movement activities typically fall into one of three movement categories: local and regional dispersal (e.g., juvenile animals from natal areas or individuals extending range distributions), regional seasonal migration, and local movements related to home range activities (foraging for food or water, defending territories, searching for mates, breeding areas, or cover).

Human encroachment and other disturbances (e.g., light, loud noises, domestic animals) associated with developed areas that have caused habitat fragmentation may have a negative effect on corridors (Schweiger et al. 2000). Therefore, wildlife corridors may function at various levels depending upon these factors and the species. The level of connectivity needed to maintain a population of a particular species

will vary with the demography of the population, including population size, survival and birth rates, and genetic factors such as the level of inbreeding and genetic variance (Rosenberg et al. 1997). Areas not considered functional wildlife dispersal corridors or linkages are typically obstructed or isolated by concentrated development and heavily traveled roads, known as “chokepoints.” One of the worst scenarios for dispersing wildlife occurs when a large block of habitat leads animals into “cul-de-sacs” of habitat surrounded by development. These habitat cul-de-sacs frequently result in adverse human/animal interface.

The San Diego River corridor that runs along the northern portion of the BSA functions as a portion of a landscape linkage providing connection of coastal and inland habitats (Penrod et al. 2001). The City of San Diego recognized the importance of this riparian corridor as a landscape linkage for amphibians, reptiles, birds, and small- and medium-sized mammals when delineating the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) for the City’s MSCP. In spite of the urbanized surrounding area, the San Diego River riparian habitat is an area of relatively high species diversity and abundance and provides a regional corridor. Concentrated development and heavily traveled roads surrounding the San Diego River corridor limit terrestrial species from using this corridor to disperse to adjacent canyons. However, this regional corridor supports avian or bat species that are capable of flying over barriers to adjacent habitat. Developed lands account for almost the entirety of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, so there are no wildlife corridors in that area. Only the adjacent San Diego River corridor, in the 500-foot buffer area to the north of the proposed CPU area, may serve as a wildlife corridor for avian or bat species.

2.3.14 Paleontology

Paleontological resources, or fossils, are the remains and/or traces of prehistoric plant and animal life. Fossils provide direct evidence of ancient organisms and document the patterns of organic evolution and extinction that have characterized the history of life. Fossil remains, such as bones, teeth, shells, and wood, are found in the geologic deposits (formations) within which they were originally buried. Paleontological resources contain not only the actual fossil remains, but also the localities where those fossils are collected and the geologic formations containing the localities. Fossil remains are important, as they provide indicators of the earth’s chronology and history. They represent a limited, nonrenewable, and sensitive scientific and educational resource.

The potential for fossil remains at a location can be predicted through previous correlations that have been established between the fossil occurrence and the geologic formations within which they are buried. Geologic formations possess a specific paleontological resource potential wherever the formation occurs based on discoveries made elsewhere in that particular formation. To evaluate paleontological resources in the proposed CPU area, the presence and distribution of geologic formations, and the respective potential for paleontological resources must be evaluated.

2.3.14.1 Physical Geological Setting

The Coastal Plain region of San Diego County is underlain by a layer cake sequence of marine and non-marine sedimentary rock units that record portions of the last 140 million years of the earth’s history. Over this period of time, the relationship of land and sea has drastically fluctuated, such that today, there are ancient marine rocks preserved up to elevations of 900 feet above sea level and ancient river deposits as high as 1,200 feet. Faulting related to the local La Nacion and Rose Canyon fault zones has broken up

this sedimentary sequence into a number of distinct fault blocks in the southwestern part of the county. See Section 2.3.4 ~~2.3.14.2~~ for further discussion of the existing geologic conditions in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area.

2.3.14.2 Geologic Formations

Knowing the geology of a particular area and the fossil productivity of formations that occur in that area, it is possible to predict where fossils will, or will not, be encountered. Geologic formations located within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area include the Eocene (48 to 50 million years old) Mount Soledad Formation, which is overlain by the Pleistocene (700,000 to 10,000 years old) Bay Point Formation. However, the vast majority of the proposed CPU area is artificial fill, which has no paleontological resource sensitivity assigned. A general overview of the geologic formations located within the project area are described below and shown in Figure 2-6.

Bay Point Formation (Qop8)

The Bay Point Formation represents a nearshore marine to onshore fluvial sedimentary deposit of middle to late Pleistocene age (700,000 to 10,000 years old). Typical exposures consist of light gray, friable to partially cemented, fine- to coarse-grained, massive to cross-bedded sandstone. This rock unit includes marine-terrace deposits, as well as valley-fill deposits, and, in some cases, river-terrace deposits. The Bay Point Formation has produced large and diverse assemblages of well-preserved marine invertebrate fossils, primarily mollusks, from many localities in the metropolitan San Diego area. Remains of fossil marine vertebrates (i.e., sharks, rays, and bony fishes) and terrestrial mammals (e.g., horse, camel, deer, mastodon, and mammoth) have also been recovered from this rock unit.

Mount Soledad Formation (Tmss)

The Mount Soledad Formation is the lowest member of the Eocene La Jolla Group, with an estimated age of 48 to 50 million years old. At the type locality on Mount Soledad, the formation is approximately 225 feet thick, composed mainly of cobble conglomerate (Kennedy 1975). The paleoenvironment of the Mount Soledad Formation is interpreted as a submarine channel, deposited during a period of rapid sea level rise. The Mount Soledad Formation contains fossils of marine mollusks, bivalves (clams, oysters), foraminifers, echinoderms (sea stars, sea urchins, sand dollars), anthropods (crabs, lobsters, barnacles), and bryozoans (moss animals). All of these fossils have a high scientific value.

Artificial Fill Materials (af)

Much of the project area is mapped as being underlain by artificial fill. Fill materials presumably were derived from earlier construction activities and were placed in such a way as to provide topographically high areas for current and future development. No fossils of paleontological interest are located in artificial fill materials. Any contained organic remains have lost their original stratigraphic/geologic context due to the disturbed nature of the artificial fill materials. Artificial fill materials are assigned a zero paleontological resource sensitivity due to the loss of the stratigraphic/geologic context of any contained organic remains (e.g., fossils).

2.3.14.3 Levels of Paleontological Resource Sensitivity


A Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix is provided in Table 2-10, which identifies the geologic formation, its location of potential occurrence, and its sensitivity rating. Paleontological resource sensitivity of geologic formations is typically rated from high to zero. The sensitivity of the paleontological resource determines the significance of a paleontological impact. The following levels of paleontological resource sensitivity are rated for individual formations, since it is the formation that contains the fossil remains:

High Sensitivity – High sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations known to contain paleontological localities with rare, well-preserved, critical fossil materials for stratigraphic or paleoenvironmental interpretation, and fossils providing important information about the paleobiology and evolutionary history (phylogeny) of animal and plant groups. Generally speaking, highly sensitive formations produce vertebrate fossil remains or are considered to have the potential to produce such remains.

Moderate Sensitivity – Moderate sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations known to contain paleontological localities with poorly preserved, common elsewhere, or stratigraphically unimportant fossil material. The moderate sensitivity category is also applied to geologic formations judged to have a strong, but unproven potential for producing important fossil remains.

Low Sensitivity – Low sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations that, based on their relative youthful age and/or high-energy depositional history, are judged unlikely to produce important fossil remains. Typically, low sensitivity formations produce invertebrate fossil remains in low abundance.

Zero Sensitivity – Zero sensitivity is assigned to geologic formations that are entirely igneous in origin and therefore have no potential for producing fossil remains, or to artificial fill materials that lose the stratigraphic/geologic context of any contained organic remains (e.g., fossils).



Legend

Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area

MODERN SURFICIAL DEPOSITS

- af — Artificial fill (late Holocene)
- Qls — Landslide deposits, undivided (Holocene and Pleistocene)
- Qmo — Undivided marine deposits in offshore region (late Holocene)

YOUNG SURFICIAL DEPOSITS

- Qya — Young alluvial flood-plain deposits (Holocene and late Pleistocene)
- Qyc — Young colluvial deposits (Holocene and late Pleistocene)

OLD SURFICIAL DEPOSITS

- Qop — Old paralic deposits, undivided (late to middle Pleistocene)
- Qop_6 — Qop6 (Old paralic deposits - Unit 6)

VERY OLD SURFICIAL DEPOSITS

- Qvop — Very old paralic deposits, undivided (middle to early Pleistocene)
- $Qvop_{11}$ — Unit 11
- $Qvop_{10}$ — Unit 10
- $Qvop_9$ — Unit 9
- $Qvop_8$ — Unit 8

SEDIMENTARY AND VOLCANIC BEDROCK UNITS

- Tsd — San Diego Formation - undivided (early Pleistocene and late Pliocene)
- Tp — Pomerado Conglomerate (middle Eocene)
- Tmv — Mission Valley Formation (middle Eocene)
- Tst — Stadium Conglomerate (middle Eocene)
- Tf — Friars Formation (middle Eocene)
- Tsc — Scripps Formation (middle Eocene)
- Tmss — Mount Soledad Formation - sandstone (middle Eocene)
- Kcs — Cabrillo Formation - sandstone (Upper Cretaceous)
- Kccg — Cabrillo Formation - cobble conglomerate (Upper Cretaceous)

ONSHORE MAP SYMBOLS

Contact - Contact between geologic units; dotted where concealed.

Fault - Solid where accurately located; dashed where approximately located; dotted where concealed. U = upthrown block, D = downthrown block. Arrow and number indicate direction and angle of dip of fault plane.

Anticline - Solid where accurately located; dashed where approximately located; dotted where concealed. Arrow indicates direction of axial plunge.

Syncline - Solid where accurately located; dotted where concealed. Arrow indicates direction of axial plunge.

Landslide - Arrows indicate principal direction of movement. Queried where existence is questionable.

Strike and dip of beds
Inclined
Strike and dip of igneous joints
Inclined
Vertical
Strike and dip of metamorphic foliation
Inclined

OFFSHORE FAULTS

Fault - Solid where well defined; dashed where approximately located; short dash where inferred; dotted where concealed; queried where uncertain. Where fault offsets sea floor, age symbol is shown on bar on downthrown side. Where age was determined, age symbol is shown astride fault and relative offset, if known, is shown by "D" and "U" on downthrown and upthrown sides. Ages of faults are indicated as follows:

- cuts strata of Holocene age
- cuts strata of late Quaternary age
- cuts strata of Quaternary age
- cuts Miocene and older strata

Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP; Kennedy and Tan, 2008

0 2,000 4,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 2-6
Geologic Map

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 2-10
Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix

Geological Deposit/Formation/ Rock Unit	Potential Fossil Localities	Sensitivity Rating
Alluvium (Qsw, Qal, or Qls)	All communities where unit occurs	Low
Ardath Shale (Ta)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Bay Point/Marine Terrace (Qbp)[1]	All communities where unit occurs	High
Cabrillo Formation (Kcs)	All communities where unit occurs	Moderate
Delmar Formation (Td)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Friars Formation (Tf)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Granite/Plutonic (Kg)	All communities where unit occurs	Zero
Lindavista Formation (Qln, Qlb)[2]	Mira Mesa/Tierrasanta	High
	All other areas	Moderate
Lusardi Formation (Kl)	Black Mountain Ranch/Lusardi Canyon Poway/Rancho Santa Fe	High
	All other areas	Moderate
Mission Valley Formation (Tmv)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Mt. Soledad Formation (Tmv)	Rose Canyon	High
	All other areas where unit occurs	Moderate
Otay Formation (To)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Point Loma Formation (Kp)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Pomerado Conglomerate (Tp)	Scripps Ranch/Tierrasanta	High
	All other areas	
River/Steam Terrace Deposits (Qt)	South Eastern/Chollas Valleys/ Fairbanks Ranch/Skyline/Paradise Hills/Otay Mesa, Nestor/San Ysidro	Moderate
	All other areas	Low
San Diego Formation (Qsd)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Santiago Peak Volcanics (Jsp) Metasedimentary	Black Mountain Ranch/La Jolla Valley, Fairbanks Ranch/Mira Mesa/ Peñasquitos	Moderate
Santiago Peak Volcanics (Jsp) Metavolcanic	All other areas	Zero
Scripps Formation (Tsd)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Stadium Conglomerate (Tst)	All communities where unit occurs	High
Sweetwater Formation	All communities where unit occurs	High
Torrey Sandstone (Tf)	Black Mountain Ranch/Carmel Valley	High
	All other areas	Low

Sensitivity Rating Grading Thresholds for Required Monitoring
High = >1,000 cubic yards and 10 feet+ deep
Moderate = >2,000 cubic yards and 10 feet+ deep
Zero-Low = Monitoring not required
Baypoint[1] – Broadly correlative with Qop 1-8 of Kennedy and Tan (2008) new mapping nomenclature.
Lindavista[2] – Broadly correlative with Qvop 1-13 of Kennedy and Tan (2008) new mapping nomenclature.
*Monitoring is always required when grading on a fossil recovery site or near a fossil recovery site in the same geologic deposit/formation/rock unit as the project site as indicated on the Kennedy Maps.
**Monitoring may be required for shallow grading (i.e., <10 feet) when a site has previously been graded and/or unweathered geologic deposits/formations/rock units are present at the surface.
***Monitoring is not required when grading documented or undocumented artificial fill.
Source: City of San Diego 2016

This page intentionally left blank.

3

Chapter 3.0
Project Description

3.1 Introduction

The project analyzed in this ~~Draft~~ PEIR is the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update (proposed CPU), as well as several discretionary actions listed in Table 3-1. The proposed CPU and associated regulatory documents and discretionary actions form the "project" for this PEIR and are referred to throughout the PEIR as the project. The project description contained within this section provides the basis for the environmental analysis in this PEIR for the proposed CPU and the associated discretionary actions.

Table 3-1
Project Components

Adoption of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan (Community Plan)
Adoption of the amendments to the General Plan to incorporate the Community Plan and Mixed Commercial Residential land use designation
Rezone land within Midway-Pacific Highway to be consistent with the Community Plan
Amend the City's certified Local Coastal Program to incorporate the Community Plan
Amend the San Diego Municipal Code to include a new Commercial-Office zone, a new Commercial-Neighborhood zone, and corresponding parking requirements
Amend the Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) within the San Diego Municipal Code related to the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area to repeal existing CPIOZ areas and adopt new CPIOZ areas
Amend the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone within the San Diego Municipal Code to include the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area
Certification of PEIR

The proposed CPU and associated regulatory documents are available for review at the City and at the following website:

Midway-Pacific Highway: https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpu/oldtownmidway

The existing Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan was adopted in 1991. The project will ensure consistency of the proposed CPU with, and incorporate relevant policies from, the City of San Diego General Plan (General Plan), as well as provide a long-range, comprehensive policy framework and vision for growth and development in the Midway-Pacific Highway community through 2035.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU provides a long-range guide for the future physical development of the community. The CPU process started in 2012 with a public outreach effort centered on community meetings that included Midway-Pacific Highway's stakeholder committees and neighborhood associations, workshops on key topics, a multi-day charrette, and meetings of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update Advisory Committee and the City's recognized community planning group.

3.2 Relationship to General Plan

The General Plan, adopted in 2008, did not change the Community Plan land use designations or zoning on individual properties, but rather provided policy direction for future CPUs, discretionary project review, and implementation programs. The General Plan provided the Citywide vision and comprehensive policy framework for how the City should grow and develop, provide public services, and maintain the qualities that define the City as a whole.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would build upon the goals and strategies in the General Plan. The proposed CPU is intended to further express General Plan policies through the provision of site-specific recommendations and policies that implement Citywide goals and policies at the Community Plan level, address community needs, and guide zoning. The General Plan and Community Plan work together to establish the policy framework for growth and development in the proposed CPU area. The Land Development Code (LDC) within the SDMC implements the Community Plan policies and recommendations through zoning and development regulations. Specific General Plan policies are referenced within the proposed CPU to emphasize their relevance and applicability in the Midway-Pacific Highway community. This PEIR provides analysis and evaluation of all relevant land use and environmental issues associated with the project.

The General Plan's Land Use Element identifies Midway-Pacific Highway as a subregional employment center and an area with high propensity for mixed-use village development implementing the policies of the City of Villages strategy. The 1991 Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan, as amended in 1999, allows stand-alone commercial or industrial uses along the trolley corridor and stand-alone commercial or residential uses along the Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street corridors. The 1999 amendments to the 1991 Midway-Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan incorporated the Bay-to-Bay Canal concept into the Community Plan, and amended the land use plan to allow mixed-use development along much of the canal's conceptual alignment. The 1991 Community Plan also places much of the future housing capacity within the City-owned land along Sports Arena Boulevard and along the conceptual Bay-to-Bay canal alignment.

The Midway-Pacific Highway area of the community features several large blocks or "superblocks" that result in concentration of vehicle trips on the few roadways that provide continuous connections through the community and result in longer distance trips for pedestrians and bicyclists. These superblocks are (1) the block bounded by Midway Drive, Barnett Avenue, the Navy's Gateway Housing complex, and Rosecrans Street; (2) the block bounded by Midway Drive, Enterprise Street, Pacific Highway, Sports Arena Boulevard, and Rosecrans Street; (3) the block bounded by Rosecrans Street, Sports Arena Boulevard, Kemper Street, and Midway Drive; and (4) the block bounded by Sports Arena Boulevard, Rosecrans Street, Kurtz Street, and Hancock Street.

The City worked with the Midway-Pacific Highway community stakeholders to identify locations that would support compact, pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use village centers linked by transit and developed community-specific policies that support infill development. The proposed CPU included examining existing and future market conditions for a number of commercial, industrial, and residential development types to make sure that development could reasonably occur under the Community Plan's policies, the proposed zoning, and other applicable development regulations.

The need for public facilities, including parks, new mobility connections, and public realm improvements, in Midway-Pacific Highway and the community's existing infrastructure were studied to determine the types and amount of additional investment that will be needed to support the future planned growth in a sustainable manner. For example, the proposed CPU evaluated developing measures to reduce congestion through improving alternative modes of transportation and strategic roadway improvements that could improve existing roadway function. The proposed zoning for Midway-Pacific Highway establishes appropriate Citywide zones that allow for mixed-use village development and base-sector employment uses, consistent with the proposed Community Plan land-use designations. Further, the proposed CPIOZ would allow flexibility in the application of development regulations for planned streets, linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies, and development within the Sports Arena Community Village and the Dutch Flats Urban Village and streetscape enhancements along Sports Arena Boulevard near Rosecrans Street.

3.3 Project Objectives

The following specific objectives for the proposed CPU support the underlying purpose of the project, assisted the City as lead agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in this PEIR, and will ultimately aid the lead agency in preparing findings and overriding considerations, if necessary. The primary goals, recommendations, and objectives of the project are as follows:

- Establish multiple-use villages and districts within the community;
- Enhance community identity and visual character through land use and urban design;
- Create a complete mobility system that promotes access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit, including within existing superblocks;
- Create a Bay-to-Bay pedestrian and bicycle linkage (replacing the Bay-to-Bay canal concept);
- Identify park and recreation facilities to serve the community;
- Provide housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit;
- Maintain employment uses including industrial, business park, and commercial office uses to support the City's economy;
- Improve localized water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design; and
- Identify future alternative uses for government-owned land in the community.

3.4 Project Description

The project includes the comprehensive update to the Midway/Pacific Highway Community Corridor Plan, which is intended to guide development through 2035. For facility planning, technical evaluation, and environmental review purposes, build-out is assumed to occur in 2035. The land use is analyzed at build-out using a total dwelling unit yield ~~for a maximum projection. This is based on t~~The total dwelling unit yield reflects assumptions that some properties would ~~not~~ redevelop at the maximum permitted residential ~~at the greater~~ density; ~~while~~ other~~s will be~~ properties would develop~~ed with~~ at ~~higher~~residential densities below the maximum due to development constraints and market conditions; and other sites may develop with a density above maximum as permitted under state and local density bonus regulations, as discussed in greater detail in Appendix N. ~~The maximum projection for residential density is utilized because the required infrastructure (streets and utilities) is in place and documented development reflects maximum development potential due to the cost of land and the demand for housing.~~

The proposed CPU provides detailed policy direction to implement the General Plan with respect to the distribution and arrangement of land uses (public and private); local street and transit network; prioritization and provision of public facilities and community-wide and site-specific urban design guidelines; and recommendations to preserve and enhance natural open space and historic and cultural resources within the Midway-Pacific Highway community.

The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan is characterized by the development of a strong public realm and unique districts and villages, connected through a system of landscaped streets that will link Mission Bay, the San Diego River, and San Diego Bay to traditional and non-traditional parks within the community to enhance community character and livability.

The Midway-Pacific Highway community desires to be an attractive, vibrant, and healthy community with entertainment, employment, commercial, and housing uses. The community will contain new mixed-use and multiple-use development and a diversity of housing types in districts and villages close to transit stops and stations, supporting the “City of Villages” General Plan concept. The community also seeks to have high-quality parks and recreational facilities including linear parks, community parks and plazas, and improved access to the nearby recreational amenities at San Diego Bay, Mission Bay, and the San Diego River. The proposed CPU proposes a multi-modal transportation system that improves access to community land uses and transit, as well as comfort and safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders.

The proposed CPU is a component of the General Plan as it expresses the guiding principles, goals, and policies contained within the 10 elements of the General Plan through the provision of more refined, community-specific recommendations. Technical and planning studies have been prepared and considered in the development of the proposed CPU, including previous planning and land use documents, redevelopment plans, visioning plans, and technical documents addressing a range of issues. The proposed CPU contains a land use map and mobility network map that will guide future public and private development in the community, as well as policy guidance on land use; mobility; urban design; economic prosperity; public facilities, services and safety; conservation; noise and air quality; and historic preservation.

While the proposed CPU sets forth procedures for their implementation, it does not establish regulations or legislation, nor does it, on its own, rezone property. Controls on development and use of public and private property including zoning, design controls, and implementation of transportation improvements are included as part of the implementation programs for the proposed CPU, and considered part of the proposed CPU.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes an Introduction and an Implementation chapter, and the following elements: Land Use, Villages and Districts; Mobility; Urban Design; Economic Prosperity; Public Facilities, Services and Safety; Recreation; Conservation; Noise; and Historic Preservation. Chapter 11 (Implementation) of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU describes available financing methods for public improvement projects. Each element of the proposed CPU is described below.

3.4.1 Community Plan Elements

3.4.1.1 Land Use, Villages and Districts Element

The Land Use, Villages and Districts Element is found within Chapter 2 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. It establishes the land use framework for the Midway-Pacific Highway community and defines the distribution of proposed land uses on a map. The land use framework for the proposed CPU is depicted on the proposed Community Plan land use map (Figure 3-1). The map designates the proposed general location, distribution, and extent of land uses. The land use designations are meant to be broad enough to give the City flexibility in implementation but clear enough to provide sufficient direction to carry out the goals of the proposed CPU. The figures are to be used and interpreted only in conjunction with the text and other figures contained in the proposed CPU.

The land use plan locates the highest intensity land uses within the community along transit corridors where existing and future commercial, residential, and mixed-use development can support existing and planned transit investments. Residential density is proposed to be increased from the adopted Community Plan in some areas and reduced in some areas to help achieve these objectives. The proposed CPU results in an overall communitywide increase of future housing units when compared to the adopted Community Plan.

Community Plan land use designations that would be applied within the proposed CPU area are described below. Future development within each land use designation would be subject to the proposed CPU policies applicable to each designation. Table 3-2 provides a summary of land use designations within the proposed CPU area, associated permitted densities, and implementing LDC base zones.

a. Land Use Designations

The Community Plan land use designations are indicated on the proposed land use maps and are differentiated by color. The land use designations are described below.


Residential

Residential – Very High

Residential – Very High allows for multi-family housing in the highest density range (74 to 109 dwelling units per acre [du/ac]).

Residential – High

Residential – High allows for multi-family housing within a high density range (54 to 73 du/ac).



Source: City of San Diego

Figure 3-1
Proposed Land Use Map

Table 3-2
Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Proposed Land Use Designations with Implementing Base Zones

General Plan Land Use	Community Plan Designation	Residential Density (dwelling units/acre)	Base Zone	Base Zone Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
Residential	Residential – Low Medium	10–14	RM-1-1	0.75
	Residential – Medium	15–29	RM-2-5	1.35
	Residential – Medium High	30–54	RM-3-8	2.25
	Residential – High	54–73	RM-3-9	2.70
	Residential – Very High	74–109	RM-4-10	3.60
Commercial, Employment, Retail, and Services	Neighborhood Commercial – Residential Permitted	0–54	CN-1-6	1.0[1]
	Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited	N/A	CC-1-3	0.75
	Community Commercial – Residential Permitted	0–44	CC-3-6	2.0[1]
		0-54	CC-3-7	2.0[1]
		0–73	CC-3-8	2.0[1]
	Heavy Commercial	N/A	CC-2-5	2.0
Multiple Use	Mixed Commercial Residential	0–44	CC-3-6	2.0[1]
		0–73	CC-3-8	2.0[1]
		0–109	CC-3-9	2.0[1]
Industrial	Business Park – Residential Permitted	0–44	CO-3-1	2.0[1]
	Urban Industrial	Live/Work Only	IS-1-1	2.0
Institutional	Institutional	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Military	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Park	N/A	N/A	N/A

N/A = not applicable
[1] Base zone provides FAR bonus for mixed-use development as follows:
CN-1-6: 0.75 FAR bonus
CC-3-6: 2.0 FAR bonus
CC-3-7: 2.5 FAR bonus
CC-3-8: 2.5 FAR bonus
CC-3-9: 3.0 FAR bonus
CO-3-1: 1.0 FAR bonus

Residential – Medium High

Residential – Medium High allows for multi-family housing within a medium-high density range (30 to 54 du/ac).

Residential – Medium

Residential – Medium allows for both single-family and multi-family housing within a medium density range (15-29 units du/ac).

Residential – Low Medium

Residential – Low Medium provides for both single-family and multi-family housing within a low-medium density range (10 to 14 du/ac).

Commercial and Employment

Neighborhood Commercial – Residential Permitted

Neighborhood Commercial – Residential Permitted focuses on commercial uses and provides for shopping areas with retail, service, civic, and office uses for the community at large within 3 miles. Residential use between 0-54 du/acre; office, public, and community gathering spaces are also allowed.

Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited

Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited focuses on commercial uses, and provides for shopping areas with retail, service, civic, and office uses for the community at large within 3 to 6 miles.

Community Commercial – Residential Permitted

Community Commercial - Residential Permitted focuses on commercial uses and allows uses including, but not limited to, retail, service, sports arenas, entertainment, and office uses for the community at large. Under this land use designation, residential uses are allowed within the ranges of 0-44 du/acre, 0-54 du/acre, and 0-73 du/acre. Civic and park uses are also allowed.

Mixed Commercial Residential

The Mixed Commercial Residential designations provide opportunities for infill development to create multiple-use areas. Single-use commercial; residential with ground floor shopkeeper units; or mixed residential and commercial use development is allowed. Permitted residential densities vary by location and fall into the ranges of 0-44 du/acre, 0-73 du/acre, and 0-109 du/acre.

Business Park – Residential Permitted

The Business Park – Residential Permitted designation provides for employment uses such as business/professional office and research and development, with limited commercial service, flex-space, and retail uses, as well as residential uses. Mixed business park/residential developments with densities between 0-44 du/acre can create unique urban housing opportunities to support office, urban business, and high-tech research and development employment uses.

Heavy Commercial – Residential Prohibited

The Heavy Commercial – Residential Prohibited designation provides for retail sales, commercial services, office, wholesale, distribution, storage, and vehicular sales and service uses.

Industrial

Urban Industrial

The Urban Industrial designation provides for small and medium-size industrial and business activities.

Institutional and Public/Semi-Public Facilities

Institutional

The Institutional designation provides for uses that are identified as public or semi-public facilities in the proposed CPU, including but not limited to, hospitals, schools, libraries, and police and fire stations.

Military

The Military designation includes MCRD, which provides military training facilities, and the U.S. Navy Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) complex, which contains research facilities.

Proposed Parks


The Proposed Parks designation provides for neighborhood parks and park equivalencies with passive and/or active recreational uses. As shown in Figure 3-2, parks and park equivalencies (linear parks, pocket parks, greens, and squares) are proposed within the Sports Arena Community Village, Dutch Flats Urban Village, Hancock Transit Corridor, Rosecrans District, Lytton District, and Channel District. While park space is identified in the proposed CPU, no specific facilities or layout of facilities have been identified.

b. Villages and Districts

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU identifies villages and districts where growth is focused into mixed-use and multiple-use activity centers that are pedestrian-friendly and linked to transit and an improved regional transportation system. These areas would implement the General Plan's City of Villages strategy and are envisioned to have an integrated mixture of uses, accessible and attractive streets, and public spaces. The proposed CPU identifies specific policies applicable to development in the area. Refer to Figure 3-2 for the location of proposed community villages and districts.

Sports Arena Community Village

The proposed CPU envisions the Sports Arena Community Village as a vibrant, pedestrian- and transit-oriented entertainment area that is a landmark and attraction for Midway-Pacific Highway and surrounding communities, and that also provides the potential for a pedestrian and bicycle connection to the San Diego River Park and Mission Bay Park. It will incorporate a mix of entertainment, office, retail, residential, public, and park uses. Within the Sports Arena Community Village, the proposed CPU applies a land use designation of Community Commercial – Residential Permitted (0-44 dwelling units per acre) to the City-owned property, and a land use designation of Mixed Commercial Residential (0-73 dwelling units per acre) to privately owned parcels along Kurtz Street. The Community Commercial – Residential Permitted land use designation would allow for a variety of commercial uses including retail, services, office, and sports arena, as well as residential and park uses. The Mixed Commercial Residential land use designation would allow for a variety of commercial retail, services, office, and residential uses in



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 16,000 32,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 3-2
Proposed Community Villages and Districts

stand-alone commercial, stand-alone residential, or mixed-use development. The Community Plan and proposed Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (see Section 3.4.2 below) would require the preparation of a specific plan or master plan for the City-owned properties to provide additional specificity regarding future land use mix and public facilities and improvements in the Sports Arena Community Village. A future specific plan or master plan would require City Council adoption and would require additional environmental review to determine the appropriate level of environmental documentation.

Dutch Flats Urban Village

Dutch Flats Urban Village is envisioned as an employment and residential-focused urban village. Office uses and flex and innovation space will support and complement the SPAWAR complex and provide opportunities for defense-related, research and development, and other base sector industries to establish business locations in proximity to transit, Downtown, and SDIA. The integration of retail, public space, and residential uses within the village along new streets and pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure will create a walkable, transit-oriented, mixed-use employment village.

Kemper Neighborhood Village

Kemper Neighborhood Village is envisioned as a pedestrian-oriented mixed-use neighborhood. The village will incorporate office, visitor, retail, residential, and institutional uses, with the San Diego Community College District's Continuing Education Center serving as a focal point of the village.

Rosecrans District

Rosecrans District is envisioned as a pedestrian-oriented commercial area. Large-format retail uses can be retained while incorporating infrastructure that provides improved pedestrian and bicycle access and smaller infill pedestrian-oriented retail spaces fronting Rosecrans Street, Midway Drive, and Sports Arena Boulevard.

Camino Del Rio District

Camino Del Rio District is envisioned as a mix of urban residential uses and small and mid-size businesses throughout the district with retail and visitor commercial uses along Camino Del Rio West and Rosecrans Street. These streets are to be improved as major gateways into the community with enhanced streetscapes to provide a sense of arrival.

Channel District

The Channel District is envisioned as a residential-oriented area with complementary visitor and office commercial uses. The creation of a pedestrian and bicycle linkage along Sports Arena Boulevard to serve as a community gateway to the San Diego River Park and Mission Bay Park will enhance the public realm and support the development of pedestrian-oriented buildings.

Cauby District

The Cauby District is envisioned as a pedestrian-oriented residential and commercial district, with pedestrian-oriented commercial uses along Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street.

Kurtz District

The Kurtz District is envisioned as an employment area with office, research and development, and complementary residential uses that support and complement the SPAWAR complex.

Lytton District

The Lytton District is envisioned as a residential-oriented district with mixed-use residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses along Lytton Street and Rosecrans Street. A pivotal component of the proposed CPU is the creation of pedestrian and bicycle linkages to NTC Park at Liberty Station and San Diego Bay along Lytton Street, Barnett Avenue, and Rosecrans Street.

Hancock Transit Corridor

Hancock Transit Corridor is envisioned as a multiple-use and mixed-use corridor connected to the Washington Street Trolley Station and the historic Mission Brewery, with a diverse mix of residential, office, and retail uses. Residential development, which can include workforce and affordable housing, will activate the area and take advantage of nearby access to trolley service.

Kettner District

The Kettner District is envisioned with a mix of residential, visitor, office, and commercial uses that benefit from access to transit at the Middletown Station and the Intermodal Transit Center (ITC), SDIA, and Downtown. The Pacific Highway corridor will evolve into a linear gateway through infrastructure and design improvements to function as a community gateway and pedestrian and bicycle link to Downtown and San Diego Bay. Several parcels south of Vine Street are under Port jurisdiction. Please refer to the Port Master Plan for land use policies related to these properties (Figure 3-1).

Marine Corps Recruit Depot

The Community Plan envisions maintaining MCRD San Diego as an active military installation and an iconic landmark of San Diego's military history. The proposed CPU incorporates the MCRD area into the Community Plan boundaries, which is a change from the current 1991 Community Plan. MCRD is identified as Military use to maintain its land use importance for national defense. The proposed CPU contains a policy to prepare a specific plan to address the reuse of the property should MCRD close and the federal government determine that the property is not needed for another military use.

c. Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU identifies CPIOZs to supplement development regulations related to residential development, the development of planned streets, linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies within the Sports Arena Community Village and the Dutch Flats Urban Village; and streetscape enhancements along Sports Arena Boulevard near Rosecrans Street. The CPIOZs are further discussed below in Section 3.4.2.1 of this PEIR.

3.4.1.2 Mobility Element

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Mobility Element provides direction on how to achieve mobility goals through a balanced, multi-modal transportation network in the Community Plan area. This element is closely linked to the Land Use, Villages and Districts Element and Urban Design Element. The Mobility Element describes existing and planned conditions related to streets, freeways, bicycling, walkability, and public transit, including recommended mobility improvements to achieve improved facilities, capacity, and access. It also provides policies regarding Transportation Demand Management (TDM), Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), parking management, and goods movement and freight circulation.

The Mobility Element identifies planned street, bicycle facility, and pedestrian route classifications, which reflect the proposed CPU's mobility goals to provide enhancements to streetscapes and street functionality that support pedestrian, bicycle, and transit activity and the creation of a mobility system that provides adequate capacity and improved regional access for vehicular traffic and that incorporates complete streets features and facilities wherever possible.


The proposed CPU identifies specific policies applicable to pedestrians, bicycling, and transit and identifies priority routes for each mode. Policies applicable to each travel mode and mobility topic are provided in addition to planned facility classifications. Street system policies focus on providing a complete street network throughout the communities to accommodate all modes and break up the community's superblocks to make the community plan area more walkable as well as increase north-south interconnectivity for all modes. Future roadway classifications for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are shown in Figure 3-3.

An important component of the Mobility Element is the planned implementation of "multi-use urban paths," which will provide enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities connecting through the community and to adjacent communities and recreational resources. Multi-use urban paths will be separated from vehicle traffic to enhance pedestrian and bicyclist comfort and safety. Additional on-street bicycle facilities are proposed to accommodate bicycle commuters and, along Pacific Highway, to connect to the planned cycle track through the Centre City/Downtown community.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies related to ITS, such as coordinated traffic signals and use of TDM, to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU also includes ITS policies that address the mobility needs of the community by maximizing existing roadway capacity and reducing congestion and parking demand. The Mobility Element is contained within Chapter 3 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

3.4.1.3 Urban Design Element

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Urban Design Element presents the proposed urban form of the Community Plan area and highlights opportunities for urban design improvements in the community. It identifies goals including the creation of a framework of streets and blocks that support a pedestrian-oriented pattern and scale of development; an attractive urban environment with high-quality design and materials; an enhanced, expanded, and connected public realm; and linear gateways and urban paths that connect to Mission Bay, the San Diego River Park, San Diego Bay, and adjacent communities. The element also provides goals and policies related to the urban framework of streets and other connections;



Copyright 2012 SanGIS - All Rights Reserved. Full text of this legal notice can be found at: http://www.sangis.org/Legal_Notice.htm

Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 16,000 32,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 3-3
Future Roadway Classifications

urban form, including public spaces and building and site design; neighborhood and community gateways and linkages; streetscape and pedestrian orientation; urban greening and forestry; and other aspects of the vision for future development in the Midway-Pacific Highway community. The Urban Design Element is contained within Chapter 4 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

3.4.1.4 Economic Prosperity Element

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Economic Prosperity Element supports employment-generating land uses and employment growth within the community by encouraging the development of urban, mixed use employment areas within the community located near transit and SDIA. It also supports commercial, industrial, and military land uses that will foster innovation, design, and technology jobs. This element identifies the value of the community's location to attract and retain innovative companies and workers who want to work in a vibrant community near urban living, recreation, and entertainment. The Economic Prosperity Element is contained within Chapter 5 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

3.4.1.5 Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Public Facilities, Service, and Safety Element identifies public facilities and services needed to serve existing and future residents, including educational facilities, public safety services, and infrastructure systems. This element provides policies regarding police and fire services, schools and public libraries, geological and seismic hazards, fire hazards, hazardous materials, and sea level rise. The Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element is contained within Chapter 6 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

3.4.1.6 Recreation Element

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Recreation Element provides goals and a comprehensive park strategy to meet the parks and recreation needs of the existing and future residents in the community. It identifies planned park and park equivalency sites, and provides policies regarding the acquisition and development of new parks and recreation facilities in order to expand active and passive recreational opportunities, and create connections between parks within the community and to parks and open spaces just outside of the community. Where undeveloped land is limited, unavailable, or cost-prohibitive, the General Plan allows for the application of park equivalencies to be determined by the community and City staff. Park equivalencies include joint use facilities, privately owned publicly accessible parks, non-traditional parks (such as indoor recreation facilities), and portions of resource-based parks. Because the Midway-Pacific Highway community is an urbanized community, park equivalencies are planned to satisfy some of the community's population-based park needs. The Recreation Element is contained within Chapter 7 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

3.4.1.7 Conservation Element

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Conservation Element provides goals and policies to effectively manage, preserve, and enhance natural resources in the community. The element addresses sustainable development, urban runoff management, coastal resources, and air quality. It supports sustainability through policies and land use guidance that provide for economic resiliency, resource

conservation, renewable energy, and enhancement of the urban forest and urban agriculture. Strategies included in the Conservation Element address development and use of sustainability and energy generation types, including design measures and technology to reduce consumption of potable water and non-renewable energy. The Conservation Element is contained within Chapter 8 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

3.4.1.8 Noise Element

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Noise Element provides goals and policies addressing noise compatibility, including commercial, traffic, and airport noise and identifies future noise contours from freeways and major roads in the community. The Noise Element is contained within Chapter 9 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

3.4.1.9 Historic Preservation Element

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Historic Preservation Element describes the archaeological tribal and historic context and history of the built environment in Midway-Pacific Highway. The Historic Preservation Element focuses on the protection of the community's historical and cultural resources, and supports educational opportunities and incentives to highlight, maintain, and preserve historic resources. This element provides a framework for evaluating individual historic properties and districts for the NRHP, California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), and the San Diego Register of Historic Resources. Specific policies for the Community Plan area are provided to identify, preserve, and promote education and awareness of the community's historic resources. The Historic Preservation Element is contained within Chapter 10 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

3.4.1.10 Implementation

The proposed CPU includes an Implementation chapter that describes future actions that would implement the Community Plan. Future implementation actions are listed below.

- Regularly update an Impact Fee Study (IFS; formerly known as Public Facilities Financing Plan) identifying the capital improvements and other projects necessary to accommodate present and future community needs as identified throughout this Community Plan.

- Implement facilities and other public improvements in accordance with the IFS (formerly known as Public Facilities Financing Plan).

- Pursue local, state, and federal grant funding available to implement unfunded needs identified in the IFS (formerly known as Public Facilities Financing Plan).

- Pursue formation of Community Benefit Assessment Districts, as appropriate, through the cooperative efforts of property owners and the community in order to construct and maintain improvements.

3.4.2 Land Development Code Amendments

3.4.2.1 Amendment to the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone Boundaries

The CPIOZ is applied within the boundaries of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan per Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 14 of the SDMC, which specifies the purpose of the CPIOZ is to supplement the SDMC by providing development regulations tailored to specific circumstances and/or sites within the community. The proposed use of the CPIOZ would apply to specific geographic areas within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area per Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 14 of the SDMC. The Sports Arena Community Village CPIOZ (Type B) would require preparation of a comprehensive specific plan or master plan for the City-owned parcels within the Sports Arena Community Village, consistent with the policies identified within the proposed CPU, prior to significant new development within the village, and allow density and/or intensity to be calculated based on site area before dedication of the right-of-way for planned streets or area for planned linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies. The Dutch Flats Urban Village CPIOZ (Type A) would reserve land for the future implementation of planned linear parks and allow density and/or intensity to be calculated based on site area before dedication of the right-of-way for planned streets or area for planned linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies as new development is proposed. The Sports Arena Boulevard Streetscape CPIOZ (Type A) would provide enhanced streetscapes to provide continuity between planned linear parks in the Sports Arena and Dutch Flats villages. The Sports Arena Community Village CPIOZ (Type B) and Dutch Flats Urban Village CPOIZ (Type A) would also include supplemental regulations prohibiting fireplaces in new residential development. A map depicting areas where CPIOZ-Type A and CPIOZ-Type B would be applied is shown in Figure 3-4.

3.4.2.2 New Zones and Parking Regulations

The implementation program for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes amendments to the SDMC, as follows: a revision to the existing CO-3-1 zone, which permits residential use at densities of 0-54 du/acre, to change its name to CO-3-2; a revision to the existing CO-3-2 zone, which permits residential use at densities of 0-73 du/acre, to change its name to CO-3-3 zone; the introduction of a new Commercial-Office (CO) zone (CO-3-1) that permits residential use at densities of 0-44 du/acre; a new Commercial-Neighborhood (CN) zone (CN-1-6) that permits residential use at a density at 0-54 du/acre; and corresponding parking requirements. The new CO zone (CO-3-1) allows for research and development and office uses with a pedestrian orientation, as well as supporting commercial and residential uses and permits a maximum density of one dwelling unit for each 1,000 square feet of lot area. The new CN zone (CN-1-6) allows development with a pedestrian orientation and permits a maximum density of one dwelling unit for each 800 square feet of lot area. Corresponding parking regulations for the new zones would be added to the SDMC. Also, the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone in the SDMC would be amended to apply to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area as a whole. The Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone currently applies to portions of the Community Plan area near existing transit corridors.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 16,000 32,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 3-4
Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones

3.4.2.3 Proposed Rezones

Figure 3-5 shows the proposed zoning that would be implemented under the proposed CPU. Table 3-2 shows the Community Plan land use and implementing LDC base zone and FAR.

3.4.3 Impact Fee Study

The project includes adoption of an IFS (formerly known as a Public Facilities Financing Plan) that addresses the need for public facilities associated with the identified needs of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. City Council adopted the current Public Facilities Financing Plan in 2004. The existing Public Facilities Financing Plan sets forth the major public facilities needs in the areas of transportation (streets, sidewalks, storm drains, traffic signals, etc.), libraries, park and recreation facilities, and fire stations needed to serve the community. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is used to determine the future public facilities needs for the proposed CPU area.

The IFS identifies and prioritizes improvements to public facilities. Improvements vary widely in their range and scope; some could be implemented incrementally as scheduled street maintenance occurs, and others would require significant capital funding from city, state, regional, and federal agencies, or are not feasible until significant new development occurs. The IFS also identifies potential funding sources for public facility financing, including development impact fees. A complete list of projects is included in the proposed IFS.

3.5 Environmental Design Considerations


Several environmental design considerations, beyond compliance with mandatory existing regulations, have been incorporated into the proposed CPU as recommendations within policies to avoid or reduce environmental impacts. These are described below.

3.5.1 Sustainability

Sustainable building concepts and practices have been incorporated into the proposed policies within various elements of the proposed CPU. Implementation of these policies will serve to reduce or avoid potential environmental effects associated with water and energy consumption, consumption of non-renewable or slowly renewing resources, and urban runoff.

3.5.2 Villages and Districts

Development completed in accordance with the proposed CPU would occur in an existing urbanized area with established public transportation infrastructure, including existing and planned future transit service. Most future development is expected to occur within mixed-use villages and districts in proximity to transit, which may reduce vehicle trips and miles traveled. In addition, implementation of the policies contained in the Land Use, Villages and Districts; Mobility; Recreation; and Conservation Elements of the proposed CPU would improve mobility within the Community Plan area by promoting development of a balanced, multi-modal transportation network, including better pedestrian and bicycle facilities and



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 16,000 32,000 Feet

Figure 3-5
Proposed Zoning

improved pedestrian and bicycle connections between villages, districts, and transit. Policies that support walking, bicycling, and transit as transportation choices in the proposed CPU could also reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled.

3.5.3 Transit

As the vision expressed by the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes the creation of a complete mobility system that provides options for people to walk, ride a bicycle, take transit, or drive, it contains policies that specifically address transit services and facilities and transit-oriented development, including the development of new and improved bicycle and pedestrian facilities to enable safe, attractive, and comfortable access to regional transit and increased transit use. It also includes land uses and policies to direct new development primarily into mixed-use villages and districts in proximity to transit and to design development to integrate with transit services and support transit use.

3.5.4 Recreation

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Recreation and Conservation Elements contain policies aimed at creating an accessible and sustainable park system that meets the needs of Midway-Pacific Highway residents and visitors by increasing the quantity and quality of recreation facilities within the proposed CPU area.

3.5.5 Urban Runoff/Water Quality

Urban runoff management policies located in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Conservation and Urban Design Elements seek to reduce potential runoff/water quality impacts by encouraging the use of LID techniques and materials that slow water runoff and absorb pollutants from roofs, parking areas, and other urban surfaces; incorporating bio-swales or other design practices where there are sufficient public rights-of-way throughout the community; and encouraging private property owners to design or retrofit landscaped areas to better capture storm water runoff.

3.5.6 Diversity and Affordability of Housing

The land use plan for the proposed CPU proposes a range of residential and mixed-use land use designations, including moderate and high densities that could allow a mix of market rate and affordable multi-family units. The Midway-Pacific Highway Land Use, Villages and Districts Element contains policies related to supporting the inclusion of on-site affordable housing units in residential developments as well as supporting the development of workforce, affordable, and senior housing in proximity to transit stations.

3.5.7 Bicycle Network

To reduce reliance on fossil fuels and encourage alternative modes of transportation, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU aims to provide a safe and convenient bicycle network that connects community destinations and links to surrounding communities and the regional bicycle network. In support of this goal, the Midway-Pacific Highway Mobility Element includes bicycle policies in Section 3.3 of the Mobility Element. Specifically, policies in this element would support and implement bicycle facilities

that would connect Midway-Pacific Highway to neighboring communities with emphasis on constructing missing connections in the bicycle network, implementing and building upon the San Diego Bicycle Master Plan, and providing buffered and separated bicycle facilities where feasible. The Mobility Element Policy ME-3.1 calls for providing and supporting a continuous network of safe, convenient, and attractive bicycle facilities that connect Midway-Pacific Highway to other communities and to the regional bicycle network. Figure 3-3 illustrates the existing and planned bicycle facilities.

3.5.8 Access to Outdoor and Active Spaces

The proposed CPU supports outdoor-focused gathering places that enhance livability and pedestrian activity as well as guide development of parks to incorporate active ground floors and outdoor uses adjacent to proposed parks and plazas. The proposed multi-use path and bicycle networks would also enhance pedestrian and bicycle access to parks and recreation facilities in the proposed CPU area and in adjacent communities.

Strategies to reduce the existing parkland deficit in the proposed CPU area are also included in the proposed CPU. The Recreation Element includes policies to provide parkland and recreation facilities to meet the needs of diverse users in the community through 2035; create a network of parks and recreation facilities that are accessible by multiple modes of transportation and connect to regional recreation and open space areas; and provide parks and recreation facilities that keep pace with population growth.

3.5.9 Improved Transportation Network and Increased Alternative Modes of Transportation

The proposed CPU includes policies and planned improvements intended to improve the existing transportation network, as well as encourage alternative modes of transportation to reduce impacts related to traffic/circulation and air quality. The proposed Mobility Element would support and help implement the General Plan at the Community Plan level by including specific policies and recommendations that will improve mobility through the development of a balanced, multi-modal transportation network and create new street, pedestrian, and bicycle connections. Specifically, the Mobility Element includes policies addressing walkability that would promote and encourage new construction and upgrades to existing streets, pedestrian pathways, bicycle facilities, and multi-use pedestrian/bicycle paths. Transit policies of the proposed Mobility Element would support village connectivity with transit (trolley and Rapid Bus routes); ITS policies would promote smart parking technology; and bicycle policies would promote a safe, comfortable, and well-connected bicycle network to make bicycling an attractive mode of transportation. In support of General Plan Policies UD-D-1 through D-3, Section 2.2 of the proposed Land Use, Villages and Districts Element focuses the highest intensity development (residential and non-residential) on the community's commercial–transit corridors and village areas to capitalize on access to transit, boost transit ridership, and reduce reliance on driving.

3.5.10 Energy Efficiency in Buildings

The Urban Design and Conservation Elements of the proposed CPU include policies to reduce air, water, and land pollution, and other environmental impacts associated with energy production and consumption. The Urban Design Element encourages new infill buildings and retrofitting of existing buildings to take into account energy-efficient design. In particular, the Midway-Pacific Highway Urban Design Element

provides policies to incorporate building features that reduce energy consumption, reduce solar heat gain, and restore and adaptively reuse older structures. Specifically, policies within the Urban Design Element address sustainable building design, access to light and air, and adaptive reuse.

The Midway-Pacific Highway Conservation Element Policy CE-1.1, along with proposed Mobility Element policies, addresses the implementation of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements in Transit Priority Areas to increase commuter walking and bicycling and to support higher density/intensity housing and employment development in Transit Priority Areas to increase transit ridership. This would include preserving existing buildings with important architectural or historic character as valued community assets and preserving structures that meet the Historical Resources criteria for designation and adaptive reuse, if necessary, to maintain their economic viability.

3.5.11 Air Quality

The Conservation Element includes policies to reduce the proposed CPU's impact on air quality and climate change. The Conservation Element includes Air Quality Policy CE-4.1 which calls for the consideration of air quality and air pollution sources in the siting, design, and construction of residential development and other development with sensitive receptors. The Conservation Element also includes policy CE-1.9, which would increase the community's overall tree canopy within the public right-of-way and in development to provide air quality benefits.

3.5.12 Urban Agriculture, Urban Forestry, and Sustainable Landscape Design

The proposed Conservation Element includes policies in Section 8.1, Sustainable Development, that would support clean and renewable energy as well as urban forestry and urban agriculture. Urban Forestry policies in Section 4.3, Urban Greening, of the Urban Design Element of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU discuss and encourage the implementation of programs for green streets, landscaping, and street trees to integrate storm water management within the public right-of-way. Additionally, Landscaping policies in the Urban Design Element advocate for the preservation of existing mature trees and the incorporation of drought-tolerant and native landscaping in public and private development. Proposed policies in the Conservation Element encourage adding or replacing street trees to fill existing gaps and provide continuous, regularly spaced tree canopies.

3.6 Plan Projections

Future development projections per the land uses allowed have been identified and are expected to occur by 2035. These projections are used for facility planning, technical evaluation, and environmental review purposes for this PEIR.

3.6.1 Land Use Distribution

Table 3-3 shows the amount of area for existing and future land uses according to future land use assumptions and analysis undertaken for the proposed CPU. The assumptions were developed based on the draft community plan vision, land use map, and policies, and on market demand, existing conditions,

and constraints. The predominant land uses in Midway-Pacific Highway would remain military and transportation (roads), with military acreage at approximately 447 acres and the transportation acreage comprising approximately 307 acres. Overall, implementation of the project is anticipated to result in multi-family development at higher densities and allow for mixed-use development incorporating residential, office commercial, and/or retail commercial land uses.

Table 3-3
Existing and Proposed CPU Assumed Land Use in Midway-Pacific Highway

	Existing Development		Proposed CPU		Difference	
Land Use	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Change (Acres)	Change (%)
Residential						
Single-Family Residential	0.8	0.1%	0	0.0%	-0.8	-100%
Multi-Family Residential	81.1	6.1%	125.4	9.5%	43.5	54%
Total	81.9	6.2%	125.4	9.5%	42.7	52%
Commercial and Office						
Office Commercial	38.8	3.0%	113.7	8.6%	74.9	193%
Retail Commercial	183.9	13.9%	189.1	14.3%	5.2	3%
Visitor Commercial	19.0	1.4%	16.7	1.3%	-2.4	-12%
Stadium/Arena	33.2	2.5%	0[1]	0.0%	-33.2[1]	-100%
Parking (Airport-Related and Other Stand-Alone)	18.9	1.4%	9.8	0.7%	-9.1	-48%
Total	293.8	22.2%	329.3	24.9%	35.5	12%
Industrial						
Total	126.1	9.5%	44.1	3.3%	-82.0	-65%
Institutional and Educational						
Education	11.2	1%	17.1	1.3%	5.9	53%
Institutional	43.0	3.1%	27.7	2.10%	-15.3	-35%
Total	54.2	4.1%	44.8	3.4%	-9.4	-17%
Military[2]						
Total	447.1	33.8%	447.1	33.8%	0	0%
Transportation and Utilities						
Transportation	312.0	23.6%	302.9	22.9%	-9.1	-3%
Utilities	3.1	0.2%	2.5	0.2%	-0.6	-20%
Total	315.1	23.8%	305.4	23.1%	-9.7	-3%
Parks[3]						
Total	0.0	0.0%	27.8	2.1%	27.8	100%
Vacant						
Total	5.8	0.4%	0	0.0%	-5.8	-100%
Total	1,324	**100.00%**	1,324	**100.00%**	0	0%

Source: City of San Diego 2017

[1] Proposed CPU would permit Stadium/Arena use (San Diego Sports Arena) to remain, be reconstructed, or be replaced with other uses. For the purposes of this CEQA analysis, the replacement of Stadium/Arena use with a mix of commercial and residential uses has been assumed. Appendix N provides an analysis of the proposed CPU with the Sports Arena retained.

[2] Although the MCRD areas are not within the current boundaries of the 1991 Community Plan, the military land uses exist within the area of the proposed CPU and so are included for consistent comparison purposes.

[3] In addition to the Parks total shown, planned parks in the proposed CPU include a 1.5 acre joint use facility at Dewey Elementary School, and 0.55 acres just north of the proposed CPU area along the San Diego River Park Pathway within Mission Bay Park. Total proposed park space is 29.86 acres.

Table 3-4 shows the existing and future residential development anticipated from application of land uses shown on the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway Land Use Map, according to future land use assumptions and analysis undertaken for the proposed CPU. Appendix N provides a discussion of the land use assumptions. Table 3-5 shows the same for existing and future non-residential development.

Table 3-4
Residential Development: Existing (2017) and at Proposed CPU

	Existing Development		Proposed Plan		Difference	
Residential Development	Residential Units	Percent of Total	Residential Units	Percent of Total	Change	Change (%)
Single-Family Units	12	1%	0	0%	(12)	(100%)
Multi-Family Units[1]	1,970	99%	11,585	100%	9,615	488%
Total Housing Units	1,982	100%	11,585	100%	9,603	485%
Household Population	4,600	-	27,070[2]	-	22,470	489%

Source: City of San Diego 2017
Notes:
[1] Includes residential units in mixed-use development.
[2] For the purposes of calculating the future household population, it has been assumed that 2.46 persons reside in each household, and a 95 percent occupancy rate occurs for the community.

Table 3-5
Non-Residential Development: Existing (2017) and Proposed CPU

	Existing Development		Proposed Plan Build-Out		Difference	
Non-Residential Development	Non-Residential Building (square feet)	Percent of Total	Non-Residential Building (square feet)	Percent of Total	Change	Change (%)
Office Commercial	1,082,059	11%	1,915,422	19%	833,363	77%
Retail Commercial	2,287,257	23.3%	2,227,328	22.1%	-59,929	-2.6%
Visitor Commercial	511,089	5.2%	505,750	5.0%	-5,339	-1%
Stadium/Arena	150,000	1.5%	0[1]	0%	-150,000[1]	-100%
Industrial	2,432,435	24.8%	2,288,259	22.7%	-144,176	5.9%
Education	192,175	2.0%	186,873	1.9%	-5,302	-2.8%
Institutional	891,539	9.1%	733,213	7.3%	-158,326	-17.8%
Military	2,234,370	22.8%	2,234,370	22.1%	0	0%
Transportation	517	0%	0	0%	-517	-100%
Utilities	16,173	0.2%	0	0%	-16,173	-100%
Parks	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total Non-Residential Development	9,797,614	100%	10,091,215	100%	293,601	3.0%

[1] Proposed CPU would permit Stadium/Arena use (San Diego Sports Arena) to remain, be reconstructed, or be replaced with other uses. For the purposes of this CEQA analysis, the replacement of Stadium/Arena use with commercial retail, office, and residential uses has been assumed. Appendix N provides an analysis of the proposed CPU with the Sports Arena retained.

3.6.1.1 Sports Arena Community Village Land Use Projections

As shown on the land use map for the proposed CPU (see Figure 3-1 in Section 3.4.1.1), the Community Commercial – Residential Permitted (0-44 du/ac) land use designation for the City-owned parcels and the Mixed Commercial Residential (0-73 du/ac) land use designation for the privately owned parcels in the Sports Arena Community Village would permit a range of future land uses. For the facility planning, technical evaluation, and environmental review purposes of this PEIR, two sets of future land use assumptions for the Sports Arena Community Village were prepared. The first set of future land use assumptions retains an arena use (within the existing structure, a renovated structure, or a rebuilt structure) in conjunction with infill commercial retail, office, and residential uses. The second set of assumptions replaces the Sports Arena use with commercial retail, office, and residential uses. These two sets of assumptions are shown in Table 3-6. Both sets of assumptions would be allowed by the proposed Community Commercial – Residential Permitted (0-44 du/ac) and Mixed Commercial Residential (0-73 du/ac) land use designations.

Table 3-6
Future Land Use Assumptions for Proposed CPU with and without Sports Arena Use

Future Land Uses with Sports Arena Use				Future Land Uses without Sports Arena Use			
Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area	Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area
Residential				**Residential**			
Single-Family Residential	0.00	0	0	Single-Family Residential	0.00	0	0
Multi-Family Residential	101.3	3,590	0	Multi-Family Residential	125.4	4,285	0
Total	101.3	3,590	0	Total	125.4	4,285	0
Commercial and Office				**Commercial and Office**			
Office Commercial	110.7	3,025	1,891,427	Office Commercial	113.7	3,025	1,915,423
Retail Commercial	192.2	4,405	2,274,828	Retail Commercial	189.1	4,275	2,227,328
Visitor Commercial	16.7	0	505,750	Visitor Commercial	16.7	0	505,750
Stadium/Arena	24.1	165	150,000	Stadium/Arena	0[1]	0	0[1]
Parking (Airport-Related or Other Stand-Alone)	9.8	0	0	Parking (Airport-Related or Other Stand-Alone)	9.8	0	0
Total	353.5	7,595	4,822,005	Total	329.3	7,300	4,648,501
Industrial				**Industrial**			
Total	44.1	0	2,288,259	Total	44.1	0	2,288,259
Institutional and Educational				**Institutional and Educational**			
Education	17.1	0	186,873	Education	17.1	0	186,873
Institutional	27.7	0	733,213	Institutional	27.7	0	733,213
Total	44.8	0	920,086	Total	44.8	0	920,086
Military				**Military**			
Total	447.1	0	2,234,370	Total	447.1	0	2,234,370
Transportation and Utilities				**Transportation and Utilities**			
Transportation	302.9	0	0	Transportation	302.9	0	0
Utilities	2.5	0	0	Utilities	2.5	0	0
Total	305.4	0	0	Total	305.4	0	0
Parks[2]				**Parks**[2]			
Total	27.8	0	0	Total	27.8	0	0

Table 3-6
Future Land Use Assumptions for Proposed CPU with and without Sports Arena Use

Future Land Uses with Sports Arena Use				Future Land Uses without Sports Arena Use			
Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area	Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area
Vacant				**Vacant**			
Total	0.00	0	0	Total	0.00	0	0
Grand Totals	1,324	11,185	10,264,720	**Grand Totals**	1,324	11,585	10,091,215
Estimated Future Population	26,140			Estimated Future Population	27,070		

Source: Planning Department
[1] Proposed CPU would permit Stadium/Arena use (San Diego Sports Arena) to remain, be reconstructed, or be replaced with other uses. For the purposes of this CEQA analysis, the replacement of Stadium/Arena use with commercial retail, office, and residential uses has been assumed. Appendix N provides an analysis of the proposed CPU with the Sports Arena retained.
[2] In addition to the Parks total shown, planned parks in the proposed CPU include a 1.5 acre joint use facility at Dewey Elementary School, and 0.55 acres just north of the proposed CPU area along the San Diego River Park Pathway within Mission Bay Park. Total proposed park space is 29.86 acres.

For the purposes of transportation, noise, and air quality analysis, the set of future land use assumptions without the San Diego Sports Arena would generate more future vehicle trips. Therefore, the future land use assumptions without the San Diego Sports Arena are analyzed in this PEIR as the proposed CPU. The set of future land use assumptions with the San Diego Sports Arena have also been analyzed under CEQA; this analysis can be found in Appendix N to this PEIR. The adoption of the proposed CPU would not preclude an arena use. A future specific plan or master plan for the Sports Arena Community Village would require additional analysis if the proposed development exceeded the amount of development analyzed in this PEIR.

3.6.2 Future Actions Associated with the Proposed CPU

Due to the nature of an amendment to a Community Plan and a lack of site-specific development proposals associated with the proposed CPU, site-specific environmental analyses of future development anticipated within the proposed CPU area are not undertaken within this PEIR. However, the analysis anticipates that future development would occur within the proposed CPU area and would be subject to applicable development regulations and requirements of the proposed CPU and this PEIR. Future development within the proposed CPU area would involve subsequent approval of public and private development proposals through both ministerial and discretionary reviews in accordance with the zoning and development regulations, and proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies. These subsequent activities may be public (i.e., road/streetscape improvements, parks, public facilities) or private projects, and are referred to as future development or future projects in the text of the PEIR. A non-inclusive list of discretionary actions that would occur as the proposed CPU is implemented is shown in Table 3-7.

Table 3-7 Potential Future Discretionary Actions Associated with the Proposed CPU
City of San Diego
Subdivision Maps Discretionary Permits Site Development Permits Establishment of Public Facilities Financing Mechanisms Coastal Development Permits Conditional Use Permits Neighborhood Development Permits Neighborhood Use Permits Planned Development Permits Variances Street Vacations, Release of Irrevocable Offers of Dedication, and Dedications Water, sewer, and storm drain infrastructure and road improvements (Public Right-of-Way Permits)
State of California
Caltrans Encroachment Permits Water Quality Certification Determinations for Compliance with Section 401 Department of Education approval of school sites
Federal Actions
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permits USFWS Section 7 or 10(a)
Other Agencies
SDG&E/Public Utilities Commission approvals of power line relocations or undergrounding

4

Chapter 4.0
Regulatory Framework

The regulatory framework applicable to each subject area included within this PEIR is included in this chapter.

4.1 Land Use

Included within Chapter 3.0, Project Description, of this PEIR are descriptions of the existing land use plans that currently apply to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The following expands the discussion of applicable plans and development regulations, including the General Plan, pertinent SDMC regulations, the City's MSCP Subarea Plan, and the ALUCP.

4.1.1 City of San Diego General Plan

A comprehensive update of the General Plan was adopted in 2008, incorporating the City of Villages strategy, which in turn was developed and adopted as part of the Strategic Framework Element in 2002. The Strategic Framework Element represented the City's new approach for shaping how the City will grow while attempting to preserve the character of its communities and its most treasured natural resources and amenities. It was developed to provide the overall structure to guide the General Plan update and future CPUs and amendments, as well as the implementation of an action plan.

Under the City of Villages strategy, the General Plan aims to direct new development projects away from natural undeveloped lands into already urbanized areas and/or areas where conditions allow the integration of housing, employment, civic, and transit uses. It is a development strategy that mirrors regional planning and smart growth principles intended to preserve remaining open space and natural habitat and focus development in areas with available public infrastructure.

The General Plan includes 10 elements intended to provide guidance for future development. These are listed here and discussed in more detail below: (1) Land Use and Community Planning Element; (2) Mobility Element; (3) Urban Design Element; (4) Economic Prosperity Element; (5) Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element; (6) Recreation Element; (7) Conservation Element; (8) Noise Element;

(9) Historic Preservation Element; and (10) Housing Element. The Housing Element, which must be updated every 8 years under state law, was last updated in 2013 and is provided under separate cover due to the need for more frequent updates. It is required to be consistent with the General Plan goals and City of Villages strategy.

a. Land Use and Community Planning Element

The Land Use and Community Planning Element provides overarching policies to integrate the City of Villages strategy and guides the provision of public facilities while accommodating planned growth. Policies within this element, in combination with other elements, also ensure consistency with zoning regulations (e.g., SDMC).

The Land Use and Community Planning Element of the General Plan is largely seen as the structure and framework for developing Community Plans. When appropriate, policies call for Community Plans to further identify appropriate land uses to meet the goals set by the General Plan and City of Villages strategy. The policies also indicate that mixed-use areas, villages, and community-specific policies are developed with public input and involvement.

The Land Use and Community Planning Element contains five goals related to community planning. These goals are to provide:

- Community plans that are clearly established as essential components of the General Plan to provide focus upon community-specific issues.
- Community plans that are structurally consistent yet diverse in their presentation and refinement of Citywide policies to address specific community goals.
- Community plans that maintain or increase planned density of residential land uses in appropriate locations.
- Community plan updates that are accompanied by an updated IFS (formerly known as Public Facilities Financing Plan).
- Community plans that are kept consistent with the future vision of the General Plan through comprehensive updates or amendments.

Community Plans are important because they contain policies tailored to a community's issues and goals. Future public and private projects will be evaluated for consistency with policies in the Community Plans.

b. Urban Design Element

The Urban Design Element of the General Plan includes goals and policies that support the creation of transit-focused, walkable village centers; the provision of high-quality public spaces and civic architecture; and the enhancement of the visual quality of office and industrial development. It also includes goals and policies specific to mixed-use villages and commercial areas, and emphasizes the integration of compatible land uses.

c. Economic Prosperity Element

The Economic Prosperity Element contains policies intended to improve the City's economic prosperity. This goal will be accomplished by ensuring that the economy grows in ways that strengthen San Diego industries and create good jobs with self-sufficient wages, increase average income, and stimulate economic investment in the community.

d. Recreation Element

The Recreation Element contains park and recreation guidelines with the goal of creating a sustainable park and recreation system that meets the needs of residents and visitors. The park and recreation guidelines, found in Tables RE-2 and RE-3, establish park and recreation facility categories, types, and typical components. Recreation Element Policy RE-A.8 states that population-based parks should be provided at a minimum ratio of 2.8 acres per 1,000 residents. As established by the guidelines, a recreation center can serve a population of 25,000 persons and should have a standard size of 17,000 square feet, and an aquatic center can serve a population of 50,000 persons.

e. Noise Element

The focus of the Noise Element is to minimize excessive noise effects and improve the quality of life of people working and living in the City. The Noise Element identifies goals and related policies with regard to noise and land use compatibility, motor vehicle traffic noise, and trolley and train noise that are relevant to the proposed CPU. While the Noise Element articulates the City's goals, the enforcement mechanism to control noise is the City's Noise Ordinance, which is discussed in Section 5.5.

4.1.2 Land Development Code Regulations

Chapters 11 through 15 of the SDMC are referred to as the LDC, as they contain the City's planning, zoning, subdivision, and building regulations that regulate how land is to be developed within the City. The LDC contains Citywide base zones that specify permitted land uses, residential density, FAR, and other development requirements for given zoning classifications; as well as overlay zones and supplemental regulations that provide additional development requirements.

Development of the proposed CPU area is subject to the development regulations of the LDC.

a. General Development Regulations

Chapter 14 of the LDC includes the general development regulations, supplemental development regulations, building regulations, and electrical/plumbing/mechanical regulations that govern all aspects of project development. The grading, landscaping, parking, signage, fencing, and storage requirements are all contained within Chapter 14, General Regulations. Also included within the general regulations of Chapter 14 are the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations, discussed below.

b. Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations

The purpose of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations is to protect, preserve and, where damaged restore, the environmentally sensitive lands of San Diego and the viability of the species

supported by those lands (LDC Chapter 14, Article 1, Division 1; City of San Diego 2000). These regulations are intended to assure that development, including, but not limited to coastal development in the Coastal Overlay Zone, occurs in a manner that protects the overall quality of the resources and the natural and topographic character of the area, encourages a sensitive form of development, retains biodiversity and interconnected habitats, maximizes physical and visual public access to and along the shoreline, and reduces hazards due to flooding in specific areas while minimizing the need for construction of flood control facilities. These regulations are intended to protect the public health, safety, and welfare while employing regulations that are consistent with sound resource conservation principles and the rights of private property owners.

Environmentally sensitive lands include sensitive biological resources, steep hillsides, coastal beaches, sensitive coastal bluffs, and special flood hazard areas (San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 1; City of San Diego 2006). Development on a site containing environmentally sensitive lands requires a Site Development Permit in accordance with Section 126.0502 of the LDC.

c. Historical Resources Regulations

The purpose of the City's Historical Resources Regulations is to protect, preserve, and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego, which include historical buildings, historical structures or objects, important archaeological sites, historical districts, historical landscapes, and traditional cultural properties/tribal cultural resources (San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2; City of San Diego 2001b). These regulations are intended to ensure that development occurs in a manner that protects the overall quality of historical resources. These regulations are intended to assure that development occurs in a manner that protects the overall quality of historical resources. It is further the intent of these regulations to protect the educational, cultural, economic, and general welfare of the public, while employing regulations that are consistent with sound historical preservation principles and the rights of private property owners. The Historical Resources Regulations require that development affecting designated historical resources or historical districts shall provide full mitigation for the impact to the resource, in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual (LDM), as a condition of approval. If development cannot, to the maximum extent feasible, comply with the development regulations for historical resources, then a project would require a Site Development Permit in accordance with Section 126.0502 of the LDC.

d. Affordable Housing Density Bonus Regulations

The purpose of these regulations is to provide increased residential density to developers who guarantee that a portion of their residential development will be available to moderate income, low income, very low income, or other noted household types. The regulations are intended to materially assist the housing industry in providing adequate and affordable housing for all economic segments of the community and to provide a balance of housing opportunities throughout the City. These regulations implement the provisions of California Government Code Sections 65915 through 65918. It is intended that the affordable housing density bonus and any additional development incentive be available for use in all residential development of five or more units, using criteria and standards provided in the General Plan as part of this proposed CPU. All requests are required to be processed by the City of San Diego, and implemented by the San Diego Housing Commission.

4.1.3 Multiple Species Conservation Program

The MSCP is a comprehensive habitat conservation planning program for San Diego County. A goal of the MSCP is to preserve a network of habitat and open space, thereby protecting biodiversity. Local jurisdictions, including the City of San Diego, implement their portions of the MSCP through subarea plans, which describe specific implementing mechanisms.

The City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan was approved in March 1997. The MSCP Subarea Plan is a plan and process for the issuance of permits under the federal and state ESAs and the California Natural Communities Conservation Planning Act of 1991. The primary goal of the MSCP Subarea Plan is to conserve viable populations of sensitive species and to conserve regional biodiversity while allowing for reasonable economic growth.

In July 1997, the City of San Diego signed an Implementing Agreement (IA) with USFWS and CDFW. The IA serves as a binding contract between the City, USFWS, and CDFW that identifies the roles and responsibilities of the parties to implement the MSCP and subarea plan. The agreement became effective on July 17, 1997, and allows the City to issue Incidental Take Authorizations under the provisions of the MSCP. Applicable state and federal permits are still required for wetlands and listed species that are not covered by the MSCP.

Multi-Habitat Planning Area

The MHPA is the area within which the permanent MSCP preserve will be assembled and managed for its biological resources. Input from responsible agencies and other interested participants resulted in adoption of the City's MHPA in 1997. The City's MHPA areas are defined by "hard-line" limits, with limited development permitted based on the development area allowance of the OR-1-2 zone [open space residential zone].

Private land entirely within the MHPA is allowed only up to 25 percent development in the least sensitive area per the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. Should more than 25 percent development be desired, an MHPA boundary line adjustment may be proposed. The City's MSCP Subarea Plan states that adjustments to the MHPA boundary line are permitted without the need to amend the City's Subarea Plan, provided the boundary adjustment results in an area of equivalent or higher biological value. To meet this standard, the area proposed for addition to the MHPA must meet the six functional equivalency criteria set forth in Section 5.4.2 of the Regional MSCP Plan. All MHPA boundary line adjustments require approval by the Wildlife Agencies and the City.

For parcels located outside the MHPA, "there is no limit on the encroachment into sensitive biological resources, with the exception of wetlands, and listed non-covered species' habitat (which are regulated by state and federal agencies) and narrow endemic species." However, "impacts to sensitive biological resources must be assessed and mitigation, where necessary, must be provided in conformance" with the City's Biological Guidelines.

The MSCP includes management priorities to be undertaken by the City as part of its MSCP implementation requirements. Those actions identified as Priority 1 are required to be implemented by the City as a condition of the MSCP Take Authorization to ensure that covered species are adequately protected. The actions identified as Priority 2 may be undertaken by the City as resources permit.

MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines

To address the integrity of the MHPA and mitigate for indirect impacts to the MHPA, guidelines were developed to manage land uses adjacent to the MHPA. The MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines are intended to be incorporated into the MMRP and/or applicable permits during the development review phase of a project. These guidelines address the issues of drainage, toxics, lighting, noise, barriers, invasive species, brush management, and grading/ development.

4.1.4 Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, serving as the ALUC, is required by state law to prepare an ALUCP for SDIA. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is within the AIA for SDIA. The AIA serves as the boundary for the ALUCP. The AIA is divided into to two review areas. Review Area 1 is defined by the combination of the 60 dB CNEL noise contour, the outer boundary of all safety zones, and the airspace Threshold Siting Surfaces. All policies and standards in the ALUCP apply within Review Area 1. Review Area 2 is defined by the combination of the airspace protection and overflight boundaries beyond Review Area 1. Only airspace protection and overflight policies and standards apply within Review Area 2.

The ALUCP contains policies and criteria that address land use compatibilities concerning noise and safety aspects of airport operations and land uses, heights of buildings, residential densities and intensities, and the disclosure of aircraft overflight. The adopted ALUCP for SDIA contains policies that limit residential uses in areas experiencing noise above 60 dB CNEL by placing conditions on residential uses within the 60 dB CNEL contour. Residential uses in such areas may require sound attenuation to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dB. Since the ALUC does not have land use authority, the City implements the compatibility plan through land use plans, development regulations, and zoning regulations. The City is required to submit discretionary and ministerial development applications within the AIA for SDIA to the ALUC until the City adopts regulations implementing the ALUCP and the ALUC determines the City's zoning, development regulations, and land use plans consistent with the ALUCP, or the City Council takes action to overrule the ALUC with a two-thirds vote.

4.1.5 San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan

SANDAG is the regional authority that creates regional-specific documents to provide guidance to local agencies, as SANDAG does not have land use authority. SANDAG's RP combines two of the region's existing planning documents: the Regional Comprehensive Plan for the San Diego Region (RCP) and the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). The RCP, adopted in 2004, laid out key principles for managing the region's growth while preserving natural resources and limiting urban sprawl. The plan covered eight policy areas, including urban form, transportation, housing, health environment, economic prosperity, public facilities, our borders, and social equity. These policy areas were addressed in the 2050 RTP/SCS and are now fully integrated into the RP.

On April 24, 2015, SANDAG released the draft RP for public comment, with a closing date of July 15, 2015. A final RP was adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on October 9, 2015.

4.2 Transportation and Circulation

This section summarizes existing regulations that apply to the transportation system.

4.2.1 State Regulations

a. California Public Utilities Commission

CPUC regulates privately owned railroad and rail transit. CPUC staff ensure that highway-rail and pathway-rail crossings are safely designed, constructed, and maintained. The Rail Crossings and Engineering Branch engineers investigate and evaluate requests to construct new rail crossings or modify existing crossings.

b. California Department of Transportation

Caltrans is the primary state agency responsible for transportation issues. One of its duties is the construction and maintenance of the state highway system. Caltrans has established standards for street traffic flow and has developed procedures to determine if intersections require improvements. For projects that may physically affect facilities under its administration, Caltrans requires encroachment permits before any construction work may be undertaken. For projects that would not physically affect facilities but may influence traffic flow and levels of services at such facilities, Caltrans may recommend measures to mitigate the traffic impacts of such projects. In addition, Caltrans must review proposals to signalize any freeway ramp interchanges through their Intersection Control Evaluation process (Caltrans Traffic Operations Policy Directive #13-01).

c. California Transportation Commission (CTC)

The CTC consists of nine members appointed by the California Governor. CTC is responsible for the programming and allocating of funds for the construction of highway, passenger rail, and transit improvements throughout the state. CTC is responsible for adopting the State Transportation Improvement Program and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program.

d. AB 1358 – California Complete Streets Act of 2008

Supporting some of the previously referenced regulations/requirements, the California Complete Streets Act of 2008 (AB 1358) requires circulation elements as of January 1, 2011, to accommodate the transportation system from a multi-modal perspective, including public transit and walking and biking, which have traditionally been marginalized in comparison to automobiles in contemporary American urban planning.

4.2.2 Local Regulations

a. San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan

See Section 4.1.5 for discussion of the RP.

b. SANDAG Regional Bike Plan

The Riding to 2050, San Diego Regional Bike Plan adopted by SANDAG supports implementation of the RP. It provides a regional strategy to make riding a bike a useful form of transportation for everyday travel. The plan will help San Diego meet its goals to reduce GHG emissions and improve mobility. Goals of the Regional Bike Plan include increase levels of bicycling; improve bicycling safety; encourage complete streets; support reductions in emissions; and increase community support. In September 2013, the SANDAG Board of Directors approved funding to implement the Regional Bike Plan Early Action Program, which focuses on the region's highest-priority projects. Priority is chosen in part based on proximity to smart growth areas, taking into account that bikeways would be used more often if they connect high-density activity hubs within a short distance of each other, and on whether a project would fill key gaps in the regional bike networks.

c. City of San Diego General Plan

The Mobility Element of the General Plan defines the policies regarding traffic flow and transportation facility design. The purpose of the Mobility Element is "to improve mobility through development of a balanced, multi-modal transportation network." The main goals of the Mobility Element pertain to walkable communities, transit first, street and freeway system, ITS, TDM, bicycling, parking management, airports, passenger rail, goods movement/freight, and regional transportation coordination and financing.

d. Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Adopted Community Plan Mobility Element

The purpose of the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan Mobility Element is to establish goals and policies to guide future street network and design, street classification, Level of Service (LOS), transit facilities and service, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, and facility improvements needed to support future travel needs within the Community Plan area. This element would be replaced by the Mobility Element of the proposed CPU if adopted.

e. City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan (Update December 2013)

The City's Bicycle Master Plan Update (City of San Diego 2013) provides a framework for making cycling a more practical and convenient transportation option for a wider variety of San Diegans with varying riding purposes and skill-levels. The plan update evaluates and builds on the 2002 Bicycle Master Plan so that it reflects changes in bicycle user needs and changes to the City's bicycle network and overall infrastructure.

4.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

Federal, state, and local criteria have been established for the determination of historical and tribal cultural resource significance. The criteria for determining a resource's significance generally focuses on a resource's integrity and uniqueness, its relationship to similar resources, and its potential to contribute important information to scholarly research. Some resources that do not meet federal significance criteria may be considered significant under state or local criteria. Additionally, Native American involvement in the development review process is addressed by several federal and state laws. The most notable of

these are the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (2001) and the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990). These acts ensure that Native American human remains and cultural items are treated with respect and dignity.

4.3.1 Federal

a. National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and National Register of Historic Places

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 established the NRHP as the official federal list of cultural resources that have been nominated by state offices for their significance at the local, state, or federal level. Listing in the NRHP provides recognition that a property is historically significant to the nation, the state, or the community. Properties listed (or potentially eligible for listing) in the NRHP must meet certain significance criteria and possess integrity of form, location, or setting. Barring exceptional circumstances, resources generally must be at least 50 years old to be considered for listing in the NRHP.

Criteria for listing in the NRHP are stated in 36 CFR 60. A resource may qualify for listing if there is quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association; and where such resources:

- Are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history.
- Are associated with the lives of persons significant in the past.
- Embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction; represent the work of a master; possess high artistic values; or represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
- Have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Eligible properties must meet at least one of the NRHP criteria and exhibit integrity, measured by the degree to which the resource retains its historical properties and conveys its historical character, the degree to which the original historic fabric has been retained, and the reversibility of changes to the property. The fourth criterion is typically reserved for archaeological and paleontological resources. These criteria have largely been incorporated into the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15065.5), as well.

At the local level, Policy HP-A.5.e of the Historic Preservation Element in the General Plan states that Native American monitors should be included during all phases of the investigation of archaeological resources. This would include surveys, testing, evaluations, data recovery phases, and construction monitoring.

4.3.2 State

a. California Environmental Quality Act

For the purposes of CEQA, a significant historical resource is one that qualifies for the CRHR or is listed in a local historic register or deemed significant in an historical resources survey, as provided under Section 5025.1(g) of the Public Resources Code. A resource that is not listed in or is not determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR, is not included in a local register or historic resources, or is not deemed significant in a historical resources survey may nonetheless be deemed significant by a CEQA lead agency.

As indicated above, the California criteria (CEQA Guidelines Section 15065.5) for the registration of significant architectural, archaeological, and historical resources in the CRHR are nearly identical to those for the NRHP. Furthermore, CEQA Section 21083.2(g) defines the criteria for determining the significance of archaeological resources. These criteria include definitions for a “unique” resource, based on its:

- Containing information needed to answer important scientific research questions and that there is a demonstrable public interest in that information.
- Having a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type.
- Being directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person.

b. California Register of Historic Resources (Public Resources Code Section 5020 et seq.)

Properties listed, or formally designated eligible for listing, in the NRHP are automatically listed in the CRHR as are State Historical Landmarks and Points of Interest. The CRHR also includes properties designated under local ordinances or identified through local historical resource surveys.

c. Native American Burials (Public Resources Code Section 5097 et seq.)

State law addresses the disposition of Native American burials in archaeological sites and protects such remains from disturbance, vandalism, or inadvertent destruction; establishes procedures to be implemented if Native American skeletal remains are discovered during construction of a project; and designates the NAHC to resolve disputes regarding the disposition of such remains. In addition, the Native American Historic Resource Protection Act makes it a misdemeanor punishable by up to a year in jail to deface or destroy an Indian historic or cultural site that is listed or may be eligible for listing in the CRHR.

d. California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act

The California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (CAL-NAGPRA; 2001), like the federal act, ensures that Native American human remains and cultural items are treated with respect and

dignity during all phases of the archaeological evaluation process in accordance with CEQA and any applicable local regulations.

e. Senate Bill 18

Native American involvement in the planning and development review process is addressed by several state laws. The most notable of the state laws is Senate Bill (SB) 18 which includes detailed requirements for local agencies to consult with identified California Native American Tribes early in the planning and/or development process.

f. Assembly Bill 52

On September 25, 2014, Governor Brown signed AB 52, which created the new category of "tribal cultural resources" that must be considered under CEQA. AB 52 requires lead agencies to provide notice to tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a project if they have requested notice of projects proposed within that area. If the tribe requests consultation within 30 days upon receipt of the notice, the lead agency must consult with the tribe. AB 52 also provides a list of recommended mitigation measures to be included in the environmental document.

4.3.3 Local

a. City of San Diego Municipal Code: Historical Resources Regulations

In January 2000, the City's Historical Resources Regulations (or Regulations), part of the SDMC (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2: Purpose of Historical Resources Regulations or Sections 143.0201-143.0280), were adopted, providing a balance between sound historic preservation principles and the rights of private property owners. The Regulations have been developed to implement applicable local, state, and federal policies and mandates. Included in these are the General Plan, CEQA, and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Historical resources, in the context of the City's Regulations, include site improvements, buildings, structures, historic districts, signs, features (including significant trees or other landscaping), places, place names, interior elements and fixtures designated in conjunction with a property, or other objects of historical, archaeological, scientific, educational, cultural, architectural, aesthetic, or traditional significance to the citizens of the City. These include structures, buildings, archaeological sites, objects, districts, or landscapes having physical evidence of human activities. These resources are usually over 45 years old and they may have been altered or still be in use.

Historical Resources Guidelines (or Guidelines) are incorporated in the San Diego LDC Land Development Manual (Manual) by reference. These Guidelines set up a Development Review Process to review projects in the City. This process is composed of two aspects: the implementation of the Historical Resources Regulations and the determination of impacts and mitigation under CEQA.

Compliance with the Historical Resources Regulations begins with the determination of the need for a site-specific survey for a project. Section 143.0212(b) of the Regulations requires that historical resource sensitivity maps be used to identify properties in the City that have a probability of containing historic or pre-historic archaeological sites. These maps are based on records maintained by the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) at San Diego State University (SDSU) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) and the San Diego Museum of Man, as well as site-specific information in

the City's files. If records show an archaeological site exists on or immediately adjacent to a subject property, the City shall require a survey. In general, archaeological surveys are required when the proposed development is on a previously undeveloped parcel, if a known resource is recorded on the parcel or within a 1-mile radius, or if a qualified consultant or knowledgeable City staff member recommends it. A historic property (built environment) survey can be required on a project if the properties are over 45 years old and appear to have integrity of setting, design, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association.

Section 143.0212(d) of the Regulations states that if a property-specific survey is required, it shall be conducted according to the Guidelines criteria. Using the survey results and other available applicable information, the City shall determine whether a historical resource exists, whether it is eligible for designation as a designated historical resource, and precisely where it is located.

b. Historical Resources Register

As compared to CEQA, the City provides a broader set of criteria for eligibility for the City's Historical Resources Register. As stated in the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, "Any improvement, building, structure, sign, interior element and fixture, feature, site, place, district, area, or object may be designated as historic by the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board if it meets any of the following criteria:

- Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's, a community's, or a neighborhood's historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping, or architectural development;
- Is identified with persons or events significant in local, State, or national history;
- Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
- Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist, or craftsman;
- Is listed or has been determined eligible by the National Park Service for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or is listed or has been determined eligible by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) for listing in the State Register of Historical Resources; or
- Is a finite group of resources related to one another in a clearly distinguishable way or is a geographically definable area or neighborhood containing improvements which have a special character, historical interest, or aesthetic value or which represent one or more architectural periods or styles in the history and development of the City."

c. General Plan Historic Preservation Element

The Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan provides guidance on archaeological and historic site preservation in San Diego, including the roles and responsibilities of the Historical Resources Board (HRB), the status of cultural resource surveys, the Mills Act, conservation easements, and other public preservation incentives and strategies. A discussion of criteria used by the HRB to designate landmarks is included, as is a list of recommended steps to strengthen historic preservation in San Diego. The Element sets a series of goals for the City for the preservation of historic resources, and the first of these

goals is to preserve significant historical resources. These goals are realized through implementation of policies that encourage the identification and preservation of historical resources.

General Plan Policies HP-A.1 through HP-A.5 are associated with the overall identification and preservation of historical resources. This includes policies to provide for comprehensive historic resource planning and integration of such plans within City land use plans, such as the proposed CPU being analyzed within this PEIR. These policies also focus on coordinated planning and preservation of tribal resources, promoting the relationship with Kumeyaay/Diegueño tribes. Historic Preservation policies HP-B.1 through HP-B.4 address the benefits of historical preservation planning and the need for incentivizing maintenance, restoration, and rehabilitation of designated historical resources. This is proposed to be completed through a historic preservation sponsorship program and through cultural heritage tourism.

4.4 Geologic Conditions

4.4.1 State

a. Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Alquist-Priolo Act)

The State of California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (1972) was established to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures for human occupancy. Pursuant to the Act, the State Geologist has established regulatory zones (known as Earthquake Fault Zones) around surface traces of active faults. These have been mapped for affected cities, including San Diego. Application for a development permit for any project within a delineated earthquake fault zone shall be accompanied by a geologic report, prepared by a geologist registered in the State of California, that is directed to the problem of potential surface fault displacement through a project site.

4.4.2 Local

a. City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study

The San Diego Seismic Safety Study includes geologic hazards and fault maps of the City. Areas of the City are identified by geologic hazard category, which reflects the geologic hazard type and related risks. These are generalized maps, and site-specific geologic/geotechnical investigations may be necessary for proposed development or construction. LDC Section 145.1803 describes when a geotechnical investigation is required, and City of San Diego Development Services Information Bulletin 515 describes the minimum submittal requirements for geotechnical and geological reports that may be required for development permits, subdivision approvals, or grading permits.

b. City of San Diego General Plan Policies

The General Plan presents goals and policies for geologic and soil safety in the Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element. Relevant excerpts from this element are included below.

Policy PF-Q.1. ,Protect public health and safety through the application of effective seismic, geologic and structural considerations.

a. Ensure that current and future community planning and other specific land use planning studies continue to include consideration of seismic and other geologic hazards. This information should be disclosed, when applicable, in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document accompanying a discretionary action.

b. Maintain updated Citywide maps showing faults, geologic hazards, and land use capabilities, and related studies used to determine suitable land uses.

c. Require the submission of geologic and seismic reports, as well as soils engineering reports, in relation to applications for land development permits whenever seismic or geologic problems are suspected.

d. Utilize the findings of a beach and bluff erosion survey to determine the appropriate rate and amount of coastline modification permissible in the City.

e. Coordinate with other jurisdictions to establish and maintain a geologic "data bank" for the San Diego area.

f. Regularly review local lifeline utility systems to ascertain their vulnerability to disruption caused by seismic or geologic hazards and implement measures to reduce any vulnerability.

g. Adhere to state laws pertaining to seismic and geologic hazards.

Policy PF-Q.2. Maintain or improve integrity of structures to protect residents and preserve communities.

- Abate structures that present seismic or structural hazards with consideration of the desirability of preserving historical and unique structures and their architectural appendages, special geologic and soils hazards, and the socio- economic consequences of the attendant relocation and housing programs.

- Continue to consult with qualified geologists and seismologists to review geologic and seismic studies submitted to the City as project requirements.

- Support legislation that would empower local governing bodies to require structural inspections for all existing pre-Riley Act (1933) buildings, and any necessary remedial work to be completed within a reasonable time.

4.5 Noise

4.5.1 State

a. California Code of Regulations

Title 24, Chapter 12, Section 1207, of the California Building Code (CBC) requires that interior noise levels, attributable to exterior sources, not exceed 45 dB CNEL in any habitable room. A habitable room in a building is used for living, sleeping, eating or cooking; bathrooms, closets, hallways, utility spaces, and similar areas are not considered habitable spaces. An acoustical study is required for proposed

single-family, multiple-unit residential and hotel/motel structures within areas where the noise contours exceed 60 dB CNEL. The studies must demonstrate that the design of the building will reduce interior noise to 45 dB CNEL or lower in habitable rooms. If compliance requires windows to be inoperable or closed, the structure must include ventilation or air-conditioning (24 CCR 1207).

Title 24, Chapter 11 of CalGreen provides mandatory measures for residential and non-residential buildings. Section 5.507, Environmental Comfort, addresses interior noise control in non-residential buildings. This section provides the minimum Sound Transmission Class and Outdoor–Indoor Sound Transmission Class for wall, roof–ceiling assemblies, and windows for buildings located within the 65 dBA CNEL contour of an airport, freeway, expressway, railroad, industrial source, or fixed guideway source as determined by the Noise Element of the General Plan. As indicated, buildings shall be constructed to provide an interior noise environment attributable to exterior sources that does not exceed an hourly average equivalent level of 50 dBA L_{eq}. Exterior features such as sound walls or earth berms may be utilized as appropriate to the building, addition, or alteration project to mitigate sound migration to the interior. An acoustical analysis documenting complying interior sound levels shall be prepared by personnel approved by the architect or engineer of record.

4.5.2 Local

a. City of San Diego General Plan

Exterior Noise

The City specifies compatibility standards for different categories of land use in the Noise Element of the General Plan. Table 4-1 provides the allowable noise levels by land use as identified in the General Plan (City of San Diego 2015).

As shown, the “compatible” noise level for noise-sensitive receptors, including single- and multi-family residential, is 60 dBA CNEL. Compatibility indicates that standard construction methods will attenuate exterior noise to an acceptable indoor noise level and people can carry out outdoor activities with minimal noise interference.

Exterior noise levels ranging between 65 and 70 dBA CNEL are considered “conditionally compatible” for multiple units, mixed-use commercial/residential, live work, and group living accommodations. The Noise Element also states (Section B, Motor Vehicle Traffic Noise) that although not generally considered compatible, the City conditionally allows multi-family and mixed-use residential uses up to 75 dBA CNEL with a requirement to include attenuation measures to ensure an interior noise level of 45 dBA CNEL where a Community Plan allows multi-family and mixed-use.

The Noise Element also addresses aircraft noise within the SDIA AIA. Policy NE-D.2 limits future residential uses within AIAs to the 65 dBA CNEL airport noise contour, except for multiple-unit, mixed-use, and live work residential uses within the SDIA AIA in areas with existing residential uses and where a community plan and the ALUCP would allow future residential uses. In addition, for residential uses located in areas greater than the 65 dBA CNEL contour, Policy NE-D.3 limits the amount of outdoor areas subject to exposure above the 65 dBA CNEL and provides noise attenuation to ensure an interior noise level that does not exceed 45 dBA CNEL.

Table 4-1
City of San Diego Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines
(Table NE-3)

Land Use Category	Exterior Noise Exposure (dBA CNEL) 60	65	70	75
Parks and Recreational				
Parks, Active and Passive Recreation				
Outdoor Spectator Sports, Golf Courses; Water Recreational Facilities; Indoor Recreation Facilities				
Agricultural				
Crop Raising & Farming; Community Gardens, Aquaculture, Dairies; Horticulture Nurseries & Greenhouses; Animal Raising, Maintain & Keeping; Commercial Stables				
Residential				
Single Dwelling Units; Mobile Homes	45			
Multiple Dwelling Units *For uses affected by aircraft noise, refer to Policies NE-D.2. & NE-D.3.	45	45*		
Institutional				
Hospitals; Nursing Facilities; Intermediate Care Facilities; Kindergarten through Grade 12 Educational Facilities; Libraries; Museums; Child Care Facilities	45			
Other Educational Facilities including Vocational/Trade Schools and Colleges and Universities	45	45		
Cemeteries				
Retail Sales				
Building Supplies/Equipment; Food, Beverages & Groceries; Pets & Pet Supplies; Sundries, Pharmaceutical, & Convenience Sales; Wearing Apparel & Accessories		50	50	
Commercial Services				
Building Services; Business Support; Eating & Drinking; Financial Institutions; Maintenance & Repair; Personal Services; Assembly & Entertainment (includes public and religious assembly); Radio & Television Studios; Golf Course Support		50	50	
Visitor Accommodations	45	45	45	
Offices				
Business & Professional; Government; Medical, Dental & Health Practitioner; Regional & Corporate Headquarters		50	50	
Vehicle and Vehicular Equipment Sales and Services Use				
Commercial or Personal Vehicle Repair & Maintenance; Commercial or Personal Vehicle Sales & Rentals; Vehicle Equipment & Supplies Sales & Rentals; Vehicle Parking				
Wholesale, Distribution, Storage Use Category				
Equipment & Materials Storage Yards; Moving & Storage Facilities; Warehouse; Wholesale Distribution				
Industrial				
Heavy Manufacturing; Light Manufacturing; Marine Industry; Trucking & Transportation Terminals; Mining & Extractive Industries				
Research & Development			50	

	Compatible	Indoor Uses	Standard construction methods should attenuate exterior noise to an acceptable indoor noise level. Refer to Section I.
		Outdoor Uses	Activities associated with the land use may be carried out.
45, 50	Conditionally Compatible	Indoor Uses	Building structure must attenuate exterior noise to the indoor noise level indicated by the number (45 or 50) for occupied areas. Refer to Section I.
		Outdoor Uses	Feasible noise mitigation techniques should be analyzed and incorporated to make the outdoor activities acceptable. Refer to Section I.
	Incompatible	Indoor Uses	New construction should not be undertaken.
		Outdoor Uses	Severe noise interference makes outdoor activities unacceptable.

Source: City of San Diego, General Plan Amendment to the Noise Element 2015

For single-family units, mobile homes, and senior housing, exterior noise levels ranging between 60 and 65 dBA CNEL are considered "conditionally compatible." Conditionally compatible uses are permissible, provided interior noise levels will not exceed 45 dBA CNEL. Therefore, projects sited on land that falls into the "conditionally compatible" noise environment require an acoustical study.

Park uses are considered compatible in areas up to 70 dBA CNEL and conditionally compatible in areas between 70 and 75 dBA CNEL.

Interior Noise

Noise-sensitive residential/habitable interior spaces have an interior standard of 45 CNEL, as stated in the City's 2016 Significance Determination Thresholds and the California Noise Insulation Standards. The Significance Determination Thresholds indicate that for multi-family development, exterior noise levels would be considered significant if future projected traffic would result in noise levels exceeding 65 dBA CNEL at exterior usable areas or interior noise levels exceeding 45 dBA CNEL.

The City assumes that standard construction techniques will provide a 15 dB reduction of exterior noise levels to an interior receiver. Given this assumption, standard building construction could be assumed to result in interior noise levels of 45 dB CNEL or less when exterior noise sources are 60 dBA CNEL or less. When exterior noise levels are greater than 60 dBA CNEL, consideration of specific non-standard building construction techniques is required.

Proposed new construction and major renovations must demonstrate compliance with the current interior noise standards through submission and approval of a Title 24 Compliance Report. In the case of ministerial projects for single-family, there is no procedure to ensure that noise is adequately attenuated outside of the AIA.

Policies

The General Plan Noise Element contains the following policies regarding the preparation of acoustical studies and interior noise guidelines:

NE-A.4. Require an acoustical study consistent with Acoustical Study Guidelines (Table NE-4) for proposed developments in areas where the existing or future noise level exceeds or would exceed the "compatible" noise level thresholds as indicated on the Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines (Table NE-3), so that noise mitigation measures can be included in the project design to meet the noise guidelines.

NE-I.1. Require noise attenuation measures to reduce the noise to an acceptable noise level for proposed developments to ensure an acceptable interior noise level, as appropriate, in accordance with California's noise insulation standards (CCR Title 24) and Airport Land Use Compatibly Plans.

NE-I.2. Apply CCR Title 24 noise attenuation measures requirements to reduce the noise to an acceptable noise level for proposed single-family, mobile homes, senior housing, and all other types of residential uses not addressed by CCR Title 24 to ensure an acceptable interior noise level, as appropriate.

NE-E.5. Implement night and daytime on-site noise level limits to address noise generated by commercial uses where it affects abutting residential and other noise-sensitive uses.

b. Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance

Section 59.5.0101 et seq. of the SDMC, the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance, regulates the sources of disturbing, excessive, or offensive noises within the City limits. Sound level limits are established for various types of land uses and are measured in 1-hour averages. The 1-hour, A-weighted equivalent sound level, $L_{eq}(1)$, is the energy average of the A-weighted sound levels occurring during a 1-hour period. The Ordinance states that it is unlawful for any person to cause noise by any means to the extent that the 1–hour average sound level exceeds the applicable limit given for that land use. The sound level limit at a location on a boundary between two zoning districts is the arithmetic mean of the respective limits for the two districts. Table 4-2 shows the exterior noise limits specified in the City's Noise Control Ordinance.

Table 4-2
San Diego Property Line Noise Level Limits

Receiving Land Use Category	Noise Level [dBA]		
	7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M.	7:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M.	10:00 P.M. to 7:00 A.M.
Single-family Residential	50	45	40
Multi-family Residential (up to a maximum density of 1 dwelling unit/2,000 square feet)	55	50	45
All Other Residential	60	55	50
Commercial	65	60	60
Industrial or Agricultural	75	75	75
Source: City of San Diego Municipal Code Section 59.5.0401			

Construction noise is regulated by Section 59.5.0404 of the SDMC, which states:

- It shall be unlawful for any person, between the hours of 7:00 P.M. of any day and 7:00 A.M. of the following day, or on legal holidays as specified in Section 21.04 of the San Diego Municipal Code, with exception of Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday, or on Sundays, to erect, construct, demolish, excavate for, alter or repair any building or structure in such a manner as to create disturbing, excessive or offensive noise …
- … it shall be unlawful for any person, including the City of San Diego, to conduct any construction activity so as to cause, at or beyond the property lines of any property zoned residential, an average sound level greater than 75 decibels during the 12-hour period from 7:00 A.M. to 7:00 P.M.

c. Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

As discussed in Section 5.1.4, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority prepared an ALUCP for SDIA. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is within the Review Area 1 AIA for SDIA. The AIA serves as the boundary for the ALUCP. In addition to the policies and criteria addressing land use compatibilities, including building heights and densities, the ALUCP contains policies and criteria concerning noise. The adopted ALUCP for SDIA contains policies that place conditions on residential uses at and above the 60 dB CNEL contour (Review Area 1). Table 4-3 provides the allowable noise levels by land use.

Table 4-3
Airport Noise Compatibility Criteria

Land Use Category [a] Note: Multiple categories may apply to a project	Exterior Noise Exposure (CNEL)			
	60-65	65-70	70-75	75+
Residential				
Single-family, Multi-family	45	45[1]	45[1,2]	45[1,2]
Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Facility	45	45[1]	45[1,2]	45[1,2]
Group Quarters	45	45[1]	45[1,2]	45[1,2]
Commercial, Office, Service, Transient Lodging				
Hotel, Motel, Resort	45/50	45/50	45/50	45/50
Office – Medical, Financial, Professional Services, Civic			50	50
Retail (e.g., Convenience Market, Drug Store, Pet Store)			50	50
Service – Low Intensity (e.g., Gas Station, Auto Repair, Car Wash)			50	50
Service – Medium Intensity (e.g., Check-cashing, Veterinary Clinics, Kennels, Personal Services)			50	50
Service – High Intensity (e.g., Eating, Drinking Establishment, Funeral Chapel, Mortuary)			50	50
Sport/Fitness Facility			50	50
Theater – Movie/Live Performance/Dinner		45	45	45
Educational, Institutional, Public Services				
Assembly – Adult (Religious, Fraternal, Other)	45	45[1]	45[1]	45[1]
Assembly – Children (Instructional Studios, Cultural Heritage Schools, Religious, other)	45			
Cemetery				
Child Day Care Center/Pre-K				
Convention Center				
Fire and Police Stations			50	50
Jail, Prison		45/50	45/50	45/50
Library, Museum, Gallery		45	45	45
Medical Care – Congregate Care Facility, Nursing and Convalescent Home	45			
Medical Care – Hospital	45			
Medical Care – Out-Patient Surgery Centers	45			
Schools for Adults – College, University, Vocational/Trade School	45	45[1]	45[1]	
Schools– Kindergarten through Grade 12 (includes Charter Schools)	45			
Industrial				
Junkyard, Dump, Recycling Center, Construction Yard				
Manufacturing/Processing – General				
Manufacturing/Processing of Biomedical Agents, Biosafety Levels 3 and 4 Only				
Manufacturing/Processing of Hazardous Materials [4]				
Mining/Extractive Industry				
Research and Development – Scientific, Technical				
Sanitary Landfill				
Self-Storage Facility				
Warehousing/Storage – General				
Warehousing/Storage of Biomedical Agents, Biosafety Levels 3 and 4 Only				
Warehousing/Storage of Hazardous Materials [4]				
Transportation, Communication, Utilities				
Auto Parking				
Electrical Power Generation Plant				
Electrical Substation				
Emergency Communications Facilities				
Marine Cargo Terminal				
Marine Passenger Terminal				
Transit Center, Bus/Rail Station				
Transportation, Communication, Utilities – General				
Truck Terminal				
Water, Wastewater Treatment Plant				
Recreation, Park, Open Space				
Arena, Stadium				
Golf Course				
Golf Course Clubhouse				

Table 4-3 Airport Noise Compatibility Criteria				
Land Use Category [a] Note: Multiple categories may apply to a project	Exterior Noise Exposure (CNEL)			
	60-65	65-70	70-75	75+
Marina				
Park, Open Space, Recreation				
Agriculture				
Aquaculture				
Agriculture				
	Compatible: Use is permitted.			
	Conditionally Compatible: Use is permitted subject to stated conditions.			
	Incompatible: Use is not permitted under any circumstances.			
45	Indoor uses: building must be capable of attenuating exterior noise to 45 CNEL			
50	Indoor uses: building must be capable of attenuating exterior noise to 50 CNEL			
45/50	Sleeping rooms must be attenuated to 45 CNEL any other indoor areas must be attenuated to 50 CNEL			
1	Avigation easement must be dedicated to the Airport owner/operator.			
2	New residential use is permitted above 70 CNEL contour only if current General/Community Plan designation allows for residential use. General/Community Plan amendments from a nonresidential designation to a residential designation are not permitted.			
3	Refer to Appendix A of the San Diego International Airport Land Compatibility Plan for definition of Assembly – Children.			
4	Refer to Appendix A of the San Diego International Airport Land Compatibility Plan for definitions of manufacturing, processing and storage of hazardous materials.			
a	Land uses not specifically listed shall be evaluated, as determined by Airport Land Use Commission, using the criteria for similar uses. Refer to Appendix A of the San Diego International Airport Land Compatibility Plan.			
b	If this land use would occur within a single- or multi-family residence, it must be evaluated using the criteria for single- or multi-family residential.			
Source: San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2014				

4.6 Health and Safety

Hazardous materials and hazardous wastes are extensively regulated by federal, state, and local regulations, with the major objective of protecting public health and the environment. In general, these regulations provide definitions of hazardous substances; identify responsible parties; establish reporting requirements; set guidelines for handling, storage, transport, remediation, and disposal of hazardous materials and wastes; and require health and safety provisions for both workers and the public, such as emergency response and worker training programs. The major regulations relevant to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are summarized below.

4.6.1 Federal

USEPA is the primary federal agency regulating hazardous wastes and materials. USEPA broadly defines a hazardous waste as one that is specifically listed in USEPA regulations, has been tested, and meets one of the four characteristics established by USEPA (toxicity, ignitability, corrosiveness, and reactivity), or that has been declared hazardous by the generator based on its knowledge of the waste. USEPA defines hazardous materials as any item or chemical that can cause harm to people, plants, or animals when released by spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emptying, discharging, injecting, leaching, dumping, or disposing into the environment. Federal regulations pertaining to hazardous wastes and materials are generally contained in Titles 29, 40, and 49 of the CFR, which are discussed herein. The terms hazardous wastes and hazardous materials are used interchangeably in this section.

a. Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] Sections 6901–6987), including the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments of 1984, protects human health and the environment, and imposes regulations on hazardous waste generators, transporters, and operators of treatment, storage, and disposal facilities. The Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments also requires USEPA to establish a comprehensive regulatory program for underground storage tanks. The corresponding regulations in 40 CFR 260–299 provide the general framework for managing hazardous waste, including requirements for entities that generate, store, transport, treat, and dispose of hazardous waste.

b. Hazardous Materials Transportation Act

DOT, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Railroad Administration are the three entities that regulate the transport of hazardous materials at the federal level. The Hazardous Materials Transportation Act (49 CFR 171, Subchapter C) governs the transportation of hazardous materials. These regulations are promulgated by DOT and enforced by USEPA.

4.6.2 State

a. California Code of Regulations Title 22

CCR Title 22 provides the following definition of hazardous materials:

> A hazardous material is a substance or combination of substances which, because of its quantity, concentration or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may either (1) cause or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious, irreversible or incapacitating irreversible illness; or (2) pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health and safety, or the environment when improperly treated, stored, transported or disposed of. Hazardous materials include waste that has been abandoned, discarded, or recycled on the property and as a result represents a continuing hazard as the development is proposed. Hazardous materials also include any contaminated soil or groundwater.

Title 22 also provides standards applicable to generators and transporters of hazardous wastes, as well as standards for operators or hazardous waste transfer facilities, among other regulations.

b. Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory

Two programs in the California Health and Safety Code (H&SC) Chapter 6.95 are directly applicable to the CEQA issue of risk due to hazardous substance release. In San Diego County, these two programs are referred to as the Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) program and the California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program. The County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health (DEH) is responsible for the implementation of the HMBP program and the CalARP program in San Diego County. The HMBP and CalARP programs provide threshold quantities for regulated hazards substances. When the indicated quantities are exceeded, an HMBP or Risk Management Plan is required pursuant to the regulations. Congress requires EPA Region 9 to make Risk Management Plan information available

to the public through USEPA's Envirofacts Data Warehouse. The Envirofacts Data Warehouse is considered the single point of access to select USEPA environmental data. California H&SC Section 25270, Aboveground Petroleum Storage Act, requires registration and spill prevention programs for aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) that store petroleum. In some cases, ASTs for petroleum may be subject to groundwater monitoring programs implemented by the RWQCBs and the SWRCB.

c. Emergency Response to Hazardous Materials Incidents

California has developed an emergency response plan to coordinate emergency services provided by federal, state, and local governments and private agencies. Response to hazardous material incidents is one part of this plan. The plan is managed by the California Emergency Management Agency, which coordinates the responses of other agencies, including the California Environmental Protection Agency (California EPA), the California Highway Patrol, CDFW, and RWQCB.

d. California Department of Toxic Substances Control

Within California EPA, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) has primary regulatory responsibility, with delegation of enforcement to local jurisdictions that enter into agreements with the state agency, for the management of hazardous materials and the generation, transport, and disposal of hazardous waste under the authority of the Hazardous Waste Control Law. Since August 1, 1992, DTSC has been authorized to implement the state's hazardous waste management program for California EPA.

DTSC is responsible for compiling a list of hazardous materials sites pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, which includes five categories:

- Hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the health and safety code;
- Land designated as "hazardous waste property" or "border zone property";
- Properties with hazardous waste disposals on public land;
- Hazardous substance release sites selected for (and subject to) a response action; and
- Sites included in the Abandoned Site Assessment Program.

4.6.3 Local

a. County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health

The Hazardous Materials Division (HMD) of DEH regulates hazardous waste and tiered permitting, USTs, aboveground petroleum storage and risk management plans, hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, and medical waste. The HMD's goal is "to protect human health and the environment by ensuring that hazardous materials, hazardous waste, medical waste, and underground storage tanks are properly managed" (County of San Diego 2016).

b. California EPA's Unified Program

In 1993, SB 1082 gave California EPA the authority and responsibility to establish a unified hazardous waste and hazardous materials management and regulatory program, commonly referred to as the Unified Program. The purpose of this program is to consolidate and coordinate six different hazardous materials and hazardous waste programs, and to ensure that they are consistently implemented throughout the state. California EPA oversees the Unified Program with support from DTSC, RWQCBs, the San Diego County Office of Emergency Services (OES), and the State Fire Marshal.

State law requires county and local agencies to implement the Unified Program. The agency in charge of implementing the program is called the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). The County of San Diego DEH, Hazardous Materials Division, is the designated CUPA for the county. In addition to the CUPA, other local agencies help to implement the Unified Program. These agencies are called Participatory Agencies. The HMD is the Participatory Agency for San Diego County.

c. San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan

Long-term prevention, mitigation efforts, and risk-based preparedness for specific hazards within San Diego are addressed as a part of the 2010 San Diego County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (HAZMIT), which was finalized in February 2010. The HAZMIT identifies specific risks for San Diego County and provides methods to help minimize damage caused by natural and man-made disasters. The final list of hazards profiled for San Diego County was determined as wildfire/structure fire, flood, coastal storms/erosion/ tsunami, earthquake/liquefaction, rain-induced landslide, dam failure, hazardous materials incidents, nuclear materials release, and terrorism. The plan is currently being reviewed and revised to reflect changes to the hazards threatening San Diego County as well as the programs in place to minimize or eliminate those hazards. This revision will include an evaluation of the impact climate change is having on the natural hazards facing San Diego. The San Diego County OES is responsible for coordinating with local jurisdictions and participating agencies to monitor, evaluate, and update the HAZMIT as necessary.

d. San Diego County Operational Area Emergency Plan

The 2010 San Diego County Operational Area Emergency Plan describes a comprehensive emergency management system, which provides for a planned response to disaster situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, terrorism, and nuclear-related incidents. It delineates operational concepts relating to various emergency situations, identifies components of the Emergency Management Organization, and describes the overall responsibilities for protecting life and property and providing for the overall well-being of the population. The plan also identifies the sources of outside support that might be provided (through mutual aid and specific statutory authorities) by other jurisdictions, state and federal agencies, and the private sector.

e. City of San Diego General Plan

The General Plan presents goals and policies relating to hazardous materials and disaster preparedness in the Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element.

4.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

There are federal, state, and local regulations that impose requirements on new development for erosion control, control of runoff contaminants, and control of direct discharge of pollutants that impact water quality. These laws, regulations, and standards are summarized below.

4.7.1 Federal

a. Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. Section 1251 et seq.) (1972) is the primary federal law that protects the nation's waters, including lakes, rivers, aquifers, and coastal areas. The Clean Water Act established basic guidelines for regulating discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States and requires that states adopt water quality standards to protect public health, enhance the quality of water resources, and ensure implementation of the Clean Water Act.

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act requires that any applicant for a federal permit to conduct any activity, including the construction or operation of a facility that may result in the discharge of any pollutant, must obtain certification from the state. Section 402 of the Clean Water Act established the NPDES to regulate the discharge of pollutants from point sources, and Section 404 established a permit program to regulate the discharge of dredged material into waters of the United States. In California, the SWRCB and RWQCBs administer the NPDES permitting programs and are responsible for developing waste discharge requirements. Each local RWQCB is responsible for developing waste discharge requirements specific to its jurisdiction. General waste discharge requirements that may apply to projects or recommendations contained within the proposed CPU include the SWRCB Construction General Permit and Industrial General Permit and the regional Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Permit administered by the RWQCB.

Under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act, states, territories, and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of impaired waters. These are waters that are too polluted or otherwise degraded to meet the water quality standards set by states, territories, or authorized tribes. The law requires that these jurisdictions establish priority rankings for waters on the lists and develop TMDLs for these waters. A TMDL is a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can receive and still safely meet water quality standards.

b. Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management

The major requirements of this executive order (EO) are to avoid support of floodplain development; to prevent uneconomic, hazardous, or incompatible use of floodplains; to protect and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values; and to be consistent with the standards and criteria of the National Flood Insurance Program. The basic tools for regulating construction in potentially hazardous floodplain areas are local zoning techniques. Proper floodplain zoning can be beneficial in the preservation of open space, retention of floodplains as groundwater recharge areas, and directing of development to less flood-prone areas.

4.7.2 State

a. Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act established the principal California legal and regulatory framework for water quality control. The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act is embodied in the California Water Code. The California Water Code authorizes the SWRCB to implement the provisions of the federal Clean Water Act. The State of California is divided into nine regions governed by RWQCBs. The RWQCBs implement and enforce provisions of the California Water Code and the Clean Water Act under the oversight of the SWRCB. The City is located within the purview of the San Diego RWQCB (Region 9). The Porter-Cologne Act also provides for the development and periodic review of Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) that designate beneficial uses of California's major rivers and other surface waters and groundwater basins, and establish water quality objectives for those waters.

b. San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (Water Board) Order No. R9-2013-0001, as amended by Order No. R9-2015-0001 and Order No. R9-2015-0100, NPDES Permit No. CAS0109266

Under the authority of the Clean Water Act amendments and federal NPDES Permit regulations, the RWQCB issued this order to the Copermittees consisting of San Diego County, the 18 cities within San Diego County, the Port, and the San Diego Regional Airport Authority. This order requires that all jurisdictions within the San Diego region prepare Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plans. Each of these jurisdictional plans must contain a component addressing construction activities and a component addressing existing development. The subsequent amendments expanded coverage to portions of Orange County and Riverside County within the San Diego Region (Region 9) and made other modifications.

4.7.3 Local

a. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin

The San Diego Basin encompasses approximately 3,900 square miles, including most of San Diego County and portions of southwestern Riverside and Orange Counties. The basin is composed of 11 major hydrologic units, 54 hydrologic areas, and 147 hydrologic subareas, extending from Laguna Beach southerly to the United States/Mexico border. Drainage from higher elevations in the east flow to the west, ultimately into the Pacific Ocean. The RWQCB prepared the Basin Plan, which defines existing and potential beneficial uses and water quality objectives for coastal waters, groundwater, surface waters, imported surface waters, and reclaimed waters in the basin. Water quality objectives seek to protect the most sensitive of the beneficial uses designated for a specific water body.

b. City of San Diego Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan

This document is a total account of how the City of San Diego plans to protect and improve the water quality of rivers, bays, and the ocean in the region in compliance with the RWQCB permit referenced above. The document describes how the City incorporates storm water BMPs into land use planning,

development review and permitting, City CIP project planning and design, and the execution of construction contracts.

c. Water Quality Improvement Plans

The MS4 Permit also requires development of WQIPs that guide the Copermittees' jurisdictional runoff management programs toward achieving improved water quality in MS4 discharges and receiving waters. The San Diego River Watershed Management Area WQIP applies to the portion of the Midway-Pacific Highway community draining to the San Diego River, while the San Diego Bay Watershed Management Area WQIP applies to the remainder of the community draining to San Diego Bay. The WQIPs further the Clean Water Act's objectives to protect, preserve, enhance, and restore the water quality and designated beneficial uses of waters of the state. The requirement sets forth a collaborative and adaptive planning and management process that identifies the highest-priority water quality conditions within a watershed management area and implements strategies through the jurisdictional runoff management programs of the respective jurisdictions.

d. Local Drainage Design Manual

Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 2 of the SDMC outlines Storm Water Runoff and Drainage Regulations, which apply to all development in the City, regardless of whether a development permit or other approval is required. In addition, drainage design policies and procedures are provided in the City's Drainage Design Manual (which is incorporated in the Land Development Manual as Appendix B). The Drainage Design Manual provides a guide for designing drainage and drainage-related facilities for developments within the City.

e. Storm Water Standards Manual

The City's current Storm Water Standards Manual provides information to project applicants on how to comply with the permanent and construction storm water quality requirements in the City. Significant elements of the Storm Water Standards Manual include:

1. LID BMP Requirements
2. Source Control BMPs
3. BMPs Applicable to Individual Priority Development Project Categories
4. Treatment Control BMPs

Although the footprint of the LID BMPs can often fit into planned landscaping features, this requires early planning to ensure that the features are located in places where they can intercept the drainage and safely store the water without adverse effects to adjacent slopes, structures, roadways, or other features. The Storm Water Standards Manual also addresses "Hydromodification – Limitations on Increases of Runoff Discharge Rates and Durations." Hydromodification management requirements would dictate design elements in locations where downstream channels are susceptible to erosion from increases in storm water runoff discharge rates and durations. Future development projects proposed within areas draining to San Diego Bay would typically be exempt from hydromodification management requirements because of the location and hardened drainage systems. Exemptions from hydromodification management requirements shall adhere to the current City's Storm Water Standards Manual. Projects

discharging into underground storm drains discharging directly to bays or the ocean are exempt, subject to conditions listed in the City's Storm Water Standards Manual.

The Storm Water Standards Manual also provides minimum requirements for construction site management, inspection, and maintenance of construction BMPs; monitoring of the weather and implementation of emergency plans as needed; and minimum performance standards, including the following: pollution prevention measures so that there would be no measurable increase of pollution (including sediment) in runoff from the site, no slope erosion, water velocity moving off-site must not be greater than pre-construction levels, and natural hydraulic features and riparian buffers preserved where possible. The City's current Storm Water Standards Manual is consistent with the Regional Best Management Practices Design Manual.

f. City of San Diego General Plan

The General Plan presents goals and policies for storm water infrastructure in the Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element, and presents goals and policies for open space (including floodplain management) and urban runoff management in the Conservation Element.

4.8 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

4.8.1 California Scenic Highways Program

Recognizing the value of scenic areas and the value of views from roads in such areas, the California State Legislature established the California Scenic Highway Program in 1963. This legislation sees scenic highways as "a vital part of the all-encompassing effort … to protect and enhance California's beauty, amenity and quality of life." Under this program, a number of state highways have been designated as eligible for inclusion as scenic routes. The 1-mile portion of State Route 163, known as the Cabrillo Freeway, between the north and south boundaries of Balboa Park, is an Officially Designated State Scenic Highway. I-8 and I-5 within the proposed CPU area are eligible state scenic highways although not officially designated.

4.8.2 City of San Diego General Plan

The General Plan includes a Citywide urban design strategy, goals, and policies regarding the physical features that define the character of a neighborhood or community. These goals complement the goals for pedestrian-oriented and walkable villages articulated in the City of Villages strategy.

The Urban Design Element of the General Plan establishes a set of design principles on which its policies are based and on which future public and private development physical design decisions can be based.

In its introduction, the Urban Design Element of the General Plan states:

> As the availability of vacant land becomes more limited, designing infill development and redevelopment that builds upon our existing communities becomes increasingly important. A compact, efficient, and environmentally sensitive pattern of development becomes increasingly important as the City continues to grow. In addition, future

development should accommodate and support existing and planned transit service (City of San Diego 2008).

The General Plan Urban Design Element policies relevant to planning at the Community Plan level involve architectural and landscape elements, as well as the design of transit and parking facilities, and residential development, mixed-use villages and commercial areas, office and business park development, and public spaces and facilities. Policies call for respecting San Diego's natural topography and distinctive neighborhoods; providing public art; and encouraging the development of walkable, transit-oriented communities.

4.9 Air Quality

Motor vehicles are San Diego County's leading source of air pollution. In addition to these sources, other mobile sources include construction equipment, trains, and airplanes. Emission standards for mobile sources are established by state and federal agencies, such as CARB and USEPA. Reducing mobile source emissions requires the technological improvement of existing mobile sources and the examination of future mobile sources, such as those associated with new or modification projects (e.g., retrofitting older vehicles with cleaner emission technologies). The State of California has developed statewide programs to encourage cleaner cars and cleaner fuels. Since 1996, smog-forming emissions from motor vehicles have been reduced by 15 percent, and the cancer risk from exposure to motor vehicle air toxics has been reduced by 40 percent. The regulatory framework described below details the federal and state agencies that are in charge of monitoring and controlling mobile source air pollutants and the measures currently being taken to achieve and maintain healthful air quality in the SDAB.

In addition to mobile sources, stationary sources also contribute to air pollution in the SDAB. Stationary sources include gasoline stations, power plants, dry cleaners, and other commercial and industrial uses. Stationary sources of air pollution are regulated by the local air pollution control or management district, in this case the San Diego APCD.

The State of California is divided geographically into 15 air basins for managing the air resources of the state on a regional basis. Areas within each air basin are considered to share the same air masses and, therefore, are expected to have similar ambient air quality. If an air basin is not in either federal or state attainment for a particular pollutant, the basin is classified as a moderate, serious, severe, or extreme non-attainment area for that pollutant (there is also a marginal classification for federal non-attainment areas). Once a non-attainment area has achieved the air quality standards for a particular pollutant, it may be redesignated to an attainment area for that pollutant. To be redesignated, the area must meet air quality standards and have a 10-year plan for continuing to meet and maintain air quality standards, as well as satisfy other requirements of the Clean Air Act (CAA). Areas that are redesignated to attainment are called maintenance areas.

4.9.1 Federal Regulations

Ambient air quality standards represent the maximum levels of background pollution considered safe, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health and welfare. The federal CAA was enacted in 1970 and amended in 1977 and 1990 (42 U.S.C. 7401) for the purposes of protecting and enhancing the quality of the nation's air resources to benefit public health, welfare, and productivity. In 1971, to

achieve the purposes of Section 109 of the CAA (42 U.S.C. 7409), USEPA developed primary and secondary national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).

Six criteria pollutants of primary concern have been designated: ozone, CO, SO_2, NO_2, lead (Pb), and respirable particulate matter (PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5}$). The primary NAAQS "… in the judgment of the Administrator, based on such criteria and allowing an adequate margin of safety, are requisite to protect the public health …" and the secondary standards "… protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects associated with the presence of such air pollutant in the ambient air" (42 U.S.C. 7409(b)(2)). The primary NAAQS were established, with a margin of safety, considering long-term exposure for the most sensitive groups in the general population (i.e., children, senior citizens, and people with breathing difficulties). The NAAQS are presented in Table 4-4.

Table 4-4
Ambient Air Quality Standards

Pollutant	Averaging Time	California Standards[1]		National Standards[2]		
		Concentration[3]	Method[4]	Primary[3,5]	Secondary[3,6]	Method[7]
Ozone[8]	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Photometry	–	Same as Primary Standard	Ultraviolet Photometry
	8 Hour	0.07 ppm (137 µg/m^3)		0.070 ppm (137 µg/m^3)		
Respirable Particulate Matter (PM_{10})[9]	24 Hour	50 µg/m^3	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	150 µg/m^3	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m^3		–		
Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$)[9]	24 Hour	No Separate State Standard		35 µg/m^3	Same as Primary Standard	Inertial Separation and Gravimetric Analysis
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m^3	Gravimetric or Beta Attenuation	12 µg/m^3	15 µg/m^3	
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m^3)	Non-dispersive Infrared Photometry	35 ppm (40 mg/m^3)	–	Non-dispersive Infrared Photometry
	8 Hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m^3)		9 ppm (10 mg/m^3)	–	
	8 Hour (Lake Tahoe)	6 ppm (7 mg/m^3)		–	–	
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO_2)[10]	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (339 µg/m^3)	Gas Phase Chemi-luminescence	100 ppb (188 µg/m^3)	–	Gas Phase Chemi-luminescence
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 µg/m^3)		0.053 ppm (100 µg/m^3)	Same as Primary Standard	
Sulfur Dioxide (SO_2)[11]	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence	75 ppb (196 µg/m^3)	–	Ultraviolet Fluorescence; Spectro-photometry (Pararosaniline Method)
	3 Hour	–		–	0.5 ppm (1,300 µg/m^3)	
	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 µg/m^3)		0.14 ppm (for certain areas)[10]	–	
	Annual Arithmetic Mean	–		0.030 ppm (for certain areas)[10]	–	
Lead[12,13]	30 Day Average	1.5 µg/m^3	Atomic Absorption	–	–	High Volume Sampler and Atomic Absorption
	Calendar Quarter	–		1.5 µg/m^3 (for certain areas)[12]	Same as Primary Standard	
	Rolling 3-Month Average	–		0.15 µg/m^3		
Visibility Reducing Particles[14]	8 Hour	See footnote 13	Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape	No National Standards		
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 µg/m^3	Ion Chroma-tography			
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 µg/m^3)	Ultraviolet Fluorescence			
Vinyl Chloride[12]	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m^3)	Gas Chroma-tography			

See footnotes on next page.

ppm = parts per million; ppb = parts per billion; µg/m^3 = micrograms per cubic meter; – = not applicable.

[1] California standards for ozone, carbon monoxide (except 8-hour Lake Tahoe), sulfur dioxide (1 and 24 hour), nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter (PM_{10}, $PM_{2.5}$, and visibility reducing particles), are values that are not to be exceeded. All others are not to be equaled or exceeded. California ambient air quality standards are listed in the Table of Standards in Section 70200 of Title 17 of the California Code of Regulations.

[2] National standards (other than ozone, particulate matter, and those based on annual arithmetic mean) are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The ozone standard is attained when the fourth highest 8-hour concentration measured at each site in a year, averaged over 3 years, is equal to or less than the standard. For PM_{10}, the 24-hour standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with a 24-hour average concentration above 150 µg/m^3 is equal to or less than 1. For $PM_{2.5}$, the 24-hour standard is attained when 98 percent of the daily concentrations, averaged over 3 years, are equal to or less than the standard. Contact the USEPA for further clarification and current national policies.

[3] Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr. Most measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 torr; ppm in this table refers to ppm by volume, or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.

[4] Any equivalent measurement method which can be shown to the satisfaction of the Air Resources Board to give equivalent results at or near the level of the air quality standard may be used.

[5] National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety to protect the public health.

[6] National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant.

[7] Reference method as described by the USEPA. An “equivalent method” of measurement may be used but must have a “consistent relationship to the reference method” and must be approved by the USEPA.

[8] On October 1, 2015, the national 8-hour ozone primary and secondary standards were lowered from 0.075 to 0.070 ppm.

[9] On December 14, 2012, the national annual $PM_{2.5}$ primary standard was lowered from 15 µg/m^3 to 12.0 µg/m^3. The existing national 24-hour $PM_{2.5}$ standards (primary and secondary) were retained at 35 µg/m^3, as was the annual secondary standards of 15 µg/m^3. The existing 24-hour PM_{10} standards (primary and secondary) of 150 µg/m^3 also were retained. The form of the annual primary and secondary standards is the annual mean, averaged over 3 years.

[10] To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 98th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 100 ppb. Note that the national standards are in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the national standards to the California standards the units can be converted from ppb to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 100 ppb is identical to 0.100 ppm.

[11] On June 2, 2010, a new 1-hour SO_2 standard was established and the existing 24-hour and annual primary standards were revoked. To attain the 1-hour national standard, the 3-year average of the annual 99th percentile of the 1-hour daily maximum concentrations at each site must not exceed 75 ppb. The 1971 SO_2 national standards (24-hour and annual) remain in effect until 1 year after an area is designated for the 2010 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1971 standards, the 1971 standards remain in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2010 standards are approved.
Note that the 1-hour national standard is in units of parts per billion (ppb). California standards are in units of parts per million (ppm). To directly compare the 1-hour national standard to the California standard the units can be converted to ppm. In this case, the national standard of 75 ppb is identical to 0.075 ppm.

[12] The CARB has identified lead and vinyl chloride as ‘toxic air contaminants’ with no threshold level of exposure for adverse health effects determined. These actions allow for the implementation of control measures at levels below the ambient concentrations specified for these pollutants.

[13] The national standard for lead was revised on October 15, 2008 to a rolling 3-month average. The 1978 lead standard (1.5 µg/m^3 as a quarterly average) remains in effect until 1 year after an area is designated for the 2008 standard, except that in areas designated nonattainment for the 1978 standard, the 1978 standard remains in effect until implementation plans to attain or maintain the 2008 standard are approved.

[14] In 1989, the CARB converted both the general statewide 10-mile visibility standard and the Lake Tahoe 30-mile visibility standard to instrumental equivalents, which are “extinction of 0.23 per kilometer” and “extinction of 0.07 per kilometer” for the statewide and Lake Tahoe Air Basin standards, respectively.

Source: CARB 2015

4.9.2 State Regulations

a. Criteria Pollutants

USEPA allows states the option to develop different (stricter) standards. The State of California has developed the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) and generally has set more stringent limits on the criteria pollutants (see Table 4-1). In addition to the federal criteria pollutants, the CAAQS

also specify standards for visibility-reducing particles, sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, and vinyl chloride (see Table 4-1). The California CAA, also known as the Sher Bill or California AB 2595, was signed into law on September 30, 1988, and became effective on January 1, 1989. The California CAA requires that districts implement regulations to reduce emissions from mobile sources through the adoption and enforcement of transportation control measures. The California CAA also requires that a district must:

1. Demonstrate the overall effectiveness of the air quality program;

2. Reduce non-attainment pollutants at a rate of 5 percent per year, or include all feasible measures and expeditious adoption schedule;

3. Ensure no net increase in emissions from new or modified stationary sources;

4. Reduce population exposure to severe non-attainment pollutants according to a prescribed schedule;

5. Include any other feasible controls that can be implemented, or for which implementation can begin, within 10 years of adoption of the most recent air quality plan; and

6. Rank control measures by cost-effectiveness. The SDAB is a non-attainment area for the State of California ozone standards, PM_{10} standard, and $PM_{2.5}$ standard.

b. Toxic Air Contaminants

The public's exposure to toxic air contaminants (TACs) is a significant public health issue in California. In 1983, the California Legislature enacted a program to identify the health effects of TACs and to reduce exposure to these contaminants to protect the public health (AB 1807: Health and Safety Code Sections 39650–39674). The Legislature established a two-step process to address the potential health effects from TACs. The first step is the risk assessment (or identification) phase. The second step is the risk management (or control) phase of the process.

The California Air Toxics Program establishes the process for the identification and control of TACs and includes provisions to make the public aware of significant toxic exposures and for reducing risk. Additionally, the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Information and Assessment Act (AB 2588, 1987, Connelly Bill) was enacted in 1987 and requires stationary sources to report the types and quantities of certain substances routinely released into the air. The goals of the Air Toxics "Hot Spots" Act are to collect emission data, to identify facilities having localized impacts, to ascertain health risks, to notify nearby residents of significant risks, and to reduce those significant risks to acceptable levels. The Children's Environmental Health Protection Act, California Senate Bill (SB) 25 (Chapter 731, Escutia, Statutes of 1999), focuses on children's exposure to air pollutants. The act requires CARB to review its air quality standards from a children's health perspective, evaluate the statewide air monitoring network, and develop any additional air toxic control measures needed to protect children's health. Locally, toxic air pollutants are regulated through the San Diego APCD's Regulation XII.

Of particular concern statewide are diesel-exhaust particulate matter (DPM) emissions. DPM was established as a TAC in 1998 and is estimated to represent a majority of the cancer risk from TACs statewide (based on the statewide average). Diesel exhaust is a complex mixture of gases, vapors, and

fine particles. This complexity makes the evaluation of health effects of diesel exhaust a complex scientific issue. Some of the chemicals in diesel exhaust, such as benzene and formaldehyde, have been previously identified as TACs by CARB and are listed as carcinogens under California's Proposition 65 or under the Federal Hazardous Air Pollutants program.

Following the identification of DPM as a TAC in 1998, CARB has worked on developing strategies and regulations aimed at reducing the risk from DPM. The overall strategy for achieving these reductions is found in the *Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-fueled Engines and Vehicles* (State of California 2000). A stated goal of the plan is to reduce the cancer risk statewide arising from exposure to DPM 85 percent by 2020.

c. State Implementation Plan

The State Implementation Plan (SIP) is a collection of documents that set forth a state's strategies for achieving the NAAQS. In California, the SIP is a compilation of new and previously submitted plans, programs (such as monitoring, modeling, permitting, etc.), district rules, state regulations, and federal controls. CARB is the lead agency for all purposes related to the SIP under state law. Local air districts and other agencies, such as the Department of Pesticide Regulation and the Bureau of Automotive Repair, prepare SIP elements and submit them to CARB for review and approval. CARB then forwards SIP revisions to USEPA for approval and publication in the Federal Register. All of the items included in the California SIP are listed in 40 CFR 52.220.

The San Diego APCD is responsible for preparing and implementing the portion of the SIP applicable to the SDAB. The San Diego APCD adopts rules, regulations, and programs to attain state and federal air quality standards, and appropriates money (including permit fees) to achieve these objectives.

d. Regional Air Quality Strategy

The San Diego APCD prepared the 1991/1992 Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) in response to the requirements set forth in AB 2595. The draft was adopted, with amendments, on June 30, 1992 (County of San Diego 1992). Attached, as part of the RAQS, are the Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) for the air quality plan prepared by SANDAG in accordance with AB 2595 and adopted by SANDAG on March 27, 1992, as Resolution Number 92-49 and Addendum. The required triennial updates of the RAQS and corresponding TCMs were adopted in 1995, 1998, 2001, 2004, and 2009. An update is currently being prepared based on the revised 8-hour ozone standard. The RAQS and TCMs set forth the steps needed to accomplish attainment of the CAAQS.

4.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

In response to rising concern associated with increasing GHG emissions and global climate change impacts, several plans and regulations have been adopted at the national, state, and local levels with the aim of reducing GHG emissions. Important federal, state, and local plans and regulations are summarized below.

4.10.1 Federal

a. Federal Clean Air Act

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled on April 2, 2007, in *Massachusetts v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency* that carbon dioxide (CO_2) is an air pollutant, as defined under the CAA, and that USEPA has the authority to regulate emissions of GHGs. USEPA announced that GHGs (including CO_2, methane [CH_4], nitrous oxide [N_2O], hydrofluorocarbons [HFCs], perfluorocarbons [PFCs], and sulfur hexafluoride [SF_6]) threaten the public health and welfare of the American people. This action was a prerequisite to finalizing USEPA's GHG emissions standards for light-duty vehicles, which were jointly proposed by USEPA and DOT's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). The standards were established on April 1, 2010, for 2012 through 2016 model year vehicles and on October 15, 2012, for 2017 through 2025 model year vehicles (USEPA 2010, 2012).

b. Climate Change Action Plan

Adopted in 1993, the U.S. Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) consists of voluntary actions to reduce all significant GHGs from all economic sectors. Backed by federal funding, the CCAP supports cooperative partnerships between the government and the private sector in establishing flexible and cost-effective ways to reduce GHG emissions. The CCAP encourages investments in new technologies but also relies on previous actions and programs focused on saving energy, reducing transportation emissions, improving forestry management, and reducing waste. With respect to energy and transportation-related GHG emissions reductions, the CCAP includes the following:

1. Energy Demand Actions to accelerate the use of existing energy saving technologies and encourage the development of more advanced technologies. Commercial actions focus on installing efficient heating and cooling systems in commercial buildings and upgrading to energy-efficient lighting systems (the Green Lights program). The State Buildings Energy Incentive Fund provides funding to states for the development of public building energy management programs. Residential actions focus on developing new residential energy standards and building codes and providing money-saving energy efficient options to homeowners.

2. Energy Supply Actions to reduce emissions from energy supply. These actions focus on increasing the use of natural gas, which emits less CO_2 than coal or oil, and investing in renewable energy sources, such as solar and wind power, which result in zero net CO_2 emissions. Energy supply strategies also focus on reducing the amount of energy lost during distribution from power plants to consumers.

3. Transportation Actions to reduce transportation-related emissions are focused on investing in cleaner fuels and more efficient technologies, and reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). In addition, the USEPA and DOT are to draft guidance documents for reducing VMT levels for use in developing local clean air programs.

c. Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards

The federal Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards determine the fuel efficiency of certain vehicle classes in the United States. While the standards had not changed since 1990, as part of the Energy and Security Act of 2007, the CAFE standards were increased in 2007 for new light-duty vehicles to 35 miles per gallon (mpg) by 2020. In April 2010, USEPA and DOT's NHTSA announced a joint Final Rulemaking establishing standards for 2012 through 2016 model year vehicles. This was followed up on October 15, 2012, when the agencies issued a Final Rulemaking with standards for model years 2017 through 2025. The 2016 standard is equivalent to 35.5 miles per gallon (mpg), and the 2025 standard is equivalent to 54.5 mpg if the levels were achieved solely through improvements in fuel efficiency. The agencies expect, however, that a portion of these improvements will be made through improvements in air conditioning leakage and the use of alternative refrigerants that would not contribute to fuel economy.

4.10.2 State

The State of California has adopted a number of plans and regulations aimed at identifying statewide and regional GHG emissions caps, GHG emissions reduction targets, and actions and timelines to achieve the target GHG reductions.

a. Executive Order S-3-05 – Statewide GHG Emission Targets

This EO, signed on June 1, 2005, established the following GHG emission reduction targets for the state of California:

- by 2010, reduce GHG emissions to 2000 levels;
- by 2020 reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels; and
- by 2050 reduce GHG emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels.

This EO also directs the secretary of California EPA to oversee the efforts made to reach these targets, and to prepare biannual reports on the progress made toward meeting the targets and on the impacts to California related to global warming, including impacts to water supply, public health, agriculture, the coastline, and forestry. With regard to impacts, the report also includes mitigation and adaptation plans to combat the impacts. The first Climate Action Team Assessment Report was produced in March 2006 and has been updated every 2 years.

b. Executive Order B-30-15 – 2030 Statewide GHG Emission Goal

This EO, issued by Governor Brown on April 29, 2015, established an interim GHG emission reduction goal for the state of California: by 2030, reduce GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels. This EO also directed all state agencies with jurisdiction over GHG emitting sources to implement measures designed to achieve the new interim 2030 goal as well as the preexisting long-term 2050 goal identified in EO S-3-05 (see discussion below). Additionally, this EO directed CARB to update its AB 32 (Nuñez) mandated Scoping Plan (see discussion above) to address the 2030 goal. CARB is developing statewide inventory projection data for 2030 as well as commencing its efforts to identify reduction strategies capable of securing emission reductions that allow for achievement of the EO's new interim goal.

c. AB 32 – California Global Warming Solutions Act

In response to EO S-3-05, the California Legislature passed AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, which was signed on September 27, 2006. It requires that CARB adopt rules and regulations that would reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. CARB is also required to publish a list of discrete GHG emission reduction measures. As required by AB 32, CARB has established a statewide GHG emissions cap for 2020, and adopted reporting rules for large industrial sources and a Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan).

d. Climate Change Scoping Plan

As directed by AB 32, the Scoping Plan prepared by CARB in December 2008 includes measures to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. These reductions are what CARB identified as necessary to reduce forecasted "Business As Usual" (BAU) 2020 emissions. CARB will update the Scoping Plan at least once every 5 years to allow evaluation of progress made and to correct the Scoping Plan's course where necessary.

The 2008 Scoping Plan estimated annual BAU 2020 emissions to reach 596 MMT CO_2E. Thus, to achieve 1990 emissions levels of 427 MMT CO_2E, a 169 MMT CO_2E reduction would be needed by 2020. The majority of reductions are directed at the sectors with the largest GHG emissions contributions—transportation and electricity generation—and involve statutory mandates affecting vehicle or fuel manufacture, public transit, and public utilities. The CARB list of reductions is included in the technical GHG analysis in Appendix I.

Approved in May 2014, the First Update to the Scoping Plan defines CARB's priorities for the next 5 years and sets the groundwork to reach long-term goals set forth in EO S-3-05. The First Update describes advancements in climate science such as the quantification of the impacts of temperature change, further understanding of the mechanisms of climate pollutants (black carbon, CH_4, and HFCs), and improvements to GHG monitoring. The First Update also describes progress made since the original Scoping Plan, including implementation of a more comprehensive Cap-and-Trade Program, the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS), a 33 percent Renewable Portfolio Standard, and an Advanced Clean Cars program that has been adopted at the federal level.

On December 14, 2017, the 2017 Scoping Plan Update was adopted, as directed by SB 32. The 2017 Scoping Plan Update will build on the state's successes to date and strengthen major programs that have been a hallmark of success. The 2017 Scoping Plan Update sets a strategy for achieving the state's 2030 target, 40 percent emissions reductions below 1990 levels through enhancing industrial efficiency and competitiveness, prioritizing transportation sustainability, continuing to lead on clean energy, managing waste, supporting resilient agricultural and rural economies, securing water supplies, cleaning the air and public health, being a successful example of carbon pricing and investment.

e. AB 1493 – Vehicular Emissions of Greenhouse Gases

AB 1493 (Pavley) directed CARB to adopt vehicle standards that lowered GHG emissions from passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks to the maximum extent technologically feasible, beginning with the 2009 Model Year. CARB has adopted amendments to its regulations that would enforce AB 1493 but provide vehicle manufacturers with new compliance flexibility. Pavley standards are currently divided into

two phases. Standards that regulate vehicles model years 2009 through 2016 are termed “Pavley I”; standards for Model Years 2017 through 2025 were originally termed “Pavley II.”

With these actions, it is expected that Pavley I will reduce GHG emissions from California passenger vehicles by a total of 31.5 MMT CO_2E counted toward the total pre-economic downturn statewide reduction target on the capped sector of 146.7 MMT CO_2E (CARB Scoping Plan). CARB adopted a second phase of the Pavley regulations, termed “Pavley II,” which are now called the Low Emission Vehicle III (LEV III) Standards. LEV III covers Model Years 2017 through 2025. These reductions are to come from improved vehicle technologies such as small engines with superchargers, continuously variable transmissions, and hybrid electric drives.

f. Executive Order S-01-07 – Low Carbon Fuel Standard

This EO directed that a statewide goal be established to reduce the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels by at least 10 percent by 2020 through an LCFS. CARB adopted the LCFS as a discrete early action measure pursuant to AB 32 in April 2009 and includes it as a reduction measure in its Scoping Plan.

The LCFS is a performance standard with flexible compliance mechanisms intended to incentivize the development of a diverse set of clean, low-carbon transportation fuel options. Its aim is to accelerate the availability and diversity of low-carbon fuels such as biofuels, electricity, and hydrogen, by taking into consideration the full life cycle of GHG emissions. A 10 percent reduction in the intensity of transportation fuels is expected to equate to a reduction of 16.5 MMT CO_2E in 2020. However, to account for possible overlap of benefits between LCFS and the Pavley GHG standards, CARB has discounted the contribution of LCFS to 15 MMT CO_2E.

g. Senate Bill 375—Regional Emissions Targets

SB 375 was signed in September 2008 and requires CARB to set regional targets for reducing passenger vehicle GHG emissions in accordance with the Scoping Plan described above. Its purpose is to align regional transportation planning efforts, regional GHG reduction targets, and land use and housing allocation to reduce GHG emissions by promoting high-density, mixed-use developments around mass transit hubs.

The current Scoping Plan prepared pursuant to AB 32 by CARB identifies reduction targets for all sources of GHG emissions in the state. While the transportation sector is responsible for the greatest GHG reductions (nearly 30 percent of the total reductions), most of these reductions will come from higher fuel efficiency vehicles per the Pavley standards (18 percent) and a more diverse fuel mix per the low carbon fuel standards (9 percent). Statewide, RTPs prepared by Metropolitan Planning Organizations, such as SANDAG, are responsible for less than 3 percent of the GHG reductions. SB 375 is the mechanism that establishes GHG emission reduction targets for each regional agency.

SANDAG’s SB 375 target is to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light trucks by 7 percent, per capita, by 2020, and by 13 percent by 2035, using a 2005 baseline as outlined in the RP. The RP, encompassing both the RTP and SCS, shows that the region will exceed these targets by pursuing the following strategies: using land in ways to make developments more compact, conserving open space, and investing in a transportation system that provides people with alternatives to driving alone.

h. California Energy Code

CCR Title 24, Part 6 is the California Energy Code. This code, originally enacted in 1978 in response to legislative mandates, establishes energy-efficiency standards for residential and non-residential buildings in order to reduce California's energy consumption. The Energy Code is updated periodically to incorporate and consider new energy-efficiency technologies and methodologies as they become available. The most recent amendments to the Energy Code, known as 2013 Title 24, or the 2013 Energy Code, became effective July 1, 2015. The 2013 Title 24 requires energy use reductions of 25 to 30 percent above the former 2008 Title 24 Energy Code.

New construction and major renovations must demonstrate their compliance with the current Energy Code through submission and approval of a Title 24 Compliance Report to the local building permit review authority and CEC. The compliance reports must demonstrate a building's energy performance through use of CEC-approved energy performance software that shows iterative increases in energy efficiency given selection of various heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC); sealing; glazing; insulation; and other components related to the building envelope. Title 24 governs energy consumed by the built environment by the major building envelope systems such as space heating, space cooling, water heating, some aspects of the fixed lighting system, and ventilation. Non-building energy use and plug-in energy use (such as appliances, equipment, electronics, plug-in lighting) are independent of building design and are not subject to Title 25.

i. California Green Building Standards

CCR Title 24, Part 11 is the California Green Building Standards. Beginning in 2011, California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen) instituted mandatory minimum environmental performance standards for all ground-up new construction of commercial and residential buildings, state-owned buildings, schools, and hospitals. It also includes voluntary tiers (I and II) with stricter environmental performance standards for these same categories of residential and non-residential buildings. Local jurisdictions must enforce the minimum mandatory requirements and may adopt CalGreen with amendments for stricter requirements.

The mandatory standards require:

- 20 percent mandatory reduction in indoor water use relative to specified baseline levels;
- 65 percent construction/demolition waste diverted from landfills (please note, AB 341 established a 75 percent diversion target; see Section 4.12.2.e);
- inclusion of electric vehicle charging stations or designated spaces capable of supporting future charging stations;
- mandatory inspections of energy systems to ensure optimal working efficiency; and
- requirements for low-pollutant emitting exterior and interior finish materials such as paints, carpets, vinyl flooring, and particle boards.

The voluntary standards require:

- Tier I – 15 percent improvement in energy requirements, stricter water conservation requirements for specific fixtures, 65 percent reduction in construction waste, 10 percent recycled content, 20 percent permeable paving, 20 percent cement reduction, cool/solar reflective roof; electrical vehicle charging; and
- Tier II – 30 percent improvement in energy requirements, stricter water conservation requirements for specific fixtures, 75 percent reduction in construction waste, 15 percent recycled content, 30 percent permeable paving, 25 percent cement reduction, cool/solar reflective roof, electrical vehicle charging.

Similar to the compliance reporting procedure described above for demonstrating code compliance under Title 24, Part 6, in new buildings and major renovations, compliance with the CalGreen water reduction requirements must be demonstrated through completion of water use reporting forms for new residential and non-residential buildings. The water use compliance forms must demonstrate a 20 percent reduction in indoor water use by either showing a 20 percent reduction in the overall baseline water use as identified in CalGreen or a reduced per-plumbing-fixture water use rate.

The CARB Scoping Plan includes a Green Building Strategy with the goal of expanding the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of new and existing buildings. Consistent with CalGreen, the Scoping Plan recognized that GHG reductions would be achieved through buildings that exceed minimum energy-efficiency standards, decrease consumption of potable water, reduce solid waste during construction and operation, and incorporate sustainable materials. CPUC, CEC, and CARB have a shared goal of achieving zero net energy for new construction in California. The key policy timelines include (1) all new residential construction in California will be zero net energy by 2020, and (2) all new commercial construction in California will be zero net energy by 2030. Green building is thus a vehicle to achieve the Scoping Plan's statewide electricity and natural gas efficiency targets, and lower GHG emissions from waste and water transport sectors.

In the Scoping Plan, CARB projects that an additional 26.3 MMT CO_2E could be reduced through expanded green building standards. However, this reduction is not counted toward the BAU 2020 reduction goal to avoid any double counting, as most of these reductions are accounted for in the electricity, waste, and water sectors. Because of this, CARB has assigned all emissions reductions that occur because of green building strategies to other sectors for meeting AB 32 requirements but will continue to evaluate and refine the emissions from this sector.

j. Senate Bill 97—CEQA GHG Amendments

SB 97 (Dutton), passed by the Legislature and signed on August 24, 2007, required the Office of Planning and Research on or before July 1, 2009, to prepare, develop, and transmit to the Resources Agency amendments to the CEQA Guidelines to assist public agencies in the evaluation and mitigation of GHGs or the effects of GHGs as required under CEQA, including the effects associated with transportation and energy consumption. SB 97 required the Resources Agency to certify and adopt those guidelines by January 1, 2010. Proposed amendments to the CEQA Guidelines for GHG emissions were submitted on April 13, 2009, adopted on December 30, 2009, and became effective March 18, 2010.

Section 15065.4 of the amended CEQA Guidelines includes the following requirements for determining the significance of impacts from GHG emissions:

(a) The determination of the significance of greenhouse gas emissions calls for a careful judgment by the lead agency consistent with the provisions in Section 15065. A lead agency should make a good-faith effort, based to the extent possible on scientific and factual data, to describe, calculate, or estimate the amount of GHG emissions resulting from a project. A lead agency shall have discretion to determine, in the context of a particular project, whether to:

1) Use a model or methodology to quantify greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a project, and which model or methodology to use. The lead agency has discretion to select the model or methodology it considers most appropriate provided it supports its decision with substantial evidence. The lead agency should explain the limitations of the particular model or methodology selected for use; and/or

2) Rely on a qualitative analysis or performance-based standards.

While the amendments require calculation of a project's contribution, they clearly do not establish a standard by which to judge a significant effect or a means to establish such a standard.

k. Senate Bill 32 and Assembly Bill 197

In September 2016, Governor Brown signed SB 32 (Chapter 249, Statutes of 2016) and AB 197 (Chapter 250, Statutes of 2016), which require the State to reduce GHG emissions to at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and invest in the communities most affected by climate change. SB 32 codifies the 2030 GHG emissions reduction goal established by EO B-30-15, issued by Governor Brown in 2015. AB 197 establishes a legislative committee on climate change policies to help continue the State's activities to reduce GHG emissions.

4.10.3 Local

a. San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan

Refer to Section 4.1.5 for a discussion of SANDAG's RP.

b. City of San Diego General Plan (2008)

The General Plan includes several climate change-related policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions from future development and City operations. For example, Conservation Element policy CE-A.2 aims to "reduce the City's carbon footprint" and to "develop and adopt new or amended regulations, programs, and incentives as appropriate to implement the goals and policies set forth" related to climate change. The Land Use and Community Planning Element; the Mobility Element; the Urban Design Element; and the Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element also identify GHG reduction and climate change adaptation goals. These elements contain policy language related to sustainable land use patterns, alternative modes of transportation, energy efficiency, water conservation, waste reduction, and greater landfill efficiency. The overall intent of these policies is to support climate protection actions, while

retaining flexibility in the design of implementation measures, which could be influenced by new scientific research, technological advances, environmental conditions, or state and federal legislation.

One specific concept introduced in the General Plan is the City of Villages strategy, which proposes growth to be directed into pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use activity centers linked to an improved regional transit system. The City of Villages strategy shifts the focus of land use policies to encourage infill development and reinvest in existing communities. Locating different land uses types near one another can decrease mobile emissions. Thus, the development of dense urban "villages" would generate less GHG emissions. The City of Villages strategy can be seen as an effort to avoid what is commonly referred to as "urban sprawl."

Cumulative impacts of GHG emissions were qualitatively analyzed and determined significant and unavoidable in the PEIR for the General Plan. A PEIR Mitigation Framework was included that indicated "for each future project requiring mitigation (measures that go beyond what is required by existing programs, plans, and regulations), project-specific measures will [need to] be identified with the goal of reducing incremental project-level impacts to less than significant; or the incremental contributions of a project may remain significant and unavoidable where no feasible mitigation exists."

c. Climate Action Plan

In December 2015, the City adopted a CAP. The CAP identifies measures to meet GHG reduction targets for 2020 and 2035. The CAP consists of a 2010 inventory of GHG emissions, a BAU projection for emissions at 2020 and 2035, state targets, and emission reductions with implementation of the CAP. The City identifies GHG reduction strategies focusing on energy- and water-efficient buildings; clean and renewable energy; bicycling, walking, transit, and land use; zero waste; and climate resiliency. Accounting for future population and economic growth, the City projects GHG emissions will be approximately 15.9 MMT CO_2E in 2020 and 16.7 MMT CO_2E in 2035. To achieve its proportional share of the state reduction targets for 2020 (AB 32) and 2050 (EO S-3-05), the City would need to reduce emissions below the 2010 baseline by 15 percent in 2020 and 50 percent by 2035. To meet these goals, the City must implement strategies that reduce emissions to approximately 11.0 MMT CO_2E in 2020 and 6.5 MMT CO_2E in 2035. Through implementation of the CAP, the City is projected to reduce emissions even farther below targets by 1.2 MMT CO_2E by 2020 and 205,462 MTCO_2E by 2035.

4.11 Public Services and Facilities

4.11.1 Local

The City requires payment of Development Impact Fees (DIFs) to collect a proportional fair share cost of capital improvements needed to offset the impact of the development (SDMC Section 142.0640). DIFs are based on community-specific financing plans completed when Community Plans are updated. Financing plans were formerly known as Public Facilities Financing Plans and are now referred to as IFSs.

The General Plan Public Facilities Element includes a number of policies that address financing of public facilities and specifies that IFSs should be completed concurrent with preparation of Community Plan updates, should set community-level priorities for facility financing, and ensure new development pays its

proportional fair share of public facilities costs through payment of DIFs. Facility types that are eligible for DIF funding include transportation, storm drains, parks and recreation, fire-rescue, police, and libraries.

a. Police

As specified in the General Plan, Public Facilities Element, Policy PF-E.2, the City goal is to maintain average response time goals as development and population growth occurs. Average response time guidelines are as follows:

- Priority E Calls (imminent threat to life) within 7 minutes
- Priority 1 Calls (serious crimes in progress) within 12 minutes
- Priority 2 Calls (less serious crimes with no threat to life) within 30 minutes
- Priority 3 Calls (minor crimes/requests that are not urgent) within 90 minutes
- Priority 4 Calls (minor requests for police service) within 90 minutes

b. Parks

The General Plan provides standards for population–based parks and recreation facilities, which include recreation centers and aquatic complexes. The standard for population-based parks is 2.8 usable acres per 1,000 residents, which can be achieved through a combination of neighborhood and community parks and park equivalencies. The standard for a recreation center is a minimum of 17,000 square feet per recreation center to serve a population of 25,000. The standard for an aquatic complex is one per 50,000 people or within approximately 6 miles.

c. Fire

The Fire-Rescue Department has an active program that promotes the clearing of canyon vegetation away from structures in accordance with Section 142.0412 of the SDMC and the San Diego Fire-Rescue Department's Canyon Fire Safety guidelines and policies related to brush management. The City thins brush on City property within 100 horizontal feet of a previously conforming structure unless a site-specific report, which indicates that a greater distance is necessary, is approved by the San Diego Fire-Rescue Department (per SDMC Section 142.0412(i) or a previously recorded entitlement requires a width more or less than the standard 100 feet. Other fire prevention measures include adopting safety codes and an aggressive brush management program. Citywide fire service goals, policies, and standards are located in the Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element of the General Plan and the Fire-Rescue Services Department's Fire Service Standards of Response Coverage Deployment Study.

Response time standards are provided in the General Plan Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element and summarized below:

a. To treat medical patients and control small fires, the first-due unit should arrive within 7.5 minutes, 90 percent of the time from the receipt of the 911 call in fire dispatch. This equates to 1-minute dispatch time, 1.5 minutes company turnout time, and 5-minute drive time in the most populated areas.

b. To provide an effective response force for serious emergencies, a multiple-unit response of at least 17 personnel should arrive within 10.5 minutes from the time of 911-call receipt in fire dispatch, 90 percent of the time.

- This response is designed to confine fires near the room of origin, to stop wildland fires to under 3 acres when noticed promptly, and to treat up to five medical patients at once.
- This equates to 1-minnute dispatch time, 1.5 minutes company turnout time, and 8-minute drive time spacing for multiple units in the most populated areas.

To direct fire station location timing and crew size planning as the community grows, fire unit deployment performance measures are established based on population density zones and are provided in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5
Deployment Measures to Address Future Growth by Population Density per Square Mile

	Structure Fire Urban Area	Structure Fire Rural Area	Structure Fire Remote Area	Wildfires Populated Areas
	>1,000-people/ sq. mi.	1,000 to 500 people/sq. mi.	500 to 50 people/sq. mi.*	Permanent open space areas
1st Due Travel Time	5	12	20	10
Total Reflex Time	7.5	14.5	22.5	12.5
1st Alarm Travel Time	8	16	24	15
1st Alarm Total Reflex	10.5	18.5	26.5	17.5

Notes: Reflect time is the total time from receipt of a 9-1-1 call to arrival of the required number of emergency units
Source: City of San Diego General Plan 2008

The following population-based performance measures are used to plan for needed facilities. Where more than 1 square mile is not populated at similar densities, and/or a contiguous area with different zoning types aggregates into a population "cluster," these measures guide the determination of response time measures (Table 4-6) and the need for fire stations.

Table 4-6
Deployment Measures to Address Future Growth by Population Clusters

Area	Aggregate Population	First-Due Unit Travel Time Goal
Metropolitan	> 200,000 people	4 minutes
Urban-Suburban	< 200,000 people	5 minutes
Rural	500 to 1,000 people	12 minutes
Remote	< 500	> 15 minutes

Source: City of San Diego General Plan 2008

4.12 Public Utilities

Groundwater recharge using recycled water is governed primarily by state and local agencies. The primary agencies involved are the California Department of Public Health, the SWRCB, and the local RWQCB. The federal government does not have direct jurisdiction over groundwater. However, it should be noted that because surface water quality may affect groundwater, and because USEPA has a role in

setting wastewater treatment requirements and standards for surface water discharges, some federal regulations may be applied indirectly to groundwater recharge projects.

4.12.1 State

a. California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) was enacted to reduce, recycle, and reuse solid waste generated in the state to the maximum extent feasible. Specifically, this Act requires city and county jurisdictions to identify an implementation schedule to divert 50 percent of the total waste stream from land disposal by the year 2000 through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities, and requires the participation of the residential, commercial, industrial, and public sectors.

4.12.2 Local

a. Water Supply

SB 610 requires water suppliers to prepare a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) report for inclusion by land use agencies during the CEQA process for new developments subject to SB 221. SB 221 requires water suppliers to prepare written verification that sufficient water supplies are planned to be available prior to approval of large-scale subdivision of land under the State Subdivision Map Act. Large-scale projects include residential development of more than 500 units, shopping centers or businesses employing more than 1,000 people, shopping centers or businesses having more than 500,000 square feet of floor space, commercial office buildings employing more than 1,000 people, and/or commercial buildings having more than 250,000 square feet of floor space or occupying more than 40 acres of land. SB 221 and SB 610 went into effect January 2002 with the intention of linking water supply availability to land use planning by cities and counties.

The City's PUD prepared a WSA report for the project (July 2017), which is included as Appendix L to this PEIR. The WSA reports were prepared for the project to assess whether sufficient water supplies are, or will be, available to meet the projected water demands associated with the proposed land use scenarios. Because no subdivision of land is proposed as part of this project, the WSA reports were prepared in compliance with the requirements of SB 610. The WSA reports include, among other information, identification of existing water supply entitlements, water rights, water service contracts, or agreements relevant to the identified water supply for the project, and quantities of water received in prior years pursuant to those entitlements, rights, contracts, and agreements.

b. Wastewater

Council Policy 400-13 identifies the need to provide maintenance access to all sewers in order to reduce the potential for spills. The policy requires that environmental impacts from access paths in environmentally sensitive areas should be minimized to the maximum extent possible through the use of sensitive access path design, canyon-proficient maintenance vehicles, and preparation of plans that dictate routine maintenance and emergency access procedures.

Council Policy 400-14 outlines a program to evaluate the potential to redirect sewage flow out of canyons and environmentally sensitive areas to an existing or proposed sewer facility located in City streets or other accessible locations. The policy includes an evaluation procedure that requires both a physical evaluation and a cost-benefit analysis. Based on the analysis, if redirection of flow outside the canyon is found infeasible, a Long-Term Maintenance and Emergency Access Plan is required. The plan would be specific to the canyon evaluated, and would prescribe long-term access locations for routine maintenance and emergency repairs along with standard operating procedures identifying cleaning methods and inspection frequency.

The City's Sewer Design Guide sets forth criteria to be used for the design of sewer systems, which may consist of pump stations, gravity sewers, force mains, and related appurtenances. It includes criteria for determining capacity and sizing of pump stations, gravity sewers and force mains, alignment of gravity sewers and force mains, estimating wastewater flow rates, design of bridge crossings, and corrosion control requirements.

c. Water Distribution

The City's Water Facility Design Guidelines identify general planning, predesign, and design details and approaches to be used for water infrastructure. The guidelines provide uniformity in key concepts, equipment types, and construction materials on facilities built under the Water CIP. These design guidelines assist in providing professionally sound, efficient, uniform, and workable facilities, whether pipelines, pressure control facilities, pumping stations, or storage facilities.

d. Communication Facilities

City Council Policy 600-43 established a set of comprehensive guidelines for the review and processing of applications for the placement and design of Wireless Communication Facilities in accordance with the City of San Diego land use regulations. These guidelines are intended to prescribe clear, reasonable, and predictable criteria to assess and process applications in a consistent and expeditious manner, while reducing visual and land use impacts associated with Wireless Communication Facilities. For applicants seeking placement of a Wireless Communication Facility on City-owned land, this policy should be used in conjunction with applicable Council policies and LDC Section 141.0420.

e. Solid Waste and Recycling

The California Legislature passed AB 939 to address landfill capacity and solid waste concerns in 1989. The Integrated Waste Management Act mandated that all cities reduce waste disposed in landfills from generators within their borders by 50 percent by the year 2000. The law also required local governments to prepare Source Reduction and Recycling Elements detailing how these reductions would be achieved. In 2011, the State enacted AB 341, which established a policy goal for California of 75 percent recycling, composting, or source reduction of solid waste by 2020. In July 2012, the City updated the Recycling Ordinance to lower the exemption threshold for required recycling, thereby requiring all privately serviced businesses, commercial/institutional facilities, apartments, and condominiums generating 4 or more cubic yards of trash per week to recycle. The City is currently at a 67 percent diversion rate (City of San Diego 2016). Pursuant to the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, any land development project of more than 40,000 square feet that may generate approximately 60 tons of waste or more during construction and/or operation is required to prepare a project-specific Waste Management Plan (WMP) to

address disposal of waste generated during short-term project construction and long-term post-construction operation. The WMP is required to identify how the project would reduce waste and achieve target reduction goals.

4.13 Biological Resources

4.13.1 Federal

a. Endangered Species Act

The federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), provides for listing of endangered and threatened species of plants and animals and designation of critical habitat for listed animal species. The ESA also prohibits all persons subject to U.S. jurisdiction from "taking" endangered species, which includes any harm or harassment. Section 7 of the ESA requires that federal agencies, prior to project approval, consult USFWS and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service to ensure adequate protection of listed species that may be affected by the project.

b. Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.) is a federal statute that implements treaties with several countries on the conservation and protection of migratory birds. The list of bird species covered by the MBTA is extensive and is detailed in 50 CFR 10.13. The regulatory definition of "migratory bird" is broad and includes any mutation or hybrid of a listed species, including any part, egg, or nest of such a bird (50 CFR 10.12). Migratory birds are not necessarily federally listed endangered or threatened birds under the ESA. The MBTA, which is enforced by USFWS, makes it unlawful "by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, [or] kill" any migratory bird or attempt such actions, except as permitted by regulation. The applicable regulations prohibit the take, possession, import, export, transport, sale, purchase, barter, or offering of these activities, except under a valid permit or as permitted in the implementing regulations (50 CFR 21.11).

c. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

USACE has primary federal responsibility for administering regulations that concern waters and wetlands in the project area. In this regard, USACE acts under two statutory authorities, the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C., Sections 9 and 10), which governs specified activities in navigable waters, and the Clean Water Act (Section 404), which governs specified activities in waters of the United States, including wetlands and special aquatic sites. Wetlands and non-wetland waters (e.g., rivers, streams, and natural ponds) are a subset of waters of the United States and receive protection under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. USACE has primary federal responsibility for administering regulations that concern waters and wetlands in the project area under statutory authority of the Clean Water Act (Section 404). In addition, the regulations and policies of various federal agencies mandate that the filling of wetlands be avoided to the maximum extent feasible. USACE requires obtaining a permit if a project proposes placing structures within navigable waters and/or alteration of waters of the United States.

4.13.2 State

a. California Endangered Species Act

Similar to the federal ESA, the California ESA of 1970 provides protection to species considered threatened or endangered by the State of California (California Fish and Game Code, Section 2050 et seq.). The California ESA recognizes the importance of threatened and endangered fish, wildlife, and plant species and their habitats, and prohibits the taking of any endangered, threatened, or rare plant and/or animal species unless specifically permitted for education or management purposes.

b. California Fish and Game Code

The California Fish and Game Code regulates the handling and management of the state's fish and wildlife. Most of the code is administered or enforced by CDFW (before January 1, 2013, California Department of Fish and Game). One section of the code generally applies to public infrastructure projects:

- Section 1602 regulates activities that would divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake that supports fish or wildlife. CDFW has jurisdiction over riparian habitats associated with watercourses. Jurisdictional waters are delineated by the outer edge of riparian vegetation or at the top of the bank of streams or lakes, whichever is wider. CDFW jurisdiction does not include tidal areas or isolated resources.

c. Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act

Refer to Section 4.7.2 for discussion of the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act.

4.13.3 Local

a. Multiple Species Conservation Program

Refer to Section 4.1.3 for discussion of the MSCP, MHPA, and MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.

b. City of San Diego Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations

The purpose of the ESL Regulations is to "protect, preserve, and, where damaged restore, the environmentally sensitive lands of San Diego and the viability of the species supported by those lands. These regulations are intended to assure that development occurs in a manner that protects the overall quality of the resources and the natural and topographic character of the area, encourages a sensitive form of development, retains biodiversity and interconnected habitats, maximizes physical and visual public access to and along the shoreline, and reduces hazards due to flooding in specific areas while minimizing the need for construction of flood control facilities. These regulations are intended to protect the public health, safety, and welfare while employing regulations that are consistent with sound resources conservation principles and the rights of private property owners." ESL Regulations cover sensitive biological resources, including wetlands, within and outside of the coastal zone and MHPA.

Future development proposed in accordance with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would be required to comply with all applicable ESL Regulations.

c. Biology Guidelines

In September 1991, the City's Biology Guidelines, part of the Land Development Manual, were adopted, to aid in the implementation and interpretation of the ESL Regulations (SDMC Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 1) and the OR-1-2 Zone (SDMC Chapter 13, Article 1, Division 2). Section III of the Biology Guidelines serve as standards for the determination of impact and mitigation under CEQA and the Coastal Act. The guidelines are the baseline biological standards for processing Neighborhood Development Permits, Site Development Permits, and Coastal Development Permits issued pursuant to the ESL.

d. City of San Diego General Plan Policies

The General Plan establishes Citywide policies to be cited in conjunction with a Community Plan. The General Plan presents goals and policies for biological resources in the Conservation Element.

4.14 Paleontological Resources

Under California law, paleontological resources are protected by CEQA; the CCR, Title 14, Division 3, Chapter 1, Sections 4307 and 4309; and Public Resources Code Section 5097.5. Pursuant to Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines (CCR Sections 15000–15387), a lead agency must find that a project would have a significant effect on the environment when the project has the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California prehistory, including significant paleontological resources. The City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016) are used to make this determination.

This page intentionally left blank.

5

Chapter 5.0
Environmental Analysis

The following sections in analyze the potential environmental impacts that may occur as a result of implementation of the project. The environmental issues addressed in this chapter include the following:

- Land Use
- Transportation and Circulation
- Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources
- Geologic Conditions
- Noise
- Health and Safety
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Public Service and Facilities
- Public Utilities
- Biological Resources
- Paleontological Resources

Each issue analysis section is formatted to include a description of existing conditions (or a reference to Chapter 2.0 for existing conditions); the criteria for the determination of impact significance; evaluation of potential project impacts, including cumulative impacts; mitigation measures, if applicable; and conclusion of significance after mitigation for impacts identified as requiring mitigation.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.1 Land Use

This section discusses existing land use and the consistency of the project with applicable plans and regulations. This section analyzes the potential that implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would permit designation or intensity of use that would have indirect or secondary environmental impacts. As discussed in Section 3.4, Project Description, the land use is analyzed at build-out using a total dwelling unit yield. ~~for a maximum projection. This is based on t~~ The total dwelling unit yield reflects assumptions that some properties would ~~not~~ redevelop at the ~~greater~~maximum permitted residential density; ~~while~~ other properties would develop at residential densities below the maximum due to development constraints and market conditions; and other sites ~~will be~~ may develop~~ed~~ with a ~~higher~~ density above maximum as permitted under state and local density bonus regulations, as discussed in greater detail in Appendix N.

5.1.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.1.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

The determination of significance regarding any inconsistency with development regulations or plan policies is evaluated in terms of the potential for the inconsistency to result in environmental impacts considered significant under CEQA. Thresholds used to evaluate potential impacts related to land use are based on applicable criteria in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G and the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016). Thresholds are modified from the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds to reflect the programmatic analysis for the project. A significant land use impact would occur if implementation of the project would:

1. Conflict with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General Plan or Community Plan or other applicable land use plan or regulation and, as a result, cause an indirect or secondary environmental impact;

2. Lead to development or conversion of General Plan or Community Plan designated open space or prime farmland to a more intensive land use, resulting in a physical division of the community;

3. Conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan; or

4. Result in land uses which are not compatible with an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP).

Issues addressed in the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds that are not addressed in this document include whether the project would increase the base flood elevation for upstream properties, or construct in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) or floodplain/wetland buffer zone. During initial project scoping, it was determined that implementation of the project would not result in significant impacts related to increases in the base flood elevation or construction in an SFHA or floodplain/wetland buffer zone because existing LDC regulations would adequately address potential impacts related to grading within an SFHA (SDMC, Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 2 Drainage Regulations and Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 1 Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations). Thus, there is no further discussion of this issue area.

5.1.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Conflicts with Applicable Plans

Would the project conflict with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General Plan or Community Plan or other applicable land use plan or regulation and, as a result, cause an indirect or secondary environmental impact?

a. City of San Diego General Plan

The project is intended to further express General Plan policies in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area through the provision of site-specific recommendations that implement Citywide goals and policies, address community needs, and guide zoning. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and General Plan work together to establish the framework for growth and development for Midway-Pacific Highway. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains nine elements, each providing neighborhood-specific goals and policies. These goals and policies are consistent with development design guidelines, other mobility and civic guidelines, incentives, and programs in accordance with the general goals stated in the General Plan. Table 5.1-1 provides a comprehensive list of all proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies for each element to be referenced in the following land use analysis. Additionally, the proposed land uses and allowed dwelling units per acre are included in Table 3-2 of Chapter 3.0, Project Description; locations of proposed land uses are shown in Figure 3-1 of Chapter 3.0, Project Description.

Table 5.1-1
Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Policies Related to Land Use

Policy	Description
Land Use, Villages and Districts Element	
Land Use	
LU-2.1	Provide adequate separation between areas designated for residential use and adult entertainment businesses.
LU-2.2	Encourage residential mixed-use in areas designated Neighborhood Commercial - Residential Permitted to support pedestrian-scale activity nodes for neighborhood livability.
LU-2.3	Encourage residential mixed-use in areas designated Community Commercial - Residential Permitted.
LU-2.4	Support live/work and shopkeeper units in Heavy Commercial areas to allow space for arts and innovation.
LU-2.5	Allow ground-floor shopkeeper units to be incorporated on the primary street frontage within buildings with residential as the primary use.
LU-2.6	Support the inclusion of on-site affordable housing units in residential developments.

Table 5.1-1 Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Policies Related to Land Use	
Policy	Description
LU-2.7	Support the development of workforce, affordable, and senior housing in proximity to transit stations.
LU-2.8	Design mixed employment-residential use developments in areas designated Business Park - Residential Permitted with employment use as the primary use to maintain an employment base in the community.
LU-2.9	Limit retail in Urban Industrial designated areas to the sale of goods manufactured or produced on site.
LU-2.10	Support live/work quarters in Urban Industrial designated areas to support artisans and innovators.
LU-2.11	Support small lot development within residential areas.
Villages and Districts	
Sports Arena Community Village	
LU-4.1	Prepare a specific plan or master plan to comprehensively guide the transformation of the City-owned property within Sports Arena Community Village that is consistent with the Community Plan vision and General Plan's City of Villages strategy.
Dutch Flats Urban Village	
LU-4.2	Establish a pedestrian- and transit-oriented urban village with an employment emphasis and a mix of commercial and residential uses to complement the employment uses.
LU-4.3	Support the continued operation of the U.S. Navy's Regional Plant Equipment Office.
LU-4.4	Support the continued use of the Navy's Regional Plant Equipment Office site for military purposes, and encourage new development on the site to integrate the complex into the village while maintaining security and force protection.
LU-4.5	Provide employment uses, which can include a mix of space for office, research and development, innovation, logistics, and technology uses.
LU-4.6	Encourage the integration of residential uses with the employment uses in the village.
LU-4.7	Encourage neighborhood-serving retail and dining uses within the business park-designated areas to reduce the need for employees and residents to drive.
LU-4.8	Should private development occur on Navy properties in the Dutch Flats Urban Village, recommend the processing of a Master Planned Development Permit with a development plan to assure that the Community Plan's vision and intent for the village, including urban design, mobility and parks, is achieved.
LU-4.9	Incorporate new streets and pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the superblock to create a walkable scale for new development and improve north-south access.
LU-4.10	Provide pedestrian paths that create connections between adjacent developments and/or properties.
LU-4.11	Integrate a Rapid Bus station with a mobility hub into the village to create a strong transit connection.
LU-4.12	Utilize shared structured parking serving multiple uses to efficiently meet the parking needs of the village.
LU-4.13	Improve Midway Drive as the gateway to the village with a multi-use urban path.
LU-4.14	Incorporate a main street with pedestrian-oriented retail uses.
LU-4.15	Provide active ground-floor uses in buildings with frontages along streets, public spaces, and parks.
LU-4.16	Incorporate green street improvements along Midway Drive, Dutch Flats Parkway, Charles Lindbergh Parkway, and Barnett Avenue.
LU-4.17	Provide a mix of parks that meets the population-based park needs of residential uses located within the village, which can include plazas, urban greens, linear parks, and other park and recreational amenities as addressed in the Recreation Element.
LU-4.18	Provide public spaces as focal points for recreation, events, and outdoor eating for employees.
LU-4.19	Improve Charles Lindbergh Parkway and a portion of Barnett Avenue with linear parks.
LU-4.20	Create a linear park and multi-use urban path along Sports Arena Boulevard and Dutch Flats Parkway, and a multi-use urban path along Barnett Avenue, to serve as a pedestrian and bicycle connection for the Bay-to-Bay link.
LU-4.21	Provide a linear park and pedestrian walkway along the village's southwestern boundary from Barnett Avenue to the Dewey Elementary School, and along its western boundary from Dewey Elementary to Midway Drive.
Kemper Neighborhood Village	

Table 5.1-1 Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Policies Related to Land Use	
Policy	Description
LU-4.22	Encourage the incorporation of a public space activity node in the village for passive recreation, events, and outdoor eating, such as a plaza, pocket park, or urban green, as part of an office, visitor-oriented commercial, and/or residential use development.
LU-4.23	Create a multi-use urban path along Midway Drive to serve as a pedestrian and bicycle connection for the Midway link.
LU-4.24	Retain the Continuing Education Center as a public educational use and strengthen it as a focal point of the village.
LU-4.25	Encourage the construction of a walkway connecting Wing Street to Duke Street.
LU-4.26	Encourage the integration of commercial uses fronting Midway Drive with the abutting uses by providing pedestrian access to a walkway connecting Wing Street to Duke Street.
LU-4.27	Encourage future development to provide a landscaped setback along the slope that abuts single family residences in the Peninsula Community Plan area.
Rosecrans District	
LU-4.28	Retrofit existing commercial centers as pedestrian-oriented areas with public spaces as focal points.
LU-4.29	Encourage active pedestrian-oriented streetfront retail uses for shopping, dining, and gathering along Sports Arena Boulevard, Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street.
LU-4.30	Apply the Community Commercial - Residential Prohibited land use designation without a community plan amendment should Fire Station No. 20 relocate to another site in the community.
LU-4.31	Encourage the transformation of the superblock bounded by Sports Arena Boulevard, Midway Drive, Kemper Street, and Rosecrans Street into to a pedestrian-, bicycle-, and transit-friendly commercial area.
LU-4.32	Create multi-use urban paths along Sports Arena Boulevard and the south side of Rosecrans Street.
Camino Del Rio District	
LU-4.33	Support the development of a mix of office, commercial, artisan food and beverage manufacturing, and urban residential uses.
LU-4.34	Support of the development of flex space for business and light industry uses and complementary residential uses in the Business Park - Residential Permitted areas.
LU-4.35	Support the development of retail, office, and visitor-oriented commercial uses along Camino Del Rio West and Rosecrans Street.
LU-4.36	Encourage renovation, reuse and infill development along Camino Del Rio West and Rosecrans Street that contributes to the improvement of these community gateways by incorporating notable architecture and building design and gateway architectural elements.
LU-4.37	Encourage streetscape treatments along Camino Del Rio West and Rosecrans Street to enhance the community's visual identity and incorporate community gateway elements that could include gateway signage.
LU-4.38	Encourage development with varying building facades with a pedestrian scale, without a front setback or with a limited setback to form a defined street wall.
Channel District	
LU-4.39	Maintain and consider increasing the supply of affordable housing residential uses on the City-owned land within the Channel District.
LU-4.40	Support the development of residential, retail, office, and visitor-oriented commercial uses along Sports Arena Boulevard and Channel Way.
LU-4.41	Incorporate building and streetscape design along Sports Arena Boulevard that enhance the pedestrian and bicycle environment and incorporate community gateway elements to highlight the gateway from Mission Bay Park and San Diego River.
Cauby District	
LU-4.42	Encourage distinct and varying building facades with a pedestrian scale and a landscaped setback along neighborhood streets.
LU-4.43	Support the use of excess right-of-way at Riley Street and Midway Drive to create a pedestrian plaza.
LU-4.44	Create a multi-use urban path along Midway Drive to serve as a pedestrian and bicycle connection for the Midway link.
LU-4.45	Encourage the development of a walkway from the western end of Cauby Street to Midway Drive.
LU-4.46	Encourage the integration of the commercial uses fronting Midway Drive with the abutting residential uses by providing pedestrian access paths or walkways.

Table 5.1-1 Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Policies Related to Land Use	
Policy	Description
LU-4.47	Encourage development to provide a landscaped setback abutting the single family residences in the Peninsula Community Plan area.
Kurtz District	
LU-4.48	Incorporate building and streetscape design along Rosecrans Street and Pacific Highway that enhance the pedestrian and bicycle environment and incorporate community gateway elements to highlight the gateways from Old Town San Diego.
LU-4.49	Work with the U.S. Navy to improve the streetscape and pedestrian and bicycle environment along Pacific Highway and Witherby Street fronting the Naval Base Point Loma – SPAWAR complex without compromising security.
LU-4.50	Maintain the presence of the Naval Base Point Loma – SPAWAR complex in the community as the U.S. Navy's premier research and development facility.
LU-4.51	Apply the Business Park - Residential Permitted land use designation at a density of 0–44 dwelling units per acre without a community plan amendment should the County Health Services Complex relocate.
Lytton District	
LU-4.52	Encourage mixed-use neighborhood commercial uses along Rosecrans Street and residential uses along Rosecrans Place as part of single- or multiple-building developments.
LU-4.53	Encourage the adaptive reuse of the Loma Theater for residential and neighborhood-serving commercial uses while preserving the exterior form of the building.
LU-4.54	Encourage mixed-use neighborhood commercial and residential uses along Lytton Street and residential along Cadiz Street as part of single- or multiple-building developments that propose to consolidate properties between Lytton Street and Cadiz Street.
LU-4.55	Encourage distinct and varying building facades with a pedestrian scale and a landscaped setback along Cadiz Street.
LU-4.56	Incorporate a pedestrian and bicycle connection between Rosecrans Street, Liberty Station, and Dutch Flats Urban Village via Lytton Street and Barnett Avenue.
LU-4.57	Incorporate a pedestrian and bicycle connection between the Peninsula community and the Old Town Transit Center via Rosecrans Street.
LU-4.58	Encourage incorporation of park space and pedestrian walkways to connect Shoup Drive and Dewey Elementary School to the conceptual linear park along the boundary between the Lytton District and Dutch Flats Urban Village.
LU-4.59	Should Dewey Elementary School relocate, the site should be considered for use as a public space, park, or recreational facility. If development of a public space, park or recreational use is infeasible, apply a Residential land use designation at a density of 30–54 dwelling units per acre without a community plan amendment and require on-site public park space to meet population-based needs.
LU-4.60	Apply a Residential land use designation at a density of 30–54 dwelling units per acre without a community plan amendment should the St. Charles Borromeo Church, Convent, and Academy relocate.
Hancock Transit Corridor	
LU-4.61	Support the incorporation of residential and commercial uses within the historic Mission Brewery building while preserving the exterior form of the building.
LU-4.62	Support the construction of live/work quarters (for adaptive reuse of an existing building) and shopkeeper units (for new development) suitable for artists, innovators, craftspeople, and other businesses.
LU-4.63	Support the development of residential and/or office uses at the MTS storage yard property adjacent to Hancock Street should the property become available for development.
LU-4.64	Encourage development with varying building facades and a pedestrian scale, without a front setback or with a limited setback to form a defined street wall.
LU-4.65	Maintain the grid block pattern along Pacific Highway to promote pedestrian activity.
LU-4.66	Support landscaping and walkways adjacent to the rail right-of-way that are compatible with rail operations to facilitate pedestrian connections to the Washington Trolley Station.
LU-4.67	Enhance the pedestrian and bicycle environment along Hancock Street and Pacific Highway to support connections to the Washington Street Trolley Station, Old Town San Diego, and Downtown.
LU-4.68	Encourage building and streetscape design along West Washington Street to enhance the pedestrian environment and community identity as gateway to the Pacific Highway Corridor and the Coastal Zone area.

Table 5.1-1
Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Policies Related to Land Use

Policy	Description
LU-4.69	Consider the development of pedestrian plazas and public or recreational space at unused right-of-way along Hancock Street, Pacific Highway, or at cross streets bisected by the rail corridor.
LU-4.70	Consider development of a park and ride facility adjacent to the Washington Street Trolley Station and Pacific Highway.
LU-4.71	Work with property owners along Hancock Street to provide a mini park at the former alignment of Bandini Street east of the rail corridor.
LU-4.72	Apply a Community Commercial - Residential Permitted land use designation at a density of 45–74 dwelling units per acre without a community plan amendment should the Veterans Village of San Diego close or relocate.
Kettner District	
LU-4.~~73~~74	Encourage residential and mixed commercial and residential development between West Washington Street and Vine Street north of the rail corridor.
LU-4.~~74~~75	Encourage the development of office and industrial space suitable for technology, green, and innovative businesses within Urban Industrial designated areas.
LU-4.~~75~~76	Encourage office and visitor commercial uses adjacent to the Middletown Trolley Station.
LU-4.~~76~~77	Support business, visitor-oriented, and public land uses within the Port Tidelands consistent with the San Diego Port Master Plan.
LU-4.~~77~~78	Ensure future uses, building intensity, and structure heights are compatible with the safety zones, noise contours, and airspace protection surfaces identified in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for San Diego International Airport.
LU-4.~~78~~79	Emphasize Pacific Highway as a linear gateway with streetscape, signage, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements.
LU-4.~~79~~80	Enhance the pedestrian and bicycle environment and building frontages along Kettner Boulevard, Palm Street, Sassafras Street, and Pacific Highway.
LU-4.~~80~~81	Encourage development with varying building facades and a pedestrian scale, without a front setback or with a limited setback to form a defined street wall.
LU-4.~~81~~82	Provide and emphasize physical and visual access to San Diego Bay.
LU-4.~~82~~83	Emphasize Laurel Street and Palm Street as connections between I-5 and San Diego Bay through streetscape enhancements.
LU-4.~~83~~84	Support the development of an Intermodal Transportation Center as a major transportation hub for the region.
LU-4.~~84~~85	Coordinate planning efforts with the San Diego Unified Port District and the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority.
Marine Corps Recruit Depot	
LU-4.~~85~~86	Support and retain the U.S. Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego as a recruit training installation for national defense.
LU-4.~~86~~87	Consult and coordinate with the U.S. Marine Corps regarding any proposed development projects or public improvements adjacent to the U.S. Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego.
LU-4.~~87~~88	Assure continuity and compatibility between the City and the U.S. Marine Corps through the coordination of planning efforts.
LU-4.~~88~~89	Prepare a specific plan to address the reuse of the property should the U.S. Marine Corps Recruit Depot San Diego close and the federal government determines that the property is not needed for another military use.
Airport Land Use Compatibility	
LU-5.1	Ensure that planning efforts address airport land use compatibility issues consistent with land use compatibility policies and regulations in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for San Diego International Airport and the Municipal Code.
Urban Design Element	
Public Space	
UD-2.1	Incorporate public spaces (e.g., plazas, pocket parks, or greens) as an integral aspect of site and building design within villages and where feasible within residential/ commercial mixed-used districts. (Refer also to the Recreation Element.)
UD-2.10	Design the frontage area between buildings and the public right-of-way to be active in areas of high pedestrian activity, or a mixture of active and passive in areas with moderate to lower levels of pedestrian activity, to support walkability.
UD-2.11	Create active frontage areas for buildings by incorporating ground-floor retail or office uses or entrances to residential lobbies within villages and residential/commercial mixed-used districts and along linear gateways, main streets, and green streets.

Table 5.1-1 Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Policies Related to Land Use	
Policy	Description
UD-2.12	Incorporate active frontage areas with outdoor seating adjacent to parks and public spaces within villages and residential/commercial mixed-used districts to create pedestrian-oriented activity centers. (Refer also to the Recreation Element.)
UD-3.~~8~~9	Encourage development of linear parks identified in the Recreation Element by allowing development projects that incorporate a linear park to count the landscaping area in the linear park ~~area~~ toward the project's landscaping requirements.
UD-4.5	Design buildings located at gateway nodes to be oriented to the gateway corner and to incorporate pedestrian spaces and iconic architectural features.
UD-6.5	Design commercial and mixed-use buildings with ground floors that face streets, courtyards, gardens, plazas, paseos, or greens to create active building frontages.
UD-6.9	Locate and design commercial and mixed-use buildings to activate the public realm.
Economic Prosperity Element	
Business Improvement, Attraction, Retention, and Expansion	
EP-1.1	Encourage office, research and development, and other base sector employment-oriented uses and supportive commercial and industrial services to locate within Midway-Pacific Highway.
EP-1.2	Encourage visitor-commercial uses to provide rooms and amenities to serve a wide range of users, including tourists and business travelers.
EP-1.3	Encourage economic growth of base sector employment industries and local businesses that provide services to the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command facility.
EP-1.4	Support the attraction, retention, and expansion of businesses that develop products and technologies which provide environmentally sustainable solutions.
EP-1.5	Encourage businesses that focus on creating innovation, design, and technology jobs.
EP-1.6	Support the retention and expansion of employment-related uses to promote economic vitality at the village and district level.
EP-1.7	Support the consolidation of parcels to facilitate expansion of businesses and additional employment opportunities.
EP-1.8	Encourage the use of local, state, and federal programs to incentivize the retention and expansion of employment-oriented businesses including small, mid-size, and start-up businesses within Midway-Pacific Highway.
EP-1.9	Support the retention and enhancement of the Marine Corps Recruit Depot and Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command facilities.
EP-1.10	Support the growth and expansion of the West City Continuing Education Center to provide educational and job training programs.
EP-1.11	Encourage shopkeeper units for entrepreneur and artist space within mixed commercial residential designated areas.
EP-1.12	Support the location of artisan and craft businesses within commercial designated areas.
Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element	
Public, Semi-Public, and Community Facilities and Services	
PF-1.1	Support the operation of a police storefront within Midway-Pacific Highway.
PF-1.5	Encourage the efficient use of land at Dewey Elementary by increasing the number of classrooms while still maintaining outdoor playground and field areas.
PF-1.6	Ensure that new or expanded buildings and public or semi-public uses on designated institutional land are compatible with the surrounding land uses.
PF-1.8	Consider alternative land uses for institutional uses that close or relocate.
PR-1.9	Encourage location of community facilities in mixed-use buildings and in Villages to enhance the public realm and support pedestrian activity and transit use.
PF-3.1	Consider future human services facilities within areas designated for heavy commercial and urban industrial.
PF-3.2	Encourage health care facilities within community commercial, mixed residential commercial, and business park areas that provide a range of services to meet the needs of residents, visitors, and employees, such as a small hospital, urgent care facilities, and clinics.
Recreation Element	
Parks and Recreation Facilities	
RE-4.1	Pursue land acquisition for the creation of public parks, with an effort to locate parkland on sites within villages or districts that promote connectivity, accessibility, safety, public health, and sustainability.

Table 5.1-1
Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Policies Related to Land Use

Policy	Description
RE-4.2	Encourage new infill developments throughout the community to satisfy park requirements by incorporating population-based parks such as public plazas, mini parks, pocket parks, special activity parks or park equivalencies within their building footprint or on site (either privately or publicly owned).
RE-4.12	Coordinate with the federal government or a future property owner to explore opportunities to create a park space to serve uses on the Naval Base Point Loma – SPAWAR complex and/or Regional Plant Equipment Office sites.
RE-4.13	Coordinate with the San Diego Unified Port District to explore opportunities to provide a public park on Port District property along Pacific Highway for the use of Midway-Pacific Highway residents and Port visitors.
RE-4.15	Encourage commercial, office, and residential development to incorporate active ground floors and outdoor seating and cafes around or adjacent to proposed parks and recreational facilities to create pedestrian-oriented activity centers.

The **Land Use, Villages and Districts Element** of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains community-specific policies to guide development within the Midway-Pacific Highway community. This element establishes the distribution and pattern of land uses throughout the community.

Midway-Pacific Highway is a community with a variety of land uses. The community has a large amount of retail commercial and visitor commercial uses due to its central location and proximity to SDIA, military installations, beaches, Sea World, and Old Town San Diego. Policies within the Land Use, Villages and Districts Element are designed to promote the overall land use goals of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, which include the development of a vibrant, balanced, and pedestrian-oriented community that provides residential, commercial, office, industrial, institutional, military, and civic uses; special districts and villages to highlight and foster the diverse character areas within the community; and a compatible mix of land uses that support active transportation and a healthy environment. Residential goals include provision of a variety of housing types for all age, income, and social groups. Commercial goals include retaining large-format retail uses while incorporating pedestrian-oriented infill commercial uses and infrastructure that provides improved pedestrian and bicycle access. Mixed-use goals generally include the creation of cohesive new mixed- and multiple-use villages and districts that include different types of land uses, parks, public spaces, housing and employment opportunities, and amenities along key points in the transit system.

As with the General Plan, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU places an emphasis on directing growth into mixed-use activity centers (villages and districts) that are pedestrian-friendly and linked to an improved pedestrian and bicycle network and regional transit system. Each village and district places an emphasis on certain types of uses while still promoting a mix of uses. The land use plan allows residential uses to be integrated with complementary uses to support vibrant activity nodes. Residential uses will provide activity outside of commercial business hours to provide eyes on the street and support employment development, commercial uses, parks, and transit.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would also be consistent with the General Plan goal of providing diverse and balanced neighborhoods and communities. The land use plan prepared for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU provides for a combination of land uses that build upon the existing land use diversity of the community and supports future growth, activity, and prosperity within the proposed CPU area.

The existing development within Midway-Pacific Highway provides a foundation for achievement of the goals laid out in the General Plan Mobility Element due to the urban character of the community, existing transit connections, and adjacency to major roadways and interstates. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU **Mobility Element** policies support the development of new streets and street extensions to reduce automobile congestion on existing community roadways, to improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity and reduce travel distances, and to be designed as "complete streets" to enable safe, attractive, and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle access and travel as well as improved access to regional transit and increased transit use. Another important component of the Mobility Element is the planned implementation of multi-use urban paths, which will provide enhanced pedestrian and bicycle facilities connecting through the community and to adjacent communities and recreational resources. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU also includes planned roadway improvements and TDM and ITS policies that address the mobility needs of the community by maximizing existing roadway capacity and reducing congestion and parking demand.

The **Urban Design Element** of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU supports and implements the General Plan at the Community Plan level by including specific design guidelines and policies for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area that support the development of mixed-use villages and districts as well as pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains urban design policies intended to improve multi-modal mobility by transforming superblocks into smaller blocks with new road connections and pedestrian connections; creating enhanced pedestrian and bicycle linkages through the community, between adjacent communities, and to regional park and open space areas; and fostering development and streetscapes that encourage pedestrian and bicycle activity. to highlight community identity through the creation of gateway nodes at key points throughout the community. The Urban Design Element also includes policies to encourage sustainable development and landscaping practices.

The **Economic Prosperity Element** supports employment-generating land uses and employment growth within the community by encouraging the development of urban mixed use areas located near transit and SDIA with a focus on commercial, industrial, and military land uses that will support innovation, design, and technology jobs. This element identifies the value of the community's location to attract and retain innovative companies and workers who want to work in a vibrant community near transit, urban living, recreation, and entertainment.

Consistent with the Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element of the General Plan, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU **Public Facilities, Services, and Safety Element** includes goals to provide public, semi-public, and community facilities and services for future growth without diminishing services to existing development. Specific policies regarding public facilities and services within the proposed CPU address fire-rescue, police, education, libraries, health care, and human services. Potential health and safety concerns related to seismic and geological conditions, hazardous materials, and sea level rise are discussed in this element, and policies are provided to encourage assessment of, and adaptation to, these risks in future development and infrastructure planning.

In regard to the Recreation Element of the General Plan, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU **Recreation Element** provides a strategy and policies to provide a network of parks and recreational facilities to serve existing uses and future development, and which are accessible by multiple modes of transportation and connected to regional recreation and open space areas. The parks and recreation

strategy is to provide a mix of recreational uses and facilities that meet the needs of residents and employees within the community. The strategy focuses on the following types of parks: neighborhood parks; mini parks; pocket parks; and park equivalencies including linear parks, joint use facilities, and community-oriented parks within portions of regional resource-based parks. A special effort was made in the development of the proposed CPU to locate new parkland within villages or districts in the community to promote connectivity, safety, public health, and sustainability. While there are no existing parks or recreation facilities within the community, the proposed CPU has identified approximately 30 acres of parks and park equivalencies to help meet the needs of the community through 2035, as well as a recreation center and shared aquatic complexes. However, the Midway-Pacific Highway community would remain in deficit of approximately 46 acres of population-based park space based on the General Plan's population-based parks guideline of 2.8 acres per 1,000 residents. To help address the shortfall, the proposed CPU provides policies to encourage new infill developments to satisfy population-based park requirements within their building footprint or on-site; to increase recreational opportunities by acquiring and developing land through street vacations, where appropriate; and to consider opportunities to increase population-based parks that may arise through the development process or through coordination with other governmental agencies such as the San Diego Unified Port District. While there are potential environmental impacts from the development of park and recreational facilities as discussed in Section 5.11, Public Services and Facilities, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU community-specific goals and recommendations are intended to support and implement the General Plan environmental goals, objectives, and guidelines policies and the physical impacts of parkland development have been analyzed throughout this PEIR. As such, the impacts to land use would be less than significant.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is consistent with the conservation policies contained within the Conservation Element of the General Plan. The **Conservation Element** of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU addresses the conservation goals and policies that can be effective in managing, preserving, and thoughtfully using the natural resources of the community, including the integration of mixed-use villages and economically vibrant employment centers with a regionally connected transit system and preservation of coastal resources and public coastal access. Climate change is addressed in a manner consistent with the General Plan within both the Conservation Element and the Urban Design Element. Sustainable development and landscaping policies are included that promote development that incorporates design measures and technology to reduce consumption of potable water and non-renewable energy and ensure that new development is consistent with the CAP. Coastal resource policies are also included that support the goals of the Coastal Act within the Coastal Zone, such as preserving, protecting, and enhancing public access to the Coastal Zone.

With respect to the General Plan policies concerning noise and land use compatibility, the **Noise Element** of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU provides a map of projected road and rail noise contours associated with implementation of the proposed CPU and includes goals and policies to guide compatible land uses, address commercial and industrial activity noise that could affect nearby sensitive receptor uses, and encourage the incorporation of various types of noise attenuation measures in new development. Please see Section 5.5 for a discussion of noise impacts.

The purpose of the General Plan Historic Preservation Element is to preserve, protect, restore, and rehabilitate historical and cultural resources throughout the City of San Diego. From its historic beginnings as part of the delta of the San Diego River to the rise of the military and aviation industry in the 1920s, the

Midway-Pacific Highway community has played a role in San Diego growth and transformation. The **Historic Preservation Element** of the proposed CPU provides general policies to preserve significant historical resources within the Midway-Pacific Highway community. This element calls for the identification and preservation of significant historical resources, for the undertaking of project-specific Native American consultation, as well as promotion of educational opportunities and incentives relative to historical resources in Midway-Pacific Highway. Impacts relative to historical resources are discussed in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources.

As part of the project analyzed within this PEIR, the City is updating the IFS (formerly Public Facilities Financing Plan) for the Midway-Pacific Highway community, which was originally adopted in 2004. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is a guide for the future development within the community and serves to determine public facility needs. The IFS includes the major public facilities' needs specific to the Midway-Pacific Highway community with respect to transportation (streets, storm drains, traffic signals, etc.), libraries, park and recreation facilities, and fire stations. Revisions to public facility needs identified in the existing Public Facilities Financing Plan, DIFs, or other CIPs, would be included in the updated IFS.

b. Land Development Code Regulations

Implementation of the actions associated with adoption of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would include an amendment to the CPIOZ (SDMC Chapter 13 Article 2 Division 14) to rescind the existing Midway-Pacific Highway CPIOZ and implement CPIOZ in three areas to provide supplemental development regulations. The proposed CPIOZ pertains to development within the Sports Arena Community Village, streetscape enhancements along Sports Arena Boulevard near Rosecrans Street, and development and linear parks in the Dutch Flats Urban Village.

The implementation program for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes amendments to the SDMC (Chapter 13 Article 1 Division 5) to revise the existing CO-3-1 and CO-3-2 zones to change their zone names; and to add a new CO zone (CO-3-1), a new CN zone (CN-1-6), and corresponding parking requirements in Chapter 14 Division 2 Article 5. It also includes an amendment to the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone in the SDMC (Chapter 13 Article 2 Division 9) to allow residential tandem parking throughout the Midway-Pacific Highway community. The proposed CPU's adherence to the City's ESL Regulations and the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines are also discussed below.

CPIOZ

The proposed use of the CPIOZ would apply to specific geographic areas within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area per Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 14 of the SDMC (refer to Chapter 3.0, Project Description, Figure 3-4). The Sports Arena Community Village CPIOZ (Type B) would require preparation of a comprehensive specific plan or master plan (consistent with the land use designations in the proposed CPU) for the City-owned parcels within the Sports Arena Community Village prior to significant new development within the village to ensure that the area is planned comprehensively, to ensure that the Community Plan's vision for the village is realized, and to provide development flexibility, and allow density and/or intensity to be calculated based on site area before dedication of the right-of-way for planned streets or area for planned linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies. The Dutch Flats Urban Village CPIOZ (Type A) would reserve land for the future implementation of planned linear parks as new development is proposed, and allow density and/or intensity to be calculated based on site area before dedication of the right-of-way for planned streets or area for planned linear parks, parks, and other

park equivalencies. The Sports Arena Boulevard Streetscape CPIOZ (Type A) would provide enhanced streetscapes to provide continuity between planned linear parks in the Sports Arena and Dutch Flats villages. The Sports Arena Community Village CPIOZ (Type B) and Dutch Flats Urban Village CPIOZ (Type A) would also include supplemental development regulations prohibiting fireplaces in new residential development.

The purpose of the CPIOZ is to supplement the SDMC by providing development regulations that are tailored to specific circumstances and/or sites within the community and have been adopted as part of the community plan. The CPIOZ supplemental development regulations, found in the Land Use, Villages and Districts Element of the proposed CPU, would implement the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies and recommendations related to the Sports Arena Community Village, Dutch Flats Urban Village, and the Sports Arena Boulevard Streetscape.

The CPIOZ has two types differentiated by their review process: Type A (ministerial review) and Type B (discretionary review). Both types are applied within the community. Development proposals subject to the Sports Arena Community Village CPIOZ Type B would require discretionary review to determine if the development proposal is consistent with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU as well as the applicable regulations listed below. Development proposals subject to CPIOZ Type B would be required to process and obtain approval of a Process Three Site Development Permit in accordance with Chapter 12, Article 6, Division 5 of the SDMC. Exceptions from these regulations may be granted per SDMC Section 132.1403 for development that is minor, temporary, or incidental and is consistent with the purpose and intent of this CPIOZ. Development projects subject to the Sports Arena Boulevard Streetscape CPIOZ Type A and the Dutch Flats Urban Village CPIOZ Type A may be processed ministerially. However, any development proposals that propose to deviate from the regulations or the supplemental CPIOZ Type A regulations would be required to obtain a discretionary permit.

New Zones and Parking Regulations

The zoning implementation program for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU also includes amendments to the SDMC, as follows: a revision to the existing CO-3-1 zone, which permits residential use at densities of 0-54 du/acre, to change its name to CO-3-2; a revision to the existing CO-3-2 zone, which permits residential use at densities of 0-73 du/acre, to change its name to CO-3-3 zone; the introduction of a new Commercial-Office (CO) zone (CO-3-1) that permits residential use at densities of 0-44 du/acre; a new Commercial-Neighborhood (CN) zone (CN-1-6) that permits residential use at a density at 0-54 du/acre; and corresponding parking requirements. The new CO zone (CO-3-1) allows for research and development and office uses with a pedestrian orientation, as well as supporting commercial and residential uses and permits a maximum density of one dwelling unit for each 1,000 square feet of lot area. The new CN zone (CN-1-6) allows development with a pedestrian orientation and permits a maximum density of one dwelling unit for each 800 square feet of lot area.

Corresponding parking regulations for the new zones would be added to the SDMC in Chapter 14 Article 2 Division 5. Also, the Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone (SDMC Chapter 13, Article 2, Division 9) would be amended to apply to the entire Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area. The Residential Tandem Parking Overlay Zone currently applies to portions of the Midway-Pacific Highway community along transit corridors and near transit stations, and allows tandem parking to be counted as two parking spaces in the calculation of required parking under specified conditions.

ESL Regulations

There are no environmentally sensitive lands (e.g., sensitive biological resources, steep hillsides, coastal beaches, sensitive coastal bluffs, and special flood hazard areas) within the project area. However, the San Diego River Flood Control Channel is located adjacent to the community to the north. Any future development proposed adjacent to environmentally sensitive land would be subject to the City's ESL Regulations (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 1), which require that proposed development be sited and designed to prevent adverse impacts on any adjacent environmentally sensitive land. Adherence to the City's ESL Regulations would avoid significant impacts to environmentally sensitive lands within the project area.

Historical Resources Regulations

The Historical Resources Regulations (Section 143.0213(a) of the LDC) apply when historical resources are present. As defined by the HRR, historical resources include: historical buildings, historical structures or historical objects, important archaeological sites, historical districts, historical landscapes, and traditional cultural properties. The proposed CPU area contain known historic resources, including resources listed in the NRHP and the San Diego Historical Resources Register.

The Land Use, Villages, and Districts, Urban Design, and Historic Preservation Elements of the proposed CPU contains policies to promote the preservation and renovation of existing historical structures, as well as to identify and designate new historical buildings for protection and restoration.

Implementation of the proposed CPU is expected to result in development and redevelopment that may impact historical resources. Direct impacts may include alteration or demolition of historic buildings, as well as impacts to archaeological sites from grading, excavation and other ground-disturbing activities tied to construction. Given the presence of historical resources distributed throughout the proposed CPU area, implementation of the proposed CPU has the potential to result in significant impacts to historical resources. The proposed CPU includes several policies aimed to reduce impacts to historical resources within the proposed CPU area. Adherence to the City's Historical Resources Regulations would avoid significant impacts to environmentally sensitive lands within the project area; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

c. San Diego Forward – The Regional Plan

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU land use scenario would be consistent with the goals of the RP, prepared by SANDAG to develop compact, walkable communities close to transit connections and consistent with smart growth principles, as summarized above. The proposed CPU proposes to establish pedestrian-oriented, urban, and mixed-use community villages that would reduce reliance on the automobile and promote walking and use of alternative transportation. Policies contained within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Land Use and Mobility Elements serve to promote bus, Rapid Bus, and trolley transit use as well as other forms of mobility, including walking and bicycling. These measures are consistent with the RP's smart growth strategies. The adoption and implementation of the project would not generate any conflict or inconsistencies with the RP*;* therefore, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

d. California Coastal Act of 1976

Midway-Pacific Highway contains two areas within the Coastal Zone. The Coastal Zone area in the southern portion of the community along Pacific Highway is predominantly within San Diego Unified Port District permitting jurisdiction and contains airport-related uses, light industrial uses, and San Diego Unified Port District offices. MCRD is also within the Coastal Zone area in the southern portion of the community. The Coastal Zone area in the northern portion of the community is along the San Diego River Flood Control Channel (Figure 5.1-1).

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would be consistent with the policies within the Coastal Act. The Coastal Act requires all jurisdictions within the Coastal Zone to prepare an LCP to guide development in the Coastal Zone. The LCP for the Coastal Zone areas in Midway-Pacific Highway is integrated into this proposed CPU. Policies contained within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Land Use, Villages and Districts; Mobility; Urban Design; Conservation; and Recreation Elements serve to protect and enhance coastal resources and address land use, public access, recreation, and view preservation within the Coastal Zone to meet the intent of the Coastal Act. These goals and policies are consistent with the general goals stated in the Coastal Act. The adoption and implementation of the project would not generate any conflict or inconsistencies with the Coastal Act; therefore, the potential impacts would be less than significant.


e. San Diego Unified Port District – Port Master Plan

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU land use scenario would be consistent with the goals and policies of the Port Master Plan, prepared by the Port. The Port has jurisdiction of properties south of Vine Street in the Kettner District adjacent to City-owned land. The land uses in the Port Master Plan include aviation-related industrial and airport-related commercial land uses, and the land uses in the proposed CPU include urban industrial land uses, which permits small and medium-size industrial and business activities (San Diego Unified Port District 2017). As such, the proposed CPU land uses adjacent to the Port-owned properties would not conflict with the land uses in the Port Master Plan. The Port is currently undergoing a comprehensive update to their Port Master Plan. Proposed CPU policies LU-4.77 and LU.4-85, which promote coordination of planning efforts between the City and the Port, would ensure that any land use modifications to the Port-owned properties would be consistent between the two documents. The adoption and implementation of the project would not generate any conflict or inconsistencies with the Port Master Plan; therefore, the potential impacts would be less than significant.

Issue 2 Conversion of Open Space or Farmland

Would the project lead to the development or conversion of general plan or community plan designated open space or prime farmland to a more intensive land use, resulting in a physical division of the community?

The project involves an update to the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan, a fully built-out community in the City of San Diego, and other associated discretionary actions. The current makeup of the urbanized proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area includes commercial, industrial, residential, institutional, and military land uses. There is no open space or prime farmland within the community (City of San Diego 2008). Therefore, implementation of the project would not lead to the development or



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 800 1,600 3,200 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.1-1
Local Coastal Zone

conversion of designated open space or prime farmland or physically divide the community. In fact, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes provisions to promote the creation of parks and reestablish connections to the Presidio, San Diego Bay, Mission Bay, and the San Diego River to integrate the community with surrounding communities. Therefore, implementation of the project would not lead to the development or conversion of designated open space or prime farmland or physically divide the community. Impacts would be less than significant.

Issue 3 Conflicts with the MSCP Subarea Plan

Would the project conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The Midway-Pacific Highway community does not include land identified as MHPA (City of San Diego 2008). The San Diego River Flood Control Channel, directly north of the Midway-Pacific Highway community, is an important open space resource and is within the MHPA. The river is home to wildlife species, including seasonal bird populations in the tidal estuary. The estuary also acts as a natural bio-filter for storm water runoff before it enters the Pacific Ocean. The City's MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines manage land uses adjacent to the flood control channel to ensure minimal impacts to the MHPA. When land is developed adjacent to the MHPA, there is a potential for secondary impacts that may degrade the habitat value or disrupt animals within the preserve area. These secondary effects of project development may include habitat insularization, drainage/water quality impacts, lighting, noise, exotic plant species, nuisance animal species, and human intrusion. These impacts could be short term resulting from construction activities, or long term.


Short-term construction impacts could result in disruption of nesting and breeding, thus affecting the population of sensitive species. To address these concerns, the MSCP includes a set of MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines that are to be evaluated and implemented at the project level. Adherence to these guidelines would avoid significant impacts to adjacent MHPA lands within the project area.

In addition, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains a policy to continue to implement the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines to guide the restoration and enhancement of the area adjacent to the San Diego River Flood Control Channel. Therefore, as concluded in Section 5.13, Biological Resources, implementation of the project would be consistent with the MSCP Subarea Plan, and impacts would be less than significant.

Issue 4 Conflicts with an Adopted ALUCP

Would the project result in land uses which are not compatible with an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)?

The project site is located within the SDIA AIA. The AIA is "the area in which current or future airport-related noise, overflight, safety, or airspace protection factors may significantly affect land uses or necessitate restrictions on those uses" (San Diego County Regional Airport Authority 2014). To facilitate implementation and reduce unnecessary referrals of projects to the ALUC, the AIA is divided into Review Area 1 and Review Area 2. The project site is located within both of them (Figure 5.1-2). The composition of each area is determined as follows:



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 4,000 8,000 16,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.1-2
SDIA Airport Influence Area

- Review Area 1 is defined by the combination of the 60 dB CNEL noise contour, the outer boundary of all safety zones, and the airspace Threshold Siting Surfaces (TSSs) (Figure 5.1-3). All policies and standards apply within Review Area 1.
- Review Area 2 is defined by the combination of the airspace protection and overflight boundaries beyond Review Area 1. Only airspace protection and overflight policies and standards apply within Review Area 2.


The ALUCP contains four principal compatibility concerns: noise (exposure to aircraft noise), safety (land use factors that affect safety both for people on the ground and occupants of aircraft), airspace protection (protection of airport airspace), and overflight (annoyance or other general concerns related to aircraft overflights). The ALUCP policies and standards are only applicable to new uses. A portion of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is located within the SDIA noise contours of the ALUCP, which range from 60- to 75+ dB CNEL (Figure 5.1-4 and Figure 5.1-5). Noise impacts are fully evaluated in Section 5.5, Noise, of this PEIR. As discussed in Section 5.5 of this PEIR, the project would not result in adverse airport noise impacts to existing uses because the project would not result in a change in SDIA operations. While the proposed CPU would result in a new land use density associated with the new CN zone (CN-1-6), there would be no new introduction of sensitive uses to these areas as the existing zoning of the areas of the community within the 70+ dBA contours as shown in the SDIA ALUCP (CN-1-2, RM-1-1, and RM-2-5) currently permit residential, educational, and institutional uses. New development within the 60-75+ dbA noise contours would be required to provide noise attenuation consistent with the ALUCP for SDIA; thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant exposure to noise from aircraft.

Portions of the Midway-Pacific Highway community are located within ALUCP Safety Compatibility Zones 1, 2E, 3NE, 3NW, and 5N (Figure 5.1-6 and Figure 5.1-7). Safety compatibility standards of the ALUCP restrict certain uses and provide maximum residential density and non-residential intensity limits that are allowable within the safety zones. These standards are shown in Table 5-1 of the SDIA ALUCP. Future development within the ALUCP Safety Compatibility Zones would be required to comply with these standards or request a City Council overrule; as such, impacts relative to ALUCP safety zones would be less than significant.

The airspace protection boundary (Figure 5.1-8) for SDIA establishes the area where the policies and standards of the ALUCP apply. Additional boundaries at the ends of the runway represent the TSSs within which specific height limitations apply. A TSS defines critical airspace that must be protected to allow for safe approaches to runways. Any objects penetrating the TSSs would cause the runway thresholds to be further displaced, reducing available landing distances.

The airspace protection boundary is based on the outermost edge of the following airspace surfaces:

- Part 77, Subpart B, 100:1 notification surface boundary
- Part 77 civil airport imaginary airspace surfaces
- The approach surfaces for both runway ends defined by the criteria in Federal Aviation Administration Order 8260.3B, United States Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS)




Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 2,000 4,000 Feet

Figure 5.1-3
SDIA Threshold Siting Surface Profile

\\ussdg1fp001.na.aecomnet.com\data\projects_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\930 Graphics\PEIRs\Midway Figs\5.1-3.ai (dbrady) 04/05/17




Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 6,000 12,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.1-4
SDIA Noise Contour Map



Legend

- Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area
- Major Roads
- Highways
- Community Planning Areas
- Airport Property Boundary
- Displaced Thresholds
- 70 dB CNEL Noise Contour

General/Community Plan Land Use

- Residential Use Allowed

Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 1,500 3,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.1-5
Residential Use Allowed Under the General/ Community Plans Inside SDIA 70 dB CNEL






Figure 5.1-6
SDIA Safety Compatibility Zones



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 1,500 3,000 Feet

Figure 5.1-7
Residential Use Allowed Under the General/Community Plans Inside the SDIA Safety Compatibility Zones



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 6,000 12,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.1-8
SDIA Airspace Protection Boundary

The southeastern most portion of the Midway-Pacific Highway community is located within the Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77 Notification Surfaces and the Threshold Siting Surface. The City requires an FAA determination of no hazard to air navigation for both ministerial and discretionary projects that exceed the Part 77 Notification Surfaces prior to approving or recommending approval as addressed in Development Services Department Information Bulletin 520. Additionally, future projects located within the TSS would be required to comply with ALUCP criteria relative to this airspace protection area. As such, impacts to airspace protection would be less than significant.


Overflight compatibility concerns apply to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The entire Midway-Pacific Highway community is located within the Overflight Notification Area (Figure 5.1-9). An overflight notification agreement must be recorded with the Office of the County Recorder for any new dwelling unit within the overflight area. The recordation of an overflight notification agreement is not necessary where the dedication of an avigation easement is required. Alternative methods of providing overflight notification are acceptable if approved by the ALUC.

Thus, as described in this section, implementation of the project would be consistent with the adopted ALUCP as future development within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would be subject to the requirements of the ALUCP and associated FAA and City requirements. In a letter dated February 7, 2018, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority determined that the proposed CPU is conditionally consistent with the ALUCP at a programmatic level and reiterated that the City must refer future projects under the proposed CPU to the ALUC for project-level consistency determinations for those projects located within applicable safety zones and noise contours, until such time as the ALUC determines that the City has incorporated the safety and noise policies and standards of the ALUCP into the Municipal Code. Thus, impacts related to conflicts with an adopted ALUCP would be less than significant.

5.1.4 Significance of Impacts

5.1.4.1 Conflicts with Applicable Plans

The project is consistent with the General Plan and the City of Villages strategy. Furthermore, the policies developed for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU within each of the proposed CPU elements were drafted in a manner that is consistent with the General Plan. Proposed amendments to the LDC would implement the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and would be consistent with applicable environmental goals, objectives, and guidelines of the General Plan. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would include approval of amendments to the LDC to revise the names of the existing CO-3-1 and CO-3-2 zones to CO-3-2 and CO-3-3, respectively, to include a new CO-3-1 zone that permits residential use at densities of 0-44 du/acre to include a new CN-1-6 zone that permits residential use at densities of 0-54 du/acre, and to include parking regulations for the new zones. The new zones are located in areas with similar existing land uses or are located adjacent to like land uses and, therefore, would be compatible with existing development. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would also revise the CPIOZ to rescind the existing CPIOZ and implement three new uses of the CPIOZ in the community (and three sets of associated CPIOZ supplemental development requirements) pertaining to development within the Sports Arena Community Village (CPIOZ Type B), Dutch Flats Urban Village



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 9,000 18,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.1-9
SDIA Overflight Area Boundary

(CPIOZ Type A), and Sports Arena Boulevard streetscape enhancements (CPIOZ Type A). The proposed CPIOZ supplemental development regulations are found in the proposed CPU's Land Use, Villages and District Element, and would not create any conflicts or inconsistencies with the adopted LDC.

Future development in accordance with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU adjacent to the San Diego River Flood Control Channel would be required to comply with ESL Regulations and MSCP/MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Future development in accordance with the proposed CPU would also be required to comply with the City's HRR to protect designated and eligible historical resources in the proposed CPU area. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU also incorporates the multi-modal strategy of the RP through the designation of high-density mixed-use villages located in proximity to transit. In addition, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies related to land use, mobility, and circulation/transportation that promote the RP's smart growth strategies. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes strategies to preserve, protect, and enhance public access to the Coastal Zone within the community and preserve coastal resources, which are consistent with the goals of the Coastal Act. The proposed CPU land use scenario would also be consistent with the goals and policies of the Port Master Plan as the proposed CPU land uses adjacent to the Port-owned properties would not conflict with the land uses in the Port Master Plan. Proposed policies LU-4.77 and LU.4-85, which promote coordination of planning efforts between the City and the Port, would ensure that any land use modifications to the Port-owned properties would be consistent between the two documents. As the project would be consistent with applicable environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General Plan and other applicable plans and regulations, no indirect or secondary environmental impact would result and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.1.4.2 Conversion of Open Space or Farmland

The project would not convert open space or prime farmland as there is no open space or prime farmland located within the community. The project would not physically divide an established community. Community connectivity would be enhanced by provisions in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU that aim to improve pedestrian and transit amenities. Impacts would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

5.1.4.3 Conflicts with the MSCP Subarea Plan

Project implementation would not be in conflict with the goals of the MSCP Subarea Plan or result in significant impacts on the adjacent MHPA. This would be assured through implementation of and strict adherence with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines incorporated into future projects as described in Section 4.1.3 of this PEIR. As such, program-level impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

5.1.4.4 Conflicts with an Adopted ALUCP

Although the Midway-Pacific Highway community is within the SDIA AIA, the project would not result in significant impacts associated with the four compatibility concern areas. The proposed CPU was ~~will be~~ submitted to the ALUC for a consistency determination with the SDIA ALUCP and was deemed conditionally consistent as future projects would be required to submit project-level consistency determinations ~~prior to the proposed CPU's adoption~~. Future projects would be required to receive ALUC

consistency determinations, as necessary, stating that the project is consistent with the SDIA ALUCP until such time as the City adopts regulations implementing the ALUCP or takes action to overrule the ALUC by a two-thirds vote. As a result, the project would not result in land uses that are incompatible with an adopted ALUCP. Impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

5.1.5 Mitigation Framework

Land use impacts from the project would be less than significant. Thus, no mitigation is required.

5.2 Transportation and Circulation

Chen Ryan Associates prepared the Midway-Pacific Highway & Old Town Mobility Element Updates Transportation Impact Study (TIS) (December 2017). The report is included as Appendix B to this PEIR. In March 2017, Chen Ryan Associates prepared the Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Communities Mobility Report. The report is included as Appendix C to this PEIR and the results of the report pertinent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU are presented in this section.

For the proposed CPU, two sets of future land use assumptions were developed and analyzed: one set with the Sports Arena use continuing in its current format or a replaced or rehabilitated structure; and one set with the Sports Arena use discontinuing and being replaced with other land uses. The technical analysis for the Transportation and Circulation section analyzes the highest density land use assumption and corresponding trip generation (i.e., the assumption that includes the discontinuation of the Sports Arena use and its replacement with other land uses). The land use assumption~~s, as discussed~~ are described in greater detail in Appendix N~~, assumes that some properties would not redevelop at the greater density while others will be developed with a higher density as permitted under state and local density bonus regulations.~~

A TIS was prepared for the proposed CPU with the highest density land use assumption as described above, and is included in Appendix B of this PEIR. Please note that a TIS was also prepared for the proposed CPU with the less dense land use ~~assumptions~~ assumption and corresponding trip generation (i.e., the continuation of the Sports Arena use); this TIS can also be found in Appendix B.

5.2.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively. This existing roadway circulation network, daily and peak-hour traffic volumes, and operations at the study roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, and freeway ramps pertinent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are discussed below.

5.2.1.1 Roadway Network

The following section provides a description of the existing study area streets within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The portions of the roadways described are intended to reflect the areas within the proposed CPU area and may not reflect the entirety of the roadway. Functional classifications are based on field observations performed during preparation of the TIS. Figure 5.2-1 illustrates the existing roadway classifications for the Midway-Pacific Highway community. The City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan identifies few bicycle facilities in the community, as noted in the descriptions below.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 800 1,600 3,200 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.2-1
Existing Roadway Functional Classification

Lytton Street/Barnett Avenue functions as a 4-lane collector with a center left-turn lane and a pavement width of 76 feet between Rosecrans Street and Midway Drive. Lytton Street/Barnett Avenue is lined with curbs and sidewalks and has no on-street parking. The roadway abuts commercial, residential, and military land uses and has a posted speed limit of 40 miles per hour (mph). This roadway includes a Class II (Bike Lane) facility in each direction.

Barnett Avenue functions as a 4-lane major arterial from Midway Drive to Pacific Highway with a pavement width of 92 feet. There is no on-street parking, but there are curbs and sidewalks. The roadway abuts commercial and industrial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 40 mph. There are Class III (Bike Route) facilities.

Midway Drive functions as a 4-lane collector with center left-turn lane between West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard and Barnett Avenue. Midway Drive is lined with curbs and sidewalks and has no on-street parking with the exception of parallel on-street parking on the northeast side of the roadway between East Drive and Rosecrans Street. The roadway abuts commercial and industrial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. The pavement width is 60 feet from West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard to Rosecrans Street and 56 feet from Rosecrans Street to Barnett Avenue. No bicycle facilities exist on the roadway.

Sports Arena Boulevard functions as a 5-lane prime arterial (from I-8 Westbound [WB] Ramps to I-8 Eastbound [EB] Ramps), a 6-lane major arterial (from I-8 EB Ramps to West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard), a 5-lane collector with a center left-turn lane (from West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard to Kemper Street), a 5-lane major arterial (from Kemper Street to East Drive), a 6-lane major arterial (from East Drive to Rosecrans Street), and a 2-lane collector (from Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway). Sports Arena Boulevard is lined with curbs and sidewalks with the exception of a segment from Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway where the curbs and sidewalks are intermittent. On-street parking along the roadway varies from having no on-street parking to having parallel on-street parking. The pavement width ranges from 52 feet (from Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway) to 96 feet (from West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard to Kemper Street and from Kemper Street to East Drive). The roadway abuts commercial, industrial, private recreation, and multi-family residential land uses and has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. There are Class III (Bike Route) facilities from I-8 WB Ramps to West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard and no bicycle facilities from West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard to Pacific Highway.

Kurtz Street functions as a 2-lane collector with parallel on-street parking on both sides of the roadway. Kurtz Street from Hancock Street to Rosecrans Street is a one-way 2-lane collector with a pavement width of 40 feet and has curbs and sidewalks. Kurtz Street from Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway is a 2-lane collector with a pavement width of 48 feet and has no curbs and sidewalks, only gutters. The roadway abuts commercial and industrial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 30 mph. No bicycle facilities exist on the roadway.

Hancock Street functions as a 2-lane collector with center left-turn lane (from Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street), a one-way 2-lane collector (from Kurtz Street to Rosecrans Street), and a 2-lane collector (from Old Town Avenue to Washington Street). The roadway abuts industrial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 30 mph. The pavement width ranges from 40 feet (from Kurtz Street to Rosecrans Street) to 60 feet (from Witherby Street to Washington Street). There is parallel on-street parking on both sides of the roadway from Sports Arena Boulevard to Camino Del Rio West, no on-street parking from Camino Del

Rio West to Witherby Street, and parallel on-street parking on the north side and diagonal on-street parking on the south side from Witherby Street to Washington Street. The roadway varies from having curbs only (no sidewalks) to having both curbs and sidewalks. There are no bicycle facilities.

Kettner Boulevard functions as a one-way 3-lane major arterial that has a posted speed limit of 40 mph from Washington Street to Laurel Street. Kettner Boulevard from Washington Street to Vine Street has a pavement width of 42 feet, has no on-street parking, and has curbs and sidewalks (sidewalks only on the southwest side of the roadway). Kettner Boulevard from Vine Street to Laurel Street has a pavement width of 52 feet and parallel on-street parking on both sides of the roadway. From Vine Street to Sassafras Street, there are curbs and sidewalks (sidewalks only on the southwest side of the roadway), and from Sassafras Street to Laurel Street there are both curbs and sidewalks on both sides of the roadway. The roadway abuts commercial and industrial land uses and has no bicycle facilities.

Pacific Highway functions as a 2-lane collector (from Sea World Drive to Taylor Street), a 6-lane major arterial (from Taylor Street to Sports Arena Boulevard), a 5-lane prime arterial (from Sports Arena Boulevard to Barnett Avenue), an expressway (from Barnett Avenue to Washington Street), a 6-lane prime arterial (from Washington Street to Sassafras Street), and a 6-lane major arterial again (from Sassafras Street to Laurel Street). There is no on-street parking with the exception of the segment from Sea World Drive to Taylor Street, which has parallel on-street parking on both sides of the roadway. The posted speed limit varies from 45 to 55 mph. There are curbs and sidewalks along the roadway with the exception of the segment from Sports Arena Boulevard to Barnett Avenue, which has curbs, but only has sidewalks on the northeast side of the roadway, and the segment from Barnett Avenue to Sassafras Street, which has no curbs or sidewalks. The pavement width ranges from 46 feet (from Sea World Drive to Taylor Street) to 118 feet (from Barnett Avenue to Washington Street). The roadway abuts transportation-related utilities, and institutional, industrial, and commercial land uses. There are Class II (Bike Lane) facilities from Sea World Drive to Sports Arena Boulevard and from Barnett Avenue to Washington Street, and Class III (Bike Route) facilities from Sports Arena Boulevard to Barnett Avenue and from Washington Street to Laurel Street.

Channel Way functions as a 2-lane collector from West Mission Bay Drive to Hancock Street with a pavement width of 40 feet. There is parallel on-street parking on both sides of the roadway. The roadway abuts commercial and multi-family residential uses and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. There are curbs and sidewalks along the roadway, but no bicycle facilities.

Kemper Street functions as a 2-lane collector with a center left-turn lane from Kenyon Street to Sports Arena Boulevard with a pavement width of 50 feet from Midway Drive to Sports Arena Boulevard and 62 feet from Kenyon Street to Midway Drive. There is parallel on-street parking and curbs and sidewalks on the northwest side of the roadway from Kenyon Street to Midway Drive and on both sides of the roadway from Midway Drive to Sports Arena Boulevard. The roadway abuts commercial and industrial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. There are no bicycle facilities.

Camino Del Rio West functions as a 6-lane prime arterial from Rosecrans Street to the I-5/I-8 ramps with a pavement width of 106 feet. There is no on-street parking, but the roadway does have curbs and sidewalks. The roadway abuts commercial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. There are no bicycle facilities.

Rosecrans Street functions as a 6-lane major arterial from Lytton Street to Sports Arena Boulevard with a pavement width of 106 feet, and a 4-lane collector with a center left-turn lane from Sports Arena Boulevard to Pacific Highway/Taylor Street with a pavement width of 82 feet. There is no on-street parking from Lytton Street to Sports Arena Boulevard and parallel on-street parking on both sides of the roadway from Sports Arena Boulevard to Pacific Highway/Taylor Street. The roadway abuts commercial, residential, industrial, and institutional land uses and has a posted speed limit of 35 mph. There are curbs and sidewalks from Lytton Street to Sports Arena Boulevard, and curbs and sidewalks from Sports Arena Boulevard to Pacific Highway/Taylor Street only on the northwest side of the roadway. There are no bicycle facilities.

Washington Street functions as a 4-lane major arterial from Frontage Road to Hancock Street with a pavement width of 62 feet from Frontage Road to Pacific Highway and a pavement width of 60 feet from Pacific Highway to Hancock Street. There is no on-street parking from Frontage Road to Pacific Highway, but there is parallel on-street parking on the southeast side of the roadway from Pacific Highway to Hancock Street. The roadway abuts commercial land uses from Pacific Highway to Hancock Street and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. There are curbs and sidewalks, but no bicycle facilities.

Vine Street functions as a 2-lane collector from California Street to Kettner Boulevard with a pavement width of 50 feet. There are curbs and sidewalks, and diagonal on-street parking on the southeast side of the roadway. The roadway abuts industrial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. There are no bicycle facilities.

Sassafras Street functions as a 3-lane collector from Pacific Highway to Kettner Boulevard with a pavement width of 52 feet. There are curbs and sidewalks, but no on-street parking. The roadway abuts institutional land uses and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. There are no bicycle facilities.

Laurel Street functions as a 4-lane major arterial from Pacific Highway to Kettner Boulevard with a pavement width of 54 feet. There are curbs and sidewalks, but no on-street parking. The roadway abuts commercial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. There are Class III (Bike Route) facilities.

Old Town Avenue functions as a 2-lane collector from Hancock Street to San Diego Avenue and has a pavement width of 28 feet from Hancock Street to Moore Street and 38 feet from Moore Street to San Diego Avenue. The street is lined with curbs and sidewalks only on the southeast side of the roadway from Hancock Street to Moore Street and on both sides of the roadway from Moore Street to San Diego Avenue. The street abuts commercial land uses and has a posted speed limit of 25 mph. There is no on-street parking and no bicycle facilities. *(Note: this roadway segment is located partly within both the Midway Pacific Highway and Old Town community planning areas.)*

5.2.1.2 Roadway Segment Conditions

To determine the impacts on the study area roadway segments, Table 5.2-1 has been developed by the City of San Diego and is used as a reference. The segment traffic volumes under LOS E as shown in this table are considered at capacity because at LOS E the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio is equal to 1.0.

Based on planning-level analysis using average daily traffic (ADT) volumes, it is estimated that all roadway segments within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area function at an acceptable LOS

D or better, except for the following segments. The segments listed below have volumes near or above their existing capacity, resulting in periods of congestion.

- Midway Drive between East Drive and Rosecrans Street (LOS E)
- Kurtz Street between Rosecrans Street and Pacific Highway (LOS E)
- Hancock Street between Old Town Avenue and Witherby Street (LOS F)
- Rosecrans Street between Lytton Street and Midway Drive (LOS E)
- Rosecrans Street between Midway Drive and Sports Arena Boulevard (LOS F)
- Barnett Avenue between Midway Drive and Pacific Highway (LOS F)
- Old Town Avenue between Hancock Street and Moore Street (LOS F)[1]

Table 5.2-1
City of San Diego Roadway Segment Capacity and Level of Service

Road Class	Lanes	A	B	C	D	E
Expressway	6	<30,000	<42,000	<60,000	<70,000	<80,000
Prime Arterial	6	<25,000	<35,000	<50,000	<55,000	<60,000
Prime Arterial	5	<20,000	<28,000	<40,000	<45,000	<50,000
Major Arterial	6	<20,000	<28,000	<40,000	<45,000	<50,000
Major Arterial	5	<17,500	<24,500	<35,000	<40,000	<45,000
Major Arterial	3	<11,250	<15,750	<22,500	<26,250	<30,000
Major Arterial (one-way)	3	<12,500	<16,500	<22,500	<25,000	<27,500
Major Arterial	4	<15,000	<21,000	<30,000	<35,000	<40,000
Collector (with center left-turn lane)	5	<12,500	<17,500	<25,000	<30,750	<37,500
Collector (with center left-turn lane)	4	<10,000	<14,000	<20,000	<25,000	<30,000
Collector (with center left-turn lane)	3	<7,500	<10,500	<15,000	<18,750	<22,500
Collector (with no center lane)	4	<5,000	<7,000	<10,000	<13,000	<15,000
Collector (with center left-turn lane)	2					
Collector (one-way)	2	<7,500	<9,500	<12,500	<15,000	<17,500
Collector (no fronting property)	2	<4,000	<5,500	<7,500	<9,000	<10,000
Collector (with commercial fronting)	2	<2,500	<3,500	<5,000	<6,500	<8,000
Collector (multi-family fronting)	2					
Sub-Collector (single-family)	2	–	–	<2,200	–	–

Notes:
The volumes and the average daily level of service listed above are only intended as a general planning guideline. Levels of service are not applied to residential streets since their primary purpose is to serve abutting lots, not carry through traffic. Levels of service normally apply to roads carrying through traffic between major trip generators and attractors.
Capacities for any classification not identified in the sources noted below were developed based on interpolation from similar classifications.
Sources: City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Manual, Table 2, Page 8, July 1998
City of San Diego Planning Department Mobility Section

5.2.1.3 Intersection Conditions

The TIS (Appendix B) includes an LOS analysis for the study intersections within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area under Existing Conditions. LOS for signalized intersections is defined in terms of delay, which is a measure of driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and loss of travel time. Specifically, LOS criteria are stated in terms of the average control delay per vehicle for the peak 15-minute period within the hour analyzed. The average control delay includes initial deceleration delay,

[1] This segment is located partially within the Midway-Pacific Highway and the Old Town CPU areas, and is within the study area.

queue move-up time, and final acceleration time in addition to the stop delay. The LOS for unsignalized intersections is determined by the computed or measured control delay and is defined for each minor movement. The criteria for the various LOS designations for signalized and unsignalized intersections are given in Table 5.2-2.

Table 5.2-2
Level of Service Criteria for Intersections

LOS	Signalized (Control Delay) (sec/veh)[a]	Unsignalized (Control Delay) (sec/veh)[b]	Description
A	≤10.0	≤10.0	Operations with very low delay and most vehicles do not stop.
B	>10.0 and ≤20.0	>10.0 and ≤15.0	Operations with good progression but with some restricted movement.
C	>20.0 and ≤35.0	>15.0 and ≤25.0	Operations where a significant number of vehicles are stopping with some backup and light congestion
D	>35.0 and ≤55.0	>25.0 and ≤35.0	Operations where congestion is noticeable, longer delays occur, and many vehicles stop. The proportion of vehicles not stopping declines.
E	>55.0 and ≤80.0	>35.0 and ≤50.0	Operations where these is significant delay, extensive queuing, and poor progression.
F	>80.0	>50.0	Operations that are unacceptable to most drivers, when the arrival rates exceed the capacity of the intersection.

Sec/veh = seconds per vehicle
Sources:
[a] 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Chapter 16, Page 2, Exhibit 16-2
[b] 2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Chapter 17, Page 2, Exhibit 17-2

Within the City of San Diego, all signalized and unsignalized intersections are considered deficient if they operate at LOS E or F. All proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU study area intersections currently operate at LOS D or better during both peak periods, except for the following intersections that operate at LOS E.

- Lytton Street & Rosecrans Street (LOS E – AM peak)
- West Mission Bay Drive & I-8 WB Off-Ramp (LOS E – PM peak)
- Lowell Street/Nimitz Boulevard & Rosecrans Street (LOS E – PM peak)

5.2.1.4 Freeway Segments

Table 5.2-3 identifies Caltrans criteria used to rate freeway segment operations based on an LOS scale of A through F.

Freeway volumes were obtained from Caltrans. The following freeway segments surrounding the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area have volumes that exceed the capacity during the PM peak hour:

- I-5 Northbound (NB), between Sea World Drive and I-8 (LOS E – PM peak)
- I-5 Southbound (SB), between I-8 and Old Town Avenue (LOS E – PM peak)
- I-5 NB, between Old Town Avenue and Washington Street (LOS E – PM peak)

Table 5.2-3
Level of Service Criteria for Freeway Segment Analysis

LOS	v/c ratio	Congestion/Delay	Traffic Description
A	<0.41	None	Free flow
B	0.41 – 0.62	None	Free to stable flow, light to moderate volumes
C	0.63 – 0.79	None to minimal	Stable flow, moderate volumes, freedom to maneuver noticeably restricted
D	0.80 – 0.92	Minimal to substantial	Approaches unstable flow, heavy volumes, and very limited freedom to maneuver
E	0.93 – 1.00	Significant	Extremely unstable flow, maneuverability and psychological comfort extremely poor
F_0	1.01 – 1.25	Considerable 0-1 hour delay	Operations that are unacceptable to most drivers, when the arrival rates exceed the capacity of the intersection
F_1	1.26 – 1.35	Severe 1-2 hour delay	Forced flow, heavy congestion, long queues form behind breakdown points, stop and go
F_2	1.36 – 1.45	Very severe 2-3 hour delay	Extremely heavy congestion, very long queues
F_3	>1.46	Extremely severe 3+ hour delay	Gridlock

Source: SANTEC/ITE Guidelines for TIS in the San Diego Region

5.2.1.5 Freeway Ramp Metering

Ramp volumes were obtained from intersection turning movements data when applicable, or from Caltrans volumes. Table 5.2-4 displays the queuing analysis results for the ramps in the study area that are currently metered.

Table 5.2-4
Existing Freeway Ramp Metering

Ramp	Peak Period	Meter Rate[1] (Veh/Hr)	Demand[2] (Veh/Hr)	Excess Demand (Veh/Hr)	Average Delay (Min)
I-8 EB/Sports Arena Boulevard	AM	*Ramp not metered in the AM peak*			
	PM	490	913	423	51.8
I-5 SB/Sea World Drive	AM	318	375	57	10.8
	PM	318	528	210	39.6
I-5 NB/Sea World Drive	AM	1,118	1,261	143	7.7
	PM	1,320	1,170	0	0.0
I-5 SB/Old Town Avenue	AM	*Ramp not metered in the AM peak*			
	PM	352	360	8	1.4
I-5 NB/Old Town Avenue	AM	670	466	0	0.0
	PM	636	631	0	0.0

veh/hr = vehicles per hour

[1] Meter rate is the assumed peak hour capacity expected to be processed through the ramp meter (using Caltrans fast rate).

[2] Demand is the peak hour demand using the on-ramp.

Source: Chen Ryan Associates 2017 (Appendix B)

The table compares the peak hour demand at the on-ramp with the current meter rate. As shown in the table, the following ramp meters within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area experience delays in excess of 15 minutes.

- I-8 EB/Sports Arena Boulevard (PM peak) – 51.8-minute delay

- I-5 SB/Sea World Drive (PM peak) – 39.6-minute delay

5.2.1.6 Alternative Transportation Facilities

a. Transit

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is served by several local bus routes, providing several options along Sports Arena Boulevard, Midway Drive, Rosecrans Street, Pacific Highway, and Washington Street, as well as connections to adjacent communities. Local bus service and Rapid Bus improvements are planned along Rosecrans Street between Old Town and Point Loma.


There are two LRT (Trolley) stations in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, the Washington Street Trolley Station and the Middletown Trolley Station. Also, the Old Town Transit Center is located just outside the community and provides additional access to LRT, bus transit, and passenger rail service. The San Diego Trolley connects the Midway-Pacific Highway community to Downtown, Mission Valley, San Diego State University, El Cajon, Santee, National City, Chula Vista, and San Ysidro.

In addition, Amtrak (intercity rail) and Coaster (commuter rail) trains travel along the rail corridor within the proposed CPU area, but there are no stops in the proposed CPU area. Freight trains, Amtrak, Coaster, and LRT can generate high, relatively brief, intermittent noise events within the vicinity of at-grade rail crossings where horns and bells are sounded. Rail noise is further discussed in Section 5.5 of this PEIR.

b. Bicycle Facilities

A key focus of the San Diego Regional Bike Plan prepared by SANDAG is to develop an interconnected network of bicycle corridors to improve the connectivity and quality of bicycle facilities and their supporting facilities. Similarly, the City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan establishes guidance on achieving an ideal bicycle environment throughout the City and refines the Regional Bike Plan to include community-wide bicycle facilities. Together these facilities promote intra-community and inter-community bicycle trips to strengthen connections within the planning area and between adjacent communities. In the Midway-Pacific Highway community, the San Diego Regional Bike Plan identifies the Pacific Highway corridor as a regional connection, and the City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan recommends additional facilities on the local street network. The proposed CPU recommends a variety of bicycle facilities, including bicycle paths (Class I), bicycle lanes (Class II), bicycle routes (Class III), and cycle tracks (Class IV).

Midway-Pacific Highway's flat topography and moderate size make bicycling an attractive mode of transportation for the community, although high vehicular traffic volumes and speeds as well as numerous conflict points create an uncomfortable environment for cyclists. Midway-Pacific Highway is in proximity to San Diego Bay, the San Diego River, and Mission Bay, which provides for the development of a Bay-to-Bay bicycle connection through the community. Class I (Bicycle Path) facilities are provided along the south side of the San Diego River. Class II (Bicycle Lane) facilities are provided along portions of Pacific Highway, Rosecrans Street, and Barnett Avenue. Class III (Bicycle Route) facilities are provided along a portion of Kemper Street, Jessop Lane, and Laurel Street. There are connections to the Peninsula community from Kemper Street (Class III) and to the Downtown/Centre City community from Pacific Highway (Class II). There are also Class I connections along the San Diego River to Ocean Beach and Mission Valley. Figure 5.2-2 shows the existing and planned bicycle network for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 800 1,600 3,200 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.2-2
Existing and Planned Bicycle Network

c. Pedestrian Facilities

Midway-Pacific Highway includes a dominance of auto-oriented land uses with higher traffic volumes, which correlates to a challenging environment for pedestrians. The community's "superblocks," including the San Diego Sports Arena site, further impede pedestrian travel. Rosecrans Street is the only east-west corridor that currently spans the entire community and the only corridor that connects to the Old Town Transit Center. The corridor also includes a 200-foot-wide I-5 underpass that is poorly lit and has narrow sidewalks with no parkways or on-street parking to buffer pedestrians from vehicular traffic, creating an unfriendly pedestrian environment.

The intersection of Midway Drive/Sports Arena Boulevard/West Point Loma Boulevard is a major vehicular junction point within the community where two major roadways (Midway Drive and Sports Arena Boulevard) intersect with two major regional access points (West Point Loma Boulevard connecting to both the Peninsula and Ocean Beach communities to the west, and to West Mission Bay Drive and I-8 ramps). The intersection also contains an uncontrolled right-turn movement to accommodate the high traffic volumes, which creates an intimidating environment for pedestrians to cross.

Retail and institutional uses along Rosecrans Street and Camino Del Rio West are major pedestrian attractions within the community. However, both Rosecrans Street and Camino Del Rio West have 5- to 7-foot sidewalks with no parkways or on-street parking to buffer pedestrians from vehicular traffic. The narrow sidewalks and lack of buffer create an unfriendly pedestrian environment.

There are also missing sidewalk facilities along Sports Arena Boulevard from Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway, with the exception of a small portion on its south side near the intersection of Rosecrans Street. While this area attracts little pedestrian traffic as it consists mainly of industrial uses, it is one of the few major north-south corridors that span the entire community.

5.2.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Thresholds used to evaluate potential impacts related to Transportation and Traffic are based on applicable criteria in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G and the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016). Thresholds are modified from the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds to reflect the programmatic analysis for the project. A significant impact could occur if implementation of the project would:

1. Result in an increase in projected traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system including roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, interchanges, or freeway ramps;

2. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

The City of San Diego and Caltrans have developed acceptable threshold standards to determine the significance of project impacts to roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, and freeway ramp metering. Along roadway segments and freeway segments, the measurement of effectiveness (MOE) is based on allowable increases in the v/c ratio. At intersections, the MOE is based on allowable increases in delay. At a freeway ramp meter, the MOE is based on allowable increases in delay, measured in

minutes. These thresholds, applicable to the analysis of transportation facilities (Issue 1) are summarized in Table 5.2-5 and further detailed below.

Table 5.2-5
Significance Criteria for Facilities in Study Area

Facility	Measures of Effectiveness (MOE)	Significance Threshold[1]
Roadway Segment	ADT, v/c ratio	> 0.02 at LOS E or > 0.01 at LOS F
Intersection	Seconds of Delay	> 2.0 seconds at LOS E or > 1.0 second at LOS F
Freeway Segment	v/c ratio	> 0.01 at LOS E or > 0.005 at LOS F
Freeway Ramp Meter	Minutes of delay per vehicle	> 2.0 minutes for freeway segments operating at LOS E, and >1.0 minutes for freeway segments operating at LOS F. The criteria only apply for ramp meters where the delay without project is 15 minutes or higher.

ADT = average daily traffic
v/c = volume to capacity
LOS = Level of Service
[1]Applies only when the facilities operates at LOS E or F
Source: City of San Diego Significance Determination Thresholds 2016; City of San Diego Development Services Department 2007; Chen Ryan Associates (Appendix B)

a. Roadway Segments

For roadway segments forecasted to operate at LOS E or F with the project, the allowable increase in v/c ratio is 0.02 at LOS E and 0.01 at LOS F. If vehicle trips from a project cause the v/c ratio to increase by more than the allowable threshold, this would be considered a significant impact. Also, if the project causes a street segment that was operating at an acceptable LOS to operate at LOS E or F, this would be considered a significant impact.

Where the roadway segment operates at LOS E or F, if the intersections at the ends of the segment are calculated to operate at an acceptable LOS with the project, and a peak hour Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) arterial analysis for the same segment shows that the segment operates at an acceptable LOS with the project, then the project impacts would be less than significant. If analysis shows either the intersections or segment under the peak hour HCM analysis do not operate acceptably, the project impacts would be significant.

In certain instances, mitigation may not be required even if a roadway segment operates at LOS E or LOS F. In such cases the following three conditions must all be met:

1. The roadway is built to its ultimate classification per the adopted Community Plan;
2. The intersections on both ends of the failing segment operate at an acceptable LOS; and
3. An HCM arterial analysis indicates an acceptable LOS on the segment.

b. Signalized and Unsignalized Intersections

LOS F is not acceptable for any approach leg except for side streets on an interconnected arterial system. If vehicle trips from a project cause an intersection approach leg to operate at LOS F, except in the cases of side streets on an interconnected arterial system, this would be considered a significant

impact. At intersections that are expected to operate at LOS E or F without the project, the allowable increase in delay is 2 seconds at LOS E and 1 second at LOS F with the addition of the project. If vehicle trips from a project cause the delay at an intersection to increase by more than the allowable threshold, this would be considered a significant impact. Also, if the project causes an intersection that was operating at an acceptable LOS to operate at LOS E or F, this would be considered a significant project impact.

c. Freeway Segments

For freeway segments forecasted to operate at LOS E or F with the project, the allowable increase in v/c ratio is 0.01 at LOS E and 0.005 at LOS F. If vehicle trips from a project cause the v/c ratio to increase by more than the allowable threshold, this would be considered a significant impact. Also, if the project causes a freeway segment that was operating at an acceptable LOS to operate at LOS E or F, this would be considered a significant impact.

d. Freeway Ramp Metering

Ramp metering is a means of controlling the volume of traffic entering the freeway with the goal of improving the traffic operations and flow on the freeway main lanes. Freeway ramp meter analysis estimates the peak hour queues and delays at freeway ramps by comparing existing volumes to the meter rate at the given location. The excess demand, if any, forms the basis for calculating the maximum queues and maximum delays anticipated at each location. Substantial queues and delays can form where demand significantly exceeds the meter rate. This approach assumes a static meter rate throughout the course of the peak hour. However, Caltrans has indicated that the meter rates are continually adjusted based on the level of traffic using the on-ramp. To the extent possible, the meter rate is set such that the queue length does not exceed the available storage, smooth flow on the freeway mainline is maintained, and there is no interference to arterial traffic.

If vehicle trips from a project cause a metered ramp with a delay of 15 minutes per vehicle or higher to increase its delay by more than 2 minutes per vehicle, this would be considered a significant impact if the freeway segment operates at LOS E or F.

5.2.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Traffic Circulation

Would the project result in an increase in projected traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system including roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, interchanges, or freeway ramps?

To assess potential impacts, this section provides a description of Future (Year 2035) community conditions for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Due to the nature of the project being an update to the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan with no specific development project being proposed at this time, the analysis provided in this section is cumulative in nature. The analysis considers the existing conditions within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and evaluates impacts to applicable facilities within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area through

2035. Since the analysis is looking at impacts over the long term, projected traffic volume increases associated with development in neighboring communities (Old Town) are included within the analysis.

a. Future Traffic Volumes

The future community conditions were developed based on the project and land use and network assumptions within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area superimposed on the SANDAG 2035 Series 12 Traffic Forecast Model.

The peak-hour intersection turning movements and roadway segment traffic data for the existing condition were obtained from several sources as detailed in the TIS. It should be noted that the existing conditions report was completed in November 2012; therefore, the traffic counts conducted to evaluate existing conditions were collected in year 2012 as well. To ensure the counts used to evaluate existing conditions are still relevant to current conditions, a sampling of the 2012 counts was validated with recently conducted counts (collected in 2015 and 2016). Through the validation process, limited growth was observed in the traffic volumes between year 2012 and year 2015/2016 conditions. Therefore, the counts used to evaluate existing conditions would still be considered valid and provide a good representation of volumes for existing conditions for a planning level study.

The resulting roadway network for the project area under future conditions under the project are present in Figure 3-3 in Chapter 3, Project Description. The daily traffic volumes are shown in Table 5.2-6.

b. Roadway Segment Analysis

Table 5.2-6 displays the LOS analysis results for roadway segments within the Midway-Pacific Highway community by comparing existing roadway classifications and existing volumes to future peak-hour traffic volumes based on future conditions projections for the proposed CPU area, including proposed roadway segment modifications and new roadways. As shown in Table 5.2-6, the project would have a cumulative impact on six of the 48 roadway segments within the study area. Where impacts occur on consecutive segments of the same roadway, these impacts have been combined for clarity.

Impact 5.2-1: Three consecutive segments of Kettner Boulevard from Washington Street to Laurel Street.

Impact 5.2-2: Greenwood Street from Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street.

Impact 5.2-3: Camino Del Rio West from Rosecrans Street to I-5/I-8 Ramps.

Impact 5.2-4: Dutch Flats Parkway from Barnett Avenue to Midway Drive

Impact 5.2-5: Sassafras Street from Pacific Highway to Kettner Boulevard.

Impact 5.2-6: Two consecutive segments of Old Town Avenue from Hancock Street to San Diego Avenue.

Table 5.2-6
Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis

Roadway Segment	Existing			Future			Δ in ADT	Δ in V/C	Significant Impact?
	ADT	V/C Ratio (a)	LOS	ADT	V/C Ratio (a)	LOS			
Lytton Street/Barnett Avenue									
Rosecrans Street to Midway Drive	22,070	0.74	D	24,400	0.61	C	2,330	-0.13	NO
Midway Drive									
West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard to Kemper Street	19,960	0.67	C	23,200	0.77	D	3,240	0.10	NO
Kemper Street to East Drive	20,240	0.67	D	20,200	0.67	D	-40	0	NO
East Drive to Rosecrans Street	27,600	0.92	**E**	26,800	0.89	**E**	-800	-0.03	NO
Rosecrans Street to Barnett Avenue	23,000	0.77	D	28,300	0.71	C	5,300	-0.06	NO
Sports Arena Boulevard									
I-8 WB Ramps to I-8 EB Ramps	35,670	0.71	C	45,800	0.76	C	10,130	0.05	NO
I-8 EB Ramps to West Point Loma Boulevard	31,010	0.62	C	39,500	0.79	C	8,490	0.17	NO
West Point Loma Boulevard to Kemper Street	17,600	0.47	B	20,100	0.40	B	2,500	-0.07	NO
Kemper Street to East Drive	19,520	0.43	B	25,800	0.52	B	6,280	0.09	NO
East Drive to Rosecrans Street	26,800	0.60	C	17,800	0.36	A	-9,000	-0.24	NO
Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway	2,600	0.33	B	10,700	0.71	D	8,100	0.38	NO
Kurtz Street									
Hancock Street to Rosecrans Street	5,340	0.31	A	12,800	0.73	D	7,460	0.42	NO
Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway	6,690	0.84	**E**	7,100	0.47	C	410	-0.37	NO
Hancock Street									
Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street	3,930	0.26	A	1,100	0.07	A	-2,830	-0.19	NO
Kurtz Street to Camino Del Rio West	4,710	0.27	A	14,700	0.53	B	9,990	0.26	NO
Camino Del Rio West to Rosecrans Street	2,990	0.17	A	7,500	0.27	A	4,510	0.10	NO
Old Town Avenue to Witherby Street	9,680	1.21	**F**	11,400	0.76	D	1,720	-0.45	NO
Witherby Street to Washington Street	2,740	0.34	B	6,300	0.79	D	3,560	0.45	NO
Kettner Boulevard									
Washington Street to Vine Street	23,720	0.86	D	34,800	1.27	**F**	11,080	0.41	**YES**
Vine Street to Sassafras Street	23,080	0.84	D	34,700	1.26	**F**	11,620	0.42	**YES**
Sassafras Street to Laurel Street	20,150	0.73	C	33,200	1.21	**F**	13,050	0.48	**YES**
Pacific Highway									
Sea World Drive to Taylor Street	7,460	0.50	C	10,600	0.71	D	3,140	0.21	NO
Taylor Street to Kurtz Street	13,300	0.27	A	19,500	0.39	A	6,200	0.12	NO
Kurtz Street to Sports Arena Boulevard	21,470	0.43	B	24,100	0.48	B	2,630	0.05	NO
Sports Arena Boulevard to Barnett Avenue	11,600	0.23	A	17,600	0.39	B	6,000	0.16	NO
Barnett Avenue to Washington Street	54,690	0.68	C	50,400	0.63	C	-4,290	-0.05	NO

Table 5.2-6
Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis

Roadway Segment	Existing			Future			Δ in ADT	Δ in V/C	Significant Impact?
	ADT	V/C Ratio (a)	LOS	ADT	V/C Ratio (a)	LOS			
Washington Street to Sassafras Street	11,650	0.19	A	19,100	0.38	A	7,450	0.19	NO
Sassafras Street to Laurel Street	19,160	0.38	B	31,000	0.62	C	11,840	0.24	NO
Channel Way									
West Mission Bay Drive to Hancock Street	1,280	0.16	A	7,200	0.48	C	5,920	0.32	NO
Kemper Street									
Kenyon Street to Midway Drive	9,010	0.60	C	9,700	0.65	C	690	0.05	NO
Midway Drive to Sports Arena Boulevard	8,120	0.54	C	9,800	0.65	C	1,680	0.11	NO
Sports Arena Boulevard to Hancock Street	*Does Not Exist*			9,400	0.63	C	9,400	--	NO
Frontier Drive									
Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street	*Does Not Exist*			12,200	0.81	D	12,200	--	NO
Greenwood Street									
Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street	*Does Not Exist*			7,000	0.88	**E**	7,000	--	**YES**
Camino Del Rio West									
Rosecrans Street to I-5/I-8 Ramps	50,700	0.85	D	67,300	1.12	**F**	16,600	0.27	**YES**
Rosecrans Street									
Lytton Street to Midway Drive	46,400	0.93	**E**	54,200	0.90	D	7,800	-0.03	NO
Midway Drive to Sports Arena Boulevard	59,100	1.18	**F**	56,900	0.95	**E**	-2,200	-0.23	NO
Sports Arena Boulevard to Pacific Highway/Taylor Street	15,500	0.52	C	22,000	0.55	C	6,500	0.03	NO
Charles Lindbergh Parkway									
Midway Drive to Sports Arena Boulevard	*Does Not Exist*			5,900	0.39	B	5,900	--	NO
Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street	*Does Not Exist*			7,800	0.52	C	7,800	--	NO
Dutch Flats Parkway									
Barnett Avenue to Midway Drive	*Does Not Exist*			13,400	0.89	**E**	13,400	--	**YES**
Midway Drive to Sports Arena Boulevard	*Does Not Exist*			8,800	0.59	C	13,400	--	NO
Barnett Avenue									
Midway Drive to Pacific Highway	57,954	1.45	**F**	51,560	0.86	D	-6,394	-0.59	NO
Washington Street									
Frontage Road to Pacific Street	10,680	0.27	A	15,500	0.39	B	4,820	0.12	NO
Pacific Street to Hancock Street	12,870	0.32	A	22,700	0.57	C	9,830	0.25	NO
Vine Street									
California Street to Kettner Boulevard	250	0.03	A	2,000	0.25	A	1,750	0.22	NO
Sassafras Street									
Pacific Highway to Kettner Boulevard	8,700	0.79	D	21,100	1.92	**F**	12,400	1.13	**YES**

Table 5.2-6
Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis

Roadway Segment	Existing			Future			Δ in ADT	Δ in V/C	Significant Impact?
	ADT	V/C Ratio (a)	LOS	ADT	V/C Ratio (a)	LOS			
Laurel Street									
Pacific Highway to Kettner Boulevard	26,290	0.66	C	29,500	0.74	C	3,210	0.08	NO
Old Town Avenue									
Hancock Street to Moore Street	11,750	1.47	**F**	12,200	1.53	**F**	450	0.06	**YES**
Moore Street to San Diego Avenue	6,120	0.77	D	6,500	0.81	**E**	380	0.04	**YES**

Bold values indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F.
ADT = average daily traffic; LOS = Level of Service; v/c = volume-to-capacity
Capacity for non-standard roadway classifications were provided by City of San Diego staff.
(a) The v/c ratio is calculated by dividing the ADT volume by each respective roadway segment's capacity.

c. Intersection Analysis

Table 5.2-7 displays the LOS analysis results for the study intersections using existing lane configurations and the future peak-hour traffic volumes based on the intersection improvements and new intersections identified in the proposed CPU. As shown in Table 5.2-7 and summarized below, the project would have a cumulative impact at ten of the 53 study intersections. Two impacts occur at intersections located outside of the Midway-Pacific Highway community, but within the study area, as identified within the TIS.

Impact 5.2-7: Lytton Street and Rosecrans Street in the AM and PM peak hours.

Impact 5.2-8: West Mission Bay Drive and I-8 WB Off-Ramp in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-9: Midway Drive and Sports Arena Boulevard/West Point Loma Boulevard in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-10: Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-11: Hancock Street and Washington Street in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-12: Kettner Boulevard and West Laurel Street in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-13: Pacific Highway and Sassafras Street in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-14: Pacific Highway and West Laurel Street in the AM and PM peak hours.

Impact 5.2-15: Nimitz Boulevard/Lowell Street and Rosecrans Street in the ~~AM and~~ PM peak hour~~s~~.

Impact 5.2-16: Moore Street and Old Town Avenue in the PM peak hour.

Table 5.2-7
Summary of Intersection Analysis

Intersection		Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Existing		Future		Δ in Delay	Significant Impact?
				DELAY (A)	LOS (B)	DELAY (A)	LOS (B)		
1	Lytton Street & Rosecrans Street	Signal	AM	**65.4**	**E**	**96.9**	**F**	**31.5**	**YES**
			PM	44.5	D	**55.2**	**E**	**10.7**	**YES**
2	West Mission Bay Drive & I-8 WB Off-Ramp	Signal	AM	14.8	B	15.4	B	0.6	NO
			PM	**59.5**	**E**	**70.2**	**E**	**10.7**	**YES**
3	Sports Arena Boulevard & Channel Way	SSSC[1]	AM	11.2	B	12.3	B	1.1	NO
			PM	14.7	B	30.6	D	15.9	NO
4	Midway Drive & Sports Arena Boulevard/West Point Loma Boulevard	Signal	AM	36.6	D	52.2	D	15.6	NO
			PM	47.2	D	**75.8**	**E**	**28.6**	**YES**
5	Midway Drive& Kemper Street	Signal	AM	22.7	C	31.6	C	8.9	NO
			PM	37.3	D	39.1	D	1.8	NO
6	Midway Drive & East Drive	Signal	AM	4.8	A	7.0	A	2.2	NO
			PM	13.0	B	17.8	B	4.8	NO
7	Midway Drive and Rosecrans Drive	Signal	AM	34.9	C	40.5	D	5.6	NO
			PM	49.1	D	**76.0**	**E**	**26.9**	**YES**
8	Midway Drive & Charles Lindbergh Parkway	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		11.2	B	--	NO
			PM			28.7	C	--	NO
9	Midway Drive & Enterprise Street	SSSC[1]	AM	11.0	B	13.4	B	2.4	NO
			PM	18.1	C	26.5	D	8.4	NO
10	Midway Drive & Barnett Avenue	Signal	AM	13.8	B	13.7	B	-0.1	NO
			PM	19.8	B	12.3	B	-7.5	NO
11	Sports Arena Boulevard & Hancock Street	Signal	AM	10.0	A	14.4	B	4.4	NO
			PM	13.1	B	17.4	B	4.3	NO
12	Sports Arena Boulevard & Kemper Street	Signal	AM	18.8	B	37.6	D	18.8	NO
			PM	17.5	B	43.9	D	26.4	NO
13	Sports Arena Boulevard & Sports Arena Driveway	Signal	AM	17.1	B	18.4	B	1.3	NO
			PM	24.8	C	27.0	C	2.2	NO
14	Sports Arena Boulevard & East Drive	Signal	AM	26.0	C	7.8	A	-18.2	NO
			PM	11.9	B	25.6	C	13.7	NO
15	Sports Arena Boulevard & Rosecrans Street	Signal	AM	35.7	D	37.6	D	1.9	NO
			PM	43.2	D	53.5	D	10.3	NO
16	Sports Arena Boulevard & Charles Lindbergh Parkway	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		13.9	B	--	NO
			PM			17.8	B	--	NO
17	Sports Arena Boulevard & Pacific Highway	Signal	AM	10.6	B	25.8	C	15.2	NO
			PM	12.0	B	17.9	B	5.9	NO
18	Kurtz Street & Hancock Street	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		12.3	B	--	NO
			PM			12.0	B	--	NO
19	Kurtz Street& Camino Del Rio West	Signal	AM	9.4	A	26.6	C	17.2	NO
			PM	20.2	C	43.5	D	23.3	NO

Table 5.2-7
Summary of Intersection Analysis

	Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Existing		Future		Δ in Delay	Significant Impact?
				DELAY (A)	LOS (B)	DELAY (A)	LOS (B)		
20	Kurtz Street & Rosecrans Street	Signal	AM	20.0	B	29.8	C	9.8	NO
			PM	31.7	C	37.0	D	5.3	NO
21	Kurtz Street & Pacific Highway	Signal	AM	11.2	B	31.0	C	19.8	NO
			PM	13.7	B	48.3	D	34.6	NO
22	Hancock Street & Channel Way	SSSC[1]	AM	9.3	A	10.0	B	0.7	NO
			PM	10.5	B	12.9	B	2.4	NO
23	Hancock Street & Camino Del Rio West	Signal	AM	24.3	C	35.3	D	11.0	NO
			PM	20.3	C	39.5	D	19.2	NO
24	Hancock Street & Rosecrans Street	*No Conflicting Movements*							
25	Hancock Street & Old Town Avenue	AWSC[2]	AM	16.9	C	24.8	C	7.9	NO
			PM	14.6	B	20.9	C	6.3	NO
26	Hancock Street & Witherby Street	AWSC[2]	AM	16.0	C	13.9	B	-2.1	NO
			PM	23.5	C	34.9	D	11.4	NO
27	Hancock Street & Washington Street	Signal	AM	22.8	C	23.1	C	0.3	NO
			PM	25.9	C	**77.8**	**E**	**51.9**	**YES**
28	Kettner Boulevard & Vine Street	SSSC[1]	AM	14.3	B	16.5	C	2.2	NO
			PM	23.2	C	19.9	C	-3.3	NO
29	Kettner Boulevard & Sassafras Street	Signal	AM	12.0	B	15.0	B	3.0	NO
			PM	11.9	B	15.3	B	3.4	NO
30	Kettner Boulevard & West Laurel Street	Signal	AM	20.0	B	19.3	B	-0.7	NO
			PM	29.7	C	**96.5**	**F**	**66.8**	**YES**
31	Pacific Highway & West Laurel Street	*No Conflicting Movements*							
32	Pacific Highway & Washington Street at Frontage Road	Signal	AM	19.4	B	20.4	C	1.0	NO
			PM	36.0	D	47.5	D	11.5	NO
33	Pacific Highway & Washington Street	Signal	AM	18.7	B	20.5	C	1.8	NO
			PM	31.2	C	27.7	C	-3.5	NO
34	Pacific Highway & Sassafras Street	Signal	AM	14.4	B	32.9	C	18.5	NO
			PM	27.3	C	**75.9**	**E**	**48.6**	**YES**
35	Pacific Highway & West Laurel Street	Signal	AM	48.4	D	**91.3**	**F**	**42.9**	**YES**
			PM	42.9	D	**141.3**	**F**	**98.4**	**YES**
New Intersections									
36	Midway Drive & Duke Street/Hancock Street	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		27.0	C	--	NO
			PM			32.1	C	--	NO
37	Kurtz Street & Frontier Drive	SSSC[1]	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		9.9	A	--	NO
			PM			19.0	C	--	NO
38	Kurtz Street & Greenwood Street	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		11.9	B	--	NO
			PM			16.9	B	--	NO

Table 5.2-7
Summary of Intersection Analysis

	Intersection	Traffic Control	Peak Hour	Existing		Future		Δ in Delay	Significant Impact?
				DELAY (A)	LOS (B)	DELAY (A)	LOS (B)		
39	Kurtz Street & Charles Lindbergh Parkway	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		8.3	A	--	NO
			PM			22.1	C	--	NO
40	Barnett Avenue & Dutch Flats Parkway	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		24.6	C	--	NO
			PM			14.5	B	--	NO
41	Midway Drive & Dutch Flats Parkway	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		48.5	D	--	NO
			PM			53.7	D	--	NO
42	Dutch Flats Parkway & Sports Arena Boulevard	Signal	AM	*Intersection does not currently exist*		10.9	B	--	NO
			PM			21.5	C	--	NO
Intersections Outside of Midway-Pacific Highway Community									
43	Hugo Street/North Harbor Drive & Rosecrans Street	Signal	AM	14.7	B	29.0	C	14.3	NO
			PM	20.7	C	31.6	C	10.9	NO
44	Nimitz Boulevard/ Lowell Street & Rosecrans Street	Signal	AM	41.2	D	38.7~~60.4~~	D~~E~~	-2.5~~19.2~~	NO~~YES~~
			PM	**63.3**	**E**	**83.1~~111.6~~**	**F**	**19.8~~48.3~~**	**YES**
45	Laning Road & Rosecrans Street	Signal	AM	15.5	B	25.5	C	10.0	NO
			PM	12.9	B	23.2	C	10.3	NO
46	Kettner Boulevard & West Hawthorn Street	Signal	AM	11.1	B	34.7	C	23.6	NO
			PM	15.0	B	13.3	B	-1.7	NO
47	Kettner Boulevard & West Grape Street	Signal	AM	7.4	A	10.1	B	2.7	NO
			PM	8.7	A	9.4	A	0.7	NO
48	Pacific Highway & Sea World Drive	Signal	AM	19.9	B	24.0	C	4.1	NO
			PM	25.6	C	34.1	C	8.5	NO
49	Pacific Highway & West Hawthorn Street	Signal	AM	35.4	D	34.4	C	-1.0	NO
			PM	20.2	C	31.7	C	11.5	NO
50	Pacific Highway & West Grape Street	Signal	AM	16.8	B	17.9	B	1.1	NO
			PM	24.2	C	31.4	C	7.2	NO
51	Friars Road & Sea World Drive	Signal	AM	11.5	B	15.4	B	3.9	NO
			PM	13.8	B	26.0	C	12.2	NO
52	I-5 SB Ramps & Sea World Drive	Signal	AM	15.5	B	17.8	B	2.3	NO
			PM	16.3	B	20.0	C	3.7	NO
53	I-5 NB Ramps & Sea World Drive	Signal	AM	21.4	C	29.3	C	7.9	NO
			PM	28.4	C	43.3	D	14.9	NO
54	Moore Street & Old Town Avenue	Signal	AM	16.4	B	23.2	C	6.8	NO
			PM	16.4	B	**96.5**	**F**	**80.1**	**YES**

Bold values indicate intersections operating at Level of Service (LOS) E or F.
(a) Delay refers to the average control delay for the entire intersection, measured in seconds per vehicle. At a one-way or two-way stop-controlled intersection, delay refers to the worst movement.
(b) LOS calculations are based on the methodology outlined in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual and performed using Synchro 9.0.
[1] Single Side Stop Controlled
[2] All Way Stop Controlled

d. Freeway Segments

Table 5.2-8 displays the LOS analysis results for the freeway segments using their existing freeway configuration and the future peak-hour traffic volumes. As shown, the traffic generated by the land use changes associated with the project would have a cumulative impact along eight freeway segments within the study area.

The following significant cumulative freeway segment impacts are identified:

Impact 5.2-17: I-5 NB (AM and PM peak hours) & SB (PM peak hour) from Clairemont Drive to Sea World Drive.

Impact 5.2-18: I-5 NB from Sea World Drive to I-8 in the AM and PM peak hours.

Impact 5.2-19: I-5 NB from Old Town Avenue to Washington Street in the AM and PM peak hours.

Impact 5.2-20: I-8 EB from Morena Boulevard to Hotel Circle Drive in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-21: I-5 SB from I-8 to Old Town Avenue in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-22: I-5 SB from Washington Street to Pacific Highway in the PM peak hour.

Impact 5.2-23: I-5 SB from Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street in the PM peak hour.

Table 5.2-8
Summary of Freeway Segment Level of Service

Freeway Segment	Direction	Number of Lanes	Capacity[1]	Existing		Future		Δ[3]	Significant Impact?
				V/C Ratio[2]	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS		
AM PEAK									
I-8									
Beginning of Freeway to Sports Arena Boulevard	EB	2M+0A	4,700	0.40	A	0.55	B	0.15	NO
	WB			0.28	A	0.36	A	0.08	NO
Sports Arena Boulevard to I-5	EB	3M+1A	8,450	0.52	B	0.64	C	0.12	NO
	WB			0.34	A	0.41	B	0.07	NO
I-5 to Morena Boulevard	EB	4M+1A	10,800	0.36	A	0.51	B	0.15	NO
	WB	5M+0A	11,750	0.47	B	0.66	C	0.19	NO
Morena Boulevard to Hotel Circle Drive	EB	4M+1A	10,800	0.60	B	0.70	C	0.10	NO
	WB	5M+0A	11,750	0.63	C	0.71	C	0.08	NO
I-5									
Clairemont Drive to Sea World Drive	NB	5M+0A	11,750	0.85	D	0.94	**E**	0.09	**YES**
	SB			0.53	B	0.59	B	0.06	NO
Sea World Drive to I-8	NB	4M+1A	10,800	0.83	D	0.97	**E**	0.17	**YES**
	SB	4M+2A	12,200	0.44	B	0.52	B	0.08	NO
I-8 to Old Town Avenue	NB	4M+1A	10,800	0.71	C	0.87	D	0.16	NO
	SB	5M+0A	11,750	0.67	C	0.83	D	0.16	NO
Old Town Avenue to Washington Street	NB	4M+0A	9,400	0.80	D	0.94	**E**	0.14	**YES**
	SB	5M+0A	11,750	0.66	C	0.79	D	0.13	NO
Washington Street to Pacific Highway	NB	4M+0A	9,400	0.64	C	0.76	C	0.12	NO
	SB			0.55	B	0.68	C	0.13	NO
Pacific Highway to Laurel Street	NB	4M+1A	10,800	0.61	B	0.89	D	0.28	NO
	SB			0.44	B	0.67	C	0.23	NO
Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street	NB	4M+1A	10,800	0.75	C	0.92	D	0.17	NO
	SB			0.56	B	0.70	C	0.14	NO
PM PEAK									
I-8									
Beginning of Freeway to Sports Arena Boulevard	EB	2M+0A	4,700	0.68	C	0.66	C	-0.02	NO
	WB			0.28	A	0.60	B	0.32	NO
Sports Arena Boulevard to I-5	EB	3M+1A	8,450	0.66	C	0.65	C	-0.01	NO
	WB			0.40	A	0.64	C	0.24	NO
I-5 to Morena Boulevard	EB	4M+1A	10,800	0.51	B	0.61	B	0.10	NO
	WB	5M+0A	11,750	0.44	B	0.71	C	0.27	NO
Morena Boulevard to Hotel Circle Drive	EB	4M+1A	10,800	0.90	D	1.02	**F**	0.12	**YES**
	WB	5M+0A	11,750	0.68	C	0.77	C	0.09	NO

Table 5.2-8
Summary of Freeway Segment Level of Service

Freeway Segment	Direction	Number of Lanes	Capacity[1]	Existing		Future		Δ[3]	Significant Impact?
				V/C Ratio[2]	LOS	V/C Ratio	LOS		
PM PEAK									
I-5									
Clairemont Drive to Sea World Drive	NB	5M+0A	11,750	0.91	D	1.00	**E**	0.09	**YES**
	SB			0.88	D	0.96	**E**	0.08	**YES**
Sea World Drive to I-8	NB	4M+1A	10,800	0.93	**E**	1.07	**F**	0.14	**YES**
	SB	4M+2A	12,200	0.75	C	0.88	D	0.13	NO
I-8 to Old Town Avenue	NB	4M+1A	10,800	0.68	C	0.82	D	0.14	NO
	SB	5M+0A	11,750	0.97	**E**	1.18	**F**	0.21	**YES**
Old Town Avenue to Washington Street	NB	4M+0A	9,400	0.96	**E**	1.14	**F**	0.18	**YES**
	SB	5M+0A	11,750	0.73	C	0.87	D	0.14	NO
Washington Street to Pacific Highway	NB	4M+0A	9,400	0.51	B	0.61	B	0.10	NO
	SB			0.89	D	1.09	**F**	0.20	**YES**
Pacific Highway to Laurel Street	NB	4M+1A	10,800	0.54	B	0.78	C	0.24	NO
	SB			0.56	B	0.86	D	0.30	NO
Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street	NB	4M+1A	10,800	0.66	C	0.77	C	0.11	NO
	SB			0.76	C	0.96	**E**	0.20	**YES**

Notes:
Bold values indicate freeway segments operating at Level of Service (LOS) E or F.
For descriptions of LOS ratings for freeway segments, refer to Table 5.2-3.
V/C Ratio is the volume-to-capacity ratio
Δ = change in v/c ratio between Existing and Future Conditions
[1]The capacity is calculated as 2,000 ADT per lane and 1,200 ADT per auxiliary lane
[2] Traffic volumes provided by City of San Diego model
[3] Peak-hour volume calculated by: (ADT*K*D)/Truck Factor

e. Ramp Meters

Table 5.2-9 displays the analysis results for the ramp meters using their existing configuration and meter rate and the future peak-hour traffic volumes. As shown, the traffic generated by the land use changes associated with the project would have a cumulative impact at one ramp meter within the study area as follows:

- **Impact 5.2-24:** I-5 SB/Sea World Drive Ramp in the PM peak hour.

Table 5.2-9
Peak Hour Ramp Metering Analysis – Horizon Year Conditions

On-Ramp	Peak Period	Meter Rate[1] (veh/hr)	Existing Demand[2] (veh/hr)	Excess Existing Demand (veh/hr)	Average Existing Delay (min)	Future Conditions Projected Demand[2] (veh/hr)	Excess Future Projected Demand (veh/hr)	Average Future Projected Delay (min)	D in Delay within Project (min)	Significant Impact?	Average with Project Queue
Sports Arena Boulevard to I-8 EB	Ramp not metered in the AM peak								0.0	NO	0 ft
	PM	641	913	272	25.5	920	279	26.1	0.6	NO	8,091 ft
Sea World Drive to I-5 SB	AM	444	375	0	0.0	530	86	11.6	11.6	NO	2,494 ft
	PM	444	528	84	11.4	670	226	30.5	**19.1**	**YES**	6,554 ft
Sea World Drive to I-5 NB	AM	1,555	1,261	0	0.0	1,530	0	0.0	0.0	NO	0 ft
	PM	1,656	1,170	0	0.0	1,250	0	0.0	0.0	NO	0 ft
Old Town Avenue to I-5 SB	Ramp not metered in the AM peak								0.0	NO	0 ft
	PM	461	360	0	0.0	410	0	0.0	0.0	NO	0 ft
Old Town Avenue to I-5 NB	AM	905	466	0	0.0	370	0	0.0	0.0	NO	0 ft
	PM	888	631	0	0.0	690	0	0.0	0.0	NO	0 ft

ft = feet; min = minutes; veh/hr = vehicles per hour

Issue 2 Alternative Transportation

Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?

a. Transit

Planned transit routes within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area identified in SANDAG's RP and discussed in the Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Communities Mobility Study include Rapid Bus, LRT (Trolley), and transit facilities as shown in Figure 5.2-3. Definitions of each of these types of service are provided in Chapter 2.0 of this PEIR. The changes in existing transit operations to serve the Midway-Pacific Highway community are described below.


- An **increase in local bus service** within key corridors to 10-minute headways is programmed and scheduled for Year 2035.

- **Bus Route 10** will convert to Rapid Service along its current route and expand its coverage through the Midway-Pacific Highway community to Ocean Beach. Route 10 currently provides local bus service between University/College Avenue and Old Town, through the communities of City Heights, North Park, and Hillcrest. The expected year for completion of this improvement is 2035.

- A new **Bus Route 28** will convert to Rapid Service along its current route. Route 28 currently provides local bus service along Rosecrans Street between Point Loma and Kearny Mesa via the Old Town Transit Center. The expected year for completion of this improvement is 2035.

- The **San Diego International Airport Intermodal Transit Center (ITC)** will act as an important hub connecting all modes of transportation accessing and departing from Lindbergh Field. The ITC is planned to be located on the north end of the airport, just south of I-5 between Washington Street and Sassafras Street. The ITC is being planned as a major transit hub connecting all three existing trolley lines (blue, green, and orange), the Coaster, Amtrak, new MTS Express Bus routes directly serving the airport, several local MTS bus routes, and the planned California High Speed Rail system. The ITC also plans to include raised bicycle lanes and cycle tracks on the streets surrounding the ITC and wider sidewalks around the ITC and new retail uses. The ITC is anticipated to be constructed and operational by the Year 2035.

The project would support implementation of the transit improvements identified in the RP by providing policies that support prioritizing the transit system and improving efficiency of transit services. For example, a number of transit-focused Mobility Element Policies are included in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU that would support efforts to develop planned transit facilities. Thus, implementation of the project would not interfere with implementation of planned transit improvements and would provide policy support for their implementation. Impacts related to conflicts with existing or planned transit facilities would be less than significant.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 1,600 3,200 Feet

Figure 5.2-3
Planned Transit Facilities

b. Bicycle Facilities

The project would support existing plans and policies relative to the bicycle network. The recommended bicycle facility network for the proposed CPU is shown in Figure 5.2-2. The Mobility Element includes several bicycle-focused policies that support installation of bicycle parking facilities, implementation of new separated and on-street bicycle facilities, and increasing the level of bicycle comfort and safety for all levels of bicycle riders. Policies in the proposed plan support coordination with SANDAG on the planning and implementation of regional bicycle facilities and support increased bicycle comfort and safety, repurposing right-of-way for bicycle facilities, and bike sharing. Thus, implementation of the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting bicycle facilities.

c. Pedestrian Facilities

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes a network of planned pedestrian facilities to support the level of pedestrian traffic in the area. Four multi-use urban paths are planned for the community to allow for shared pedestrian and bicycle use along Sports Arena Boulevard, Dutch Flats Parkway, Barnett Avenue, Lytton Street, Kemper Street, Midway Drive, Rosecrans Street, and Pacific Highway. In addition to the improvements along these major corridors, key pedestrian improvements are also identified along Camino Del Rio West and Barnett Avenue/Lytton Street. Additional pedestrian improvements are proposed at the intersections of Sports Arena Boulevard/West Point Loma Boulevard/Midway Drive, Sports Arena Boulevard/Rosecrans Street/Camino Del Rio West, and Pacific Highway/Barnett Avenue/Witherby Street.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Mobility Element includes a number of policies that support enhancements to pedestrian travel within the proposed CPU area such as implementing the multi-use urban path system, constructing sidewalk and intersection improvements, and installing missing sidewalks and curb ramps. In addition, the IFS for the proposed CPU will contain planned pedestrian improvements to install curb ramps, sidewalks, and audible pedestrian signals to meet ADA standards. Implementation of the project would not restrict or impede pedestrian connectivity and would not conflict with any adopted policies or plans addressing pedestrian facilities. Thus, impacts would be less than significant.

5.2.4 Significance of Impacts

Cumulative impacts to roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, and ramp meters were determined to be significant, as detailed below.

5.2.4.1 Traffic Circulation

a. Roadway Segments

- Kettner Boulevard: Washington Street to Laurel Street (**Impact 5.2-1**)
- Greenwood Street: Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street (**Impact 5.2-2**)
- Camino Del Rio West: Rosecrans Street to I-5/I-8 Ramps (**Impact 5.2-3**)
- Dutch Flats Parkway: Barnett Avenue to Midway Drive (**Impact 5.2-4**)
- Sassafras Street: Pacific Highway to Kettner Boulevard (**Impact 5.2-5**)

- Old Town Avenue: Hancock Street to San Diego Avenue **(Impact 5.2-6)**

b. Intersections

- Lytton Street & Rosecrans Street in the AM and PM peak hours (**Impact 5.2-7**)
- West Mission Bay Drive & I-8 WB Off-Ramp in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-8**)
- Midway Drive & Sports Arena Boulevard/West Point Loma Boulevard in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-9**)
- Midway Drive & Rosecrans Street in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-10**)
- Hancock Street & Washington Street in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-11**)
- Kettner Boulevard & West Laurel Street in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-12**)
- Pacific Highway & Sassafras Street in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-13**)
- Pacific Highway & West Laurel Street in the AM and PM peak hours (**Impact 5.2-14**)
- Nimitz Boulevard/Lowell Street & Rosecrans Street in the ~~AM and~~ PM peak hour~~s~~ (**Impact 5.2-15**)
- Moore Street & Old Town Avenue in the PM peak hour **(Impact 5.2-16)**

c. Freeway Segments

- I-5 NB (AM and PM peak hours) & SB (PM peak hour) from Clairemont Drive to Sea World Drive (**Impact 5.2-17**)
- I-5 NB from Sea World Drive to I-8 in the AM and PM peak hours (**Impact 5.2-18**)
- I-5 NB from Old Town Avenue to Washington Street in the AM and PM peak hours (**Impact 5.2-19**)
- I-8 EB from Morena Boulevard to Hotel Circle Drive in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-20**)
- I-5 SB from I-8 to Old Town Avenue in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-21**)
- I-5 SB from Washington Street to Pacific Highway in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-22**)
- I-5 SB from Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-23**)

d. Ramp Meters

- I-5 SB/Sea World Drive in the PM peak hour (**Impact 5.2-24**)

5.2.4.2 Alternative Transportation

The project would be consistent with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Additionally, the project would provide policies that support improvements to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact related to conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation, and no mitigation is required.

5.2.5 Mitigation Framework

The TIS identified improvements that would mitigate or reduce roadway segment and intersection impacts. One improvement is ultimately recommended as part of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and is included in the Midway-Pacific Highway IFS (TRANS 5.2-7b). The other identified

improvements that would mitigate or reduce vehicular impacts were not recommended as part of the project for various reasons, such as to maintain consistency with the overall proposed CPU mobility vision and other proposed CPU and General Plan goals and policies for walkable neighborhoods and multi-modal facilities, which are consistent with the General Plan's City of Villages strategy; lack of available right-of-way to accommodate an additional lane, maintain existing features, and/or allow for any other proposed improvements; removal of on-street parking, which is heavily utilized by area businesses and restaurants; and to maintain geometric continuity along roadway segments where improvements would otherwise bisect areas planned for residential redevelopment.

While mitigation measures TRANS 5.2-1 through TRANS 5.2-6 would reduce potentially significant impacts to roadway segments if implemented, none of the measures are included within the proposed IFS because they would require road widening or other automobile-related improvements that would impede implementation of planned pedestrian and bicycle improvements as well as realization of the proposed CPU's goals regarding walkability and bicycling.

While mitigation measures TRANS 5.2-7 through TRANS 5.2-16 would reduce potentially significant impacts to intersections if implemented, only TRANS 5.2-7b is included within the proposed IFS. The measures (other than TRANS 5.2-7b) are not included in the proposed IFS because they would impede implementation of planned pedestrian and bicycle improvements as well as realization of the proposed CPU's goals regarding walkability and bicycling.

Mitigation measures TRANS 5.2-17 through 5.2-24 are identified for impacts to freeways; however, because freeway improvements are not within the authority of the City, they are infeasible and not proposed as part of the proposed CPU. The improvements identified in SANDAG's RP would improve operations along the freeway segments and ramps; however, to what extent is still undetermined, as these are future improvements that must be defined more over time. The City will continue to coordinate with Caltrans and SANDAG on future improvements, as future project-level developments proceed, to develop potential "fair share" mitigation strategies for freeway impacts, as appropriate.

5.2.5.1 Roadway Segments

TRANS 5.2-1: Kettner Boulevard (Impact 5.2-1)

- Washington Street to Vine Street: Widen the roadway to a 4-lane major (one-way) arterial.
- Vine Street to Sassafras Street: Widen the roadway to a 4-lane major (one-way) arterial.
- Sassafras Street to Laurel Street: Widen the roadway to a 4-lane major (one-way) arterial.

TRANS 5.2-2: Greenwood Street from Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street (Impact 5.2-2): Improve the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a center left-turn lane.

TRANS 5.2-3: Camino Del Rio West from Rosecrans Street to I-5/I-8 Ramps (Impact 5.2-3): Improve the roadway to a 6-lane expressway.

TRANS 5.2-4: Dutch Flats Parkway from Barnett Avenue to Midway Drive (Impact 5.2-4): Improve the roadway to a 4-lane collector with a center left-turn lane.

TRANS 5.2-5: Sassafras Street from Pacific Highway to Kettner Boulevard (Impact 5.2-5): Widen the roadway to a 4-lane collector with center left-turn lane.

TRANS 5.2-6: Old Town Avenue (Impact 5.2-6):

- Hancock Street to Moore Street: Widen the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a center left-turn lane.
- Moore Street to San Diego Avenue: Widen the roadway to a 2-lane collector with a center-left-turn lane.

5.2.5.2 Intersections

TRANS 5.2-7: Lytton Street & Rosecrans Street (Impact 5.2-7):

a. Add a second southbound left-turn lane from Lytton Street to eastbound Rosecrans Street, add an additional westbound through movement lane on Rosecrans Street (three total), and implement right-turn overlap phases at all legs of the intersection.

b. Partial Mitigation: Add second southbound left-turn lane from Lytton Street to eastbound Rosecrans Street and implement right-turn overlap phases at all legs of the intersection. This improvement is identified in the Midway-Pacific Highway IFS.

TRANS 5.2-8: West Mission Bay Drive and I-8 Westbound Off-Ramp (Impact 5.2-8): Provide a third exclusive westbound right-turn lane from the Interstate 8 westbound off-ramp to W. Mission Bay Drive.

TRANS 5.2-9: Midway Drive and Sports Arena Boulevard/West Point Loma Boulevard (Impact 5.2-9): Provide dual left-turn lanes on Midway Drive in the northbound, on Sports Arena Boulevard in the southbound, and on West Point Loma Boulevard in the eastbound directions.

TRANS 5.2-10: Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street (Impact 5.2-10): Widen the eastbound and westbound approaches along Rosecrans Street to include a fourth through lane.

TRANS 5.2-11: Hancock Street and Washington Street (Impact 5.2-11): Restripe the southbound approach along Hancock Street to include a second southbound right-turn lane.

TRANS 5.2-12: Kettner Boulevard and West Laurel Street (Impact 5.2-12): Widen the eastbound approach of W. Laurel Street to include a third through lane.

TRANS 5.2-13: Pacific Highway and Sassafras Street (Impact 5.2-13): Add a second southbound left-turn lane from Pacific Highway to eastbound Sassafras Street.

TRANS 5.2-14: Pacific Highway and West Laurel Street (Impact 5.2-14): Widen the eastbound and westbound approaches of the intersection to include a second eastbound left-turn lane from West Laurel Street to Pacific Highway and a third through lane in each direction along West Laurel Street, as well as widen the northbound approach to include a second left-turn lane from northbound Pacific Highway to westbound West Laurel Street, and an exclusive right-turn lane from northbound Pacific Highway to eastbound West Laurel Street.

TRANS 5.2-15: Nimitz Boulevard/Lowell Street and Rosecrans Street (Impact 5.2-15): Widen the eastbound ~~and westbound~~ approach~~es~~ of the intersection along Rosecrans Street to include a third through lane~~, and an additional left-turn lane from eastbound Rosecrans Street to northbound Nimitz Boulevard~~.

TRANS 5.2-16: Old Town Avenue and Moore Street (Impact 5.2-16): Implement exclusive eastbound and westbound left-turn lanes along Old Town Avenue and convert the eastbound/westbound signal phasing from permitted to protected phasing.

5.2.5.3 Freeway Segments

TRANS 5.2-17: I-5 northbound and southbound from Clairemont Drive to Sea World Drive (Impact 5.2-17): SANDAG's Regional Plan identifies the construction of a managed lane along this segment to be completed by Year 2050. There is some uncertainty related to the actual improvements and associated traffic impacts that will materialize over time. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify individual project-level impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through fair share contributions in addition to the funding identified in the Revenue Constrained Network.

TRANS 5.2-18: I-5 northbound from Sea World Drive to I-8 (Impact 5.2-18): SANDAG's Regional Plan identifies the construction of a managed lane along this segment to be completed by Year 2050. There is some uncertainty related to the actual improvements and associated traffic impacts that will materialize over time. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify individual project-level impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through fair share contributions in addition to the funding identified in the Revenue Constrained Network.

TRANS 5.2-19: I-5 northbound from Old Town Avenue to Washington Street (Impact 5.2-19): SANDAG's Regional Plan identifies <u>operational improvements</u> ~~the construction of a managed lane~~ along this segment to be completed by Year 2050. There is some uncertainty related to the actual improvements and associated traffic impacts that will materialize over time. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify individual project-level impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through fair share contributions in addition to the funding identified in the Revenue Constrained Network.

TRANS 5.2-20: I-8 eastbound from Morena Boulevard to Hotel Circle Drive (Impact 5.2-20): SANDAG's Regional Plan identifies operational improvements along this segment to be completed

by Year 2050. There is some uncertainty related to the actual improvements and associated traffic impacts that will materialize over time. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify individual project-level impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through fair share contributions in addition to the funding identified in the Revenue Constrained Network.

TRANS 5.2-21: I-5 southbound from I-8 to Old Town Avenue (Impact 5.2-21): SANDAG's Regional Plan identifies operational improvements ~~the construction of a managed lane~~ along this segment to be completed by Year 2050. There is some uncertainty related to the actual improvements and associated traffic impacts that will materialize over time. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify individual project-level impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through fair share contributions in addition to the funding identified in the Revenue Constrained Network.

TRANS 5.2-22: I-5 southbound from Washington Street to Pacific Highway (Impact 5.2-22): SANDAG's Regional Plan identifies operational improvements ~~the construction of a managed lane~~ along this segment to be completed by Year 2050. There is some uncertainty related to the actual improvements and associated traffic impacts that will materialize over time. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify individual project-level impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through fair share contributions in addition to the funding identified in the Revenue Constrained Network.

TRANS 5.2-23: I-5 southbound from Laurel Street to Hawthorn Street (Impact 5.2-23): SANDAG's Regional Plan identifies operational improvements ~~the construction of a managed lane~~ along this segment to be completed by Year 2050. There is some uncertainty related to the actual improvements and associated traffic impacts that will materialize over time. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify individual project-level impacts and provide the mechanism to mitigate them through fair share contributions in addition to the funding identified in the Revenue Constrained Network.

5.2.5.4 Ramp Meters

TRANS 5.2-24: The City of San Diego shall coordinate with Caltrans to address ramp capacity at this impacted ramp location. Particularly, this impact could be reduced to less than significant by the following improvements: additional lanes, interchange reconfigurations, the implementation of a second interchange between Sea World Drive and Clairemont Drive (which is not currently included in the San Diego Forward Plan), and TDM as described in the Mobility Element in policies ME-7.1 through 7.9. However, specific capacity improvements are still undetermined, as these are future improvements that must be defined more over time. Additionally, the proposed CPU includes a variety of transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities that may help to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel, which can help improve ramp capacity. Still, implementation of freeway improvements in a timely manner is beyond the full control

of the City since Caltrans has approval authority over freeway improvements. ~~The City of San Diego shall coordinate with Caltrans to address ramp flow rate at the I-5 southbound/Sea World Drive Ramp (Impact 5.2-24). Ramp meter delays would decrease to less than 15 minutes if the ramp flow rate is increased from 444 cars per hour to 555 cars per hour. Improvements could include reducing the ramp meter cycle length or providing additional travel lanes; however, specific capacity improvements are still undetermined, as these are future improvements that must be defined more over time. Furthermore, implementation of freeway improvements in a timely manner is beyond the full control of the City since Caltrans has approval authority over freeway improvements.~~

5.2.6 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation

While implementation of the mitigation measures identified above would reduce impacts to less than significant at all of the roadway segments and intersections, only mitigation measure TRANS 5.2-7b is included within the proposed IFS. Mitigation measure TRANS 5.2-7b would reduce impacts at the intersection of Lytton Street and Rosecrans Street to LOS E in the AM peak hour and to LOS D in the PM peak hour, thereby reducing the impact in the PM peak hour to less than significant. In the remaining cases, the improvements that would mitigate or reduce vehicular impacts were not recommended as part of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU or the proposed IFS for various reasons, such as because they would be inconsistent with the mobility and urban design goals and policies of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and the City's General Plan for walkable neighborhoods and multi-modal facilities, which are consistent with the General Plan's City of Villages strategy; lack of available right-of-way to accommodate an additional lane, maintain existing features, and/or allow for any other proposed improvements; removal of on-street parking, which is heavily utilized by area businesses and restaurants; and to maintain geometric continuity along roadway segments where improvements would otherwise bisect areas planned for residential redevelopment.

Due to the programmatic nature of the project, there is uncertainty as to the specific phasing of development including actual design and specific location of future projects and thus the timing of the proposed mitigation improvements. Future development projects' transportation studies would be able to more accurately identify potential transportation impacts and provide the mechanism to address project-specific mitigation including, but not limited to, physical improvements, fair share contribution, or transportation demand management measures, or a combination of these measures. Impacts to roadway segments and intersections would remain significant and unavoidable.

Likewise, impacts to Caltrans facilities (freeway segments and ramps, Impacts 5.2-17 through 5.2-24) would remain significant and unavoidable because the City cannot ensure that the mitigation necessary to avoid or reduce the impacts to a level below significance would be implemented prior to occurrence of the impact.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

This section analyzes the potential impacts on historical and tribal cultural resources due to implementation of the project. It documents the historical background for the Midway-Pacific Highway community and addresses prehistoric, historic, archaeological, and tribal cultural resources. The information in this section is based on the City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area Historic Resources Survey Report: Historic Context & Reconnaissance Survey (Galvin Preservation Associates Inc. 2017) (Historic Resources Survey Report); the Community Plan Update for the Community of Midway-Pacific Highway Prehistoric Cultural Resources Report, City of San Diego, California (Cultural Constraints Analysis) (AECOM 2015); and other primary and secondary sources. These reports are included as Appendices D and E to this PEIR, respectively.

5.3.1 Existing Conditions

A general discussion of the environmental setting relative to historical and tribal cultural resources and the applicable regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.3.2 Methodology

A Prehistoric Cultural Resources Report and Historic Resources Survey Report (addressing the built-environment) were prepared for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and associated discretionary actions. The Cultural Resources Study describes the pre-history of the Midway-Pacific Highway area, identifies known significant archaeological resources (prehistoric and historic periods), provides guidance on the identification of possible new significant archaeological resources, and includes recommendations for treatment of significant archaeological resources. The Historic Resources Survey Report provides information regarding the significant historical themes in the development of Midway-Pacific Highway area, the property types that convey those themes in an important way, and the location of potential historical resources within the community, including individual resources, and districts.

5.3.2.1 Prehistoric and Archaeological Resources

Cultural sensitivity levels for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are rated low, moderate, or high based on the results of a literature search conducted at the SCIC at SDSU in 2011; a records update at the San Diego Museum of Man; an updated records search conducted by qualified City staff in 2014 using the CHRIS data, which includes Museum of Man records; a Sacred Lands File check by the NAHC; and regional environmental factors.

A low sensitivity rating indicates few or no previously recorded resources within the area. Resources at this level would not be expected to be complex, with little to no site structure or artifact diversity. The

potential for identification of additional resources in such areas would be low. A moderate sensitivity rating indicates that some previously recorded resources were identified within the area. These are more complex resources consisting of more site structure, diversity of feature types, and diversity of artifact types. The potential for the presence of additional resources in such areas would be moderate. Areas identified as high sensitivity would indicate that the records search identified several previously recorded sites within the area. These resources may range from moderately complex to highly complex, with more-defined living areas or specialized work space areas, and a large breadth of features and artifact assemblages. The potential for identification of additional resources in such areas would be high.

Sensitivity ratings may be adjusted based on the amount of disturbance that has occurred, which may have previously impacted archaeological resources.

Because the majority of the community is developed and there is very little undeveloped land within the proposed CPU area, the cultural sensitivity for the entire proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is considered moderate. However, based on the original natural setting of mud and salt marshes in the area and the fact that the majority of the area has been developed, the cultural sensitivity level for the majority of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is considered low. One section, south of Loma Portal and bounded by I-5 to the east, Pacific Highway to the west, and Laurel Street to the south, however, is considered to have moderate sensitivity. This portion of the community planning area was located along the former periodic shoreline of the San Diego River and at the base of the hills, making it attractive for prehistoric activities. Several prehistoric campsites, as well as a possible location for the ethnographic village of *Kotsi/Cosoy*/*Kosaii*/*Kosa'aay*, have been mapped by the SCIC in this area. Although this area has been subject to extensive development, and fill may be present, the cultural sensitivity for this area is considered moderate. As such, the community of Midway-Pacific Highway contains two sensitivity ratings as illustrated in Figure 5.3-1. Sensitivity levels may also be adjusted based on ongoing input from the Native American community.

5.3.2.2 Historical Resources

The Historic Resources Survey Report was conducted using a four-step approach, which included research, fieldwork, evaluation, and documentation. The research phase involved review of existing records and an archival records search. Existing information reviewed included local landmark application forms; the adopted Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan; the Historical Resources Inventory for Middletown Area; and San Diego History, General Plan. Archival research was conducted at the San Diego History Center, the San Diego Public Library, and the Los Angeles Public Central Library.

The fieldwork phase consisted of a property-by-property inspection of the entire proposed CPU area. Field teams identified individual properties that appeared eligible for individual designation, as well as geographically definable areas that appeared eligible for designation as historic districts.

All properties identified in the field as potentially eligible for designation were then evaluated using the City of San Diego local designation criteria. Properties determined potentially eligible for designation on the City's Register were then evaluated for the NRHP and CRHR. All properties identified and evaluated as potentially eligible for listing in the San Diego Register, CRHR, and/or NRHP as part of this survey were then documented in a database.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 2,000 4,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.3-1
Cultural Sensitivity Areas - Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources

All survey reports were analyzed and synthesized into the final Historic Resources Survey Report, including the historic context statement, which establishes the significant themes and property types that reflect those themes, and reconnaissance survey data.

5.3.3 Significance Determination Thresholds

Historical resources significance determinations, pursuant to the City of San Diego's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016), consist first of determining the sensitivity or significance of identified historical resources and, second, determining direct and indirect impacts that would result from project implementation. Based on the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, which have been adopted to guide a programmatic assessment of the project, impacts related to historical resources would be significant if the project would result in any of the following:

1) An alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of a historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, object or site; or

2) A substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric archaeological resource, a religious or sacred use site, or the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

3) 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

    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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe;

The City of San Diego's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds define a significant historical resource as one that qualifies for the CRHR or is listed in a local historic register or deemed significant in a historical resource survey, as provided under Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, although even a resource that is not listed in or determined eligible for listing in the CRHR, not included in a local register, or not deemed significant in a historical resource survey may nonetheless be historically significant for the purposes of CEQA. The City's Historical Resources Guidelines state the significance of a resource may be determined based on the potential for the resource to address important research questions as documented in a site-specific technical report prepared as part of the environmental review process.

Research priorities for the prehistoric, ethnohistoric, and historic periods of San Diego history are discussed in Appendix A to the City's Historical Resources Guidelines. As a baseline, the City of San Diego has established the following criteria to be used in the determination of significance under CEQA:

- An archaeological site must consist of at least three associated artifacts/ecofacts (within a 50-square-meter area) or a single feature and must be at least 45 years of age. Archaeological sites containing only a surface component are generally considered not significant, unless demonstrated otherwise. Such site types may include isolated finds, bedrock milling stations, sparse lithic scatters, and shellfish processing stations. All other archaeological sites are considered potentially significant. The determination of significance is based on a number of factors specific to a particular site including site size, type and integrity; presence or absence of a subsurface deposit, soil stratigraphy, features, diagnostics, and datable material; artifact and ecofact density; assemblage complexity; cultural affiliation; association with an important person or event; and ethnic importance.
- The determination of significance for historic buildings, structures, objects, and landscapes is based on age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, and integrity.
- A site will be considered to possess ethnic significance if it is associated with a burial or cemetery; religious, social, or traditional activities of a discrete ethnic population; an important person or event as defined by a discrete ethnic population; or the mythology of a discrete ethnic population.


5.3.4 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites

Would the project result in an alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of a historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, object, or site?

a. Individual Historic Resources

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is home to four designated historical resources listed in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Register. These are the Hebrew Cemetery Site, Dutch Flats/Ryan Field, Mission Brewery/American Agar Co., and the Mission Brewery Bottling Plant. Figure 5.3-2 shows the locations of these resources. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area also contains two properties listed in the NRHP: the Marine Corps Recruit Depot National Register Historic District and the Mission Brewery. Additionally, during the preparation of the Historic Resources Survey Report, 45 potential individual resources that appear eligible for local listing under the City of San Diego's designation criteria were identified. The locations of these resources are shown in Figure 5.3-3. During the Historic Resources Survey Report, observations and research conducted identified 45 properties as potentially significant individual resources. The resources identified can be found in the Midway-Pacific Highway. Community Plan Area Historic Resources Survey Report (Appendix D). Of the resources identified as potentially significant individual resources, approximately 53 percent are commercial properties, 15 percent are industrial properties, and 8 percent are educational or child-care properties. Other properties analyzed include a Catholic Church, a single-family home, an apartment complex, a hospital, a motel, a movie theater, and the Sports Arena. Thematically, the potentially significant individual resources are distributed as follows:




Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 1,600 3,200 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.3-2
Location of Designated Historical Resources



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 1,600 3,200 Feet

Figure 5.3-3

Location of Potentially Eligible City Register Designated Historic Resources

\\ussdg1fp001.na.aecomnet.com\data\projects_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\930 Graphics\PEIRs\Midway Figs\2-5.ai (dbrady) 09/28/17

- Transportation Improvements and Early Industrial Development, 1882–1914: 2 percent
- Military, Aerospace, and Related Industrial Development, 1901–1953: 17 percent
- Postwar Commercial and Residential Development, 1945–1970: 74 percent

One property (1929 Hancock Street) was identified as needing to be evaluated within the context of both Military, Aerospace, and Related Industrial Development, and Postwar Commercial and Residential Development. Therefore, the percentages shown above are out of a total of 46, and the property was counted in both development periods.

Three residential properties along Midway Drive had unknown dates of construction and the original owners of the buildings could not be determined at the time of the Historic Resources Survey Report. This makes up 7 percent of the potentially significant properties in the proposed CPU area.

While the SDMC provides for the regulation and protection of designated and potential historical resources, it is impossible to ensure the successful preservation of all historic built environment resources within the plan area. Thus, potential impacts to individual historic resources could occur where implementation of the project would result in increased development potential. Impacts would be considered significant.

b. Potential Historic Districts Identified in the Historic Resources Survey

The Historic Resources Survey Report identified one existing historic district, the Marine Corps Recruit Depot National Register Historic District, but did not identify any new areas that may be eligible as potential Historic Districts. Since the project would not increase development potential within the designated Historic District, the project would not result in a significant impact to this district. Additionally, indirect impacts to the Historic District are not anticipated because development in these areas would be subject to existing General Plan and proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies that address development sensitivity to surrounding character.

c. Multiple Property Listing

A Multiple Property Listing (MPL) is a group of related significant properties with shared themes, trends, and patterns of history. The Midway-Pacific Highway Historical Resources Survey has not identified any thematically related property groupings that appear eligible as MPLs. However, the Historic Preservation Element does note the potential that properties within the planning area could be included in future City-wide MPLs addressing themes such as defense-industry resources. Any such resources would be evaluated when and if such an MPL is established.

Impact 5.3-1: Implementation of the project could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning.

Issue 2 Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains

Would the project result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric or historic archaeological resource, a religious or sacred use site, or the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

According to the Cultural Constraints Analysis, seven archaeological and cultural resources have been recorded within the Midway-Pacific Highway community. These resources consist of one prehistoric campsite, one prehistoric village site with an associated burial ground, one possible location for the ethnographic village of *Kotsi/Cosoy/Kosaii/Kosa'aay*, two historic dumps, one historic refuse deposit, and one complex of brick kilns and factory features associated with the Vitrified Products Corporation.

Although there is very little undeveloped land within the proposed CPU area, future development and related construction activities, facilitated by the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU at the project level could result in the alteration or destruction of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources, objects, or sites and could impact religious or sacred uses; or disturb human remains, particularly considering the proximity to the community of Old Town. Direct impacts may include substantial alteration or demolition of archaeological sites from grading, excavation, or other ground-disturbing activities. Indirect impacts may include the potential for vandalism or destruction of an archaeological resource or traditional cultural property.

Avoiding impacts on religious or sacred places or human remains may not be possible in certain circumstances when resources are discovered during construction. The NAHC has indicated that sacred lands have been identified within the vicinity of Midway-Pacific Highway. Consultation with tribal entities and other interested parties has been recommended. Additionally, as stated previously, the southeast corner of the Midway area and the northern portion of the Pacific-Highway corridor has been determined to have a moderate cultural resource sensitivity, as several prehistoric campsites and a possible location for the ethnographic village of *Kotsi/Cosoy/Kosaii/Kosa'aay* have been mapped by the SCIC in that area. Therefore, tribal consultation in accordance with AB 52 and the Public Resources Code has been incorporated into the mitigation framework for subsequent projects to ensure that tribal cultural resources are addressed early in the development review process. However, the potential for encountering human remains during construction activities remains a possibility.

The City has developed Historical Resource Sensitivity Maps that provide general locations of where historical resources are known to occur or have the potential to occur. These maps were developed in coordination with technical experts and tribal representatives. Upon submittal of ministerial and/or discretionary permit applications, a parcel is reviewed against the Historical Resource Sensitivity Maps specifically to determine whether the project has the potential to adversely impact an archaeological resource that may be eligible for individual listing in the local register (SDMC Section 143.0212).

This review is supplemented with a project-specific records search of the NAHC Sacred Lands File by qualified staff and, as stated above, a site-specific archaeological survey would be required.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is designed to support the historic preservation goals of the General Plan, and contains policies requiring protection and preservation of significant archaeological

resources in the proposed Historic Preservation Element. Native American consultation early in the project review process is also included in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU to identify tribal cultural resources and to develop adequate treatment and mitigation for significant archaeological sites with cultural and religious significance to the Native American community in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations and guidelines.

While existing regulations, the SDMC, and proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies would provide for the regulation and protection of archaeological resources and human remains and avoid potential impacts, it is impossible to ensure the successful preservation of all archaeological resources. Therefore, potential impacts to archaeological resources are considered significant.

Impact 5.3-2: Implementation of the project could adversely impact a prehistoric or historic archaeological resource including religious or sacred use sites and human remains.

Issue 3 Tribal Cultural Resource

Would the project result in 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:

1. *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*
2. *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 Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

In 2008, the Planning Department began the initiation process to update the Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan. As part of that process, the City requested a list of California Native American Tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area from the NAHC. In August of 2009, notices were sent to the contacts identified by the NAHC; however, no responses were received requesting consultation on the project. During the course of the next three years, a series of public workshops were held to develop a draft plan, and an archaeological consultant was retained to assist the City with developing a constraints analysis for the CPU. In 2011, a Sacred Lands File Check of the NAHC was requested. The NAHC response indicated that although no sacred lands were identified in the vicinity of the community plan area, they recommended consultation with tribal entities and other interested parties be conducted as part of the environmental review process. An updated list of contacts specific to the project area for that purpose was provided by the NAHC.

An NOP was released in October 2015, several months after the passage of AB 52. At that time, the City of San Diego had not yet received any formal requests for notification by a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed CPU, and therefore, formal consultation under AB 52 was not initiated. During this time, however, the City had already provided notification to locally affiliated tribes in accordance with SB 18 and no requests for consultation were requested. On June 30, 2016, the City received letters and maps from the Iipay Nation

of Santa Ysabel and Jamul Indian Village identifying their traditionally and culturally affiliated areas within the City of San Diego's jurisdictional boundaries for the purpose of AB 52 notification, which includes the CPU area. In July 2017, letters were sent to both tribes informing them that a Draft PEIR was being prepared for the project, and requesting if consultation was required in accordance with the provisions of AB 52. Although no response was received within the prescribed timeframe, information about the proposed CPU project scope, records search results, and proposed mitigation framework for subsequent project review was presented at a subsequent monthly tribal consultation meeting in November 2017. The City's programmatic approach to future "project-level" environmental review was discussed, including assurance that AB 52 consultation would be implemented during project-specific environmental review when known resources are present or a potential exists for resources to be encountered. All concurred and consultation was concluded. ~~In November 2017, the project scope and EIR analysis was discussed with both tribal representatives, at which time it was determined that formal consultation would not be required for community plan updates and that the subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the adopted CPU and Mitigation Framework would be subject to the provisions of AB 52 and may require tribal consultation at that time.~~

As stated in Section 2.3.3.1, the Sacred Lands File check from the NAHC indicated that no sacred lands have been identified within the proposed CPU area. Several key areas have been identified that may be of high level of interest to local Native American communities. Many of these are already listed on the City's Historical Resources Register, the California Register of Historical Resources, and the National Register of Historic Places, or have not been formally recognized. For any subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the proposed CPU where a recorded archaeological site or Tribal Cultural Resource (as defined in the Public Resources Code) is identified, the City would be required to initiate consultation with identified California Indian tribes pursuant to the provisions in Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2, in accordance with AB 52. Results of the consultation process will determine the nature and extent of any additional archaeological evaluation or changes to the project and appropriate mitigation measures for direct impacts that cannot be avoided.

Native American consultation early in the project review process is also included in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU to identify tribal cultural resources and to develop adequate treatment and mitigation for significant archaeological sites with cultural and religious significance to the Native American community in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations and guidelines.

While existing regulations, the SDMC, and proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies would provide for the regulation and protection of tribal cultural resources and would avoid potential impacts, it is impossible to ensure the successful preservation of all tribal cultural resources. Therefore, potential impacts to tribal cultural resources are considered significant.

Impact 5.3-3: Implementation of the project could adversely impact a tribal cultural resource.

5.3.5 Significance of Impacts

5.3.5.1 Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites

Implementation of the project could result in an alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site where an increase in density is proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan or current zoning (**Impact 5.3-1**). These impacts would be potentially significant.

5.3.5.2 Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains

Implementation of the project could adversely impact prehistoric or historic archaeological resources, including religious or sacred use sites and human remains (**Impact 5.3-2**). These impacts would be potentially significant.

5.3.5.3 Tribal Cultural Resources

Implementation of the project could adversely impact tribal cultural resources (**Impact 5.3-3**). These impacts would be significant.

5.3.6 Mitigation Framework

The General Plan, combined with federal, state, and local regulations, provides a regulatory framework for project-level historical resources evaluation/analysis criteria and, when applicable, mitigation measures for future discretionary projects. All development projects with the potential to affect historical resources—such as designated historical resources; historical buildings, districts, landscapes, objects, and structures; important archaeological sites; tribal cultural resources; and traditional cultural properties—are subject to site-specific review in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines through the subsequent project review process. The following mitigation measures (**HIST 5.3-1** and **HIST 5.3-2**) provide a framework that would be required of all development projects with the potential to impact significant historical resources.

HIST 5.3-1: Historic Buildings, Structures, and Objects

Prior to issuance of any permit for a development project implemented in accordance with the project that would directly or indirectly affect a building/structure in excess of 45 years of age, the City shall determine whether the affected building/structure is historically significant. The evaluation of historic architectural resources shall be based on criteria such as age, location, context, association with an important person or event, uniqueness, or structural integrity, as indicated in the Historical Resources Guidelines.

Preferred mitigation for historic buildings or structures shall be to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm to the resource shall be taken. Depending upon project impacts, measures shall include, but are not limited to:

- Preparing a historic resource management plan;
- Adding new construction that is compatible in size, scale, materials, color, and workmanship to the historical resource (such additions, whether portions of existing buildings or additions to historic districts, shall be clearly distinguishable from historic fabric);
- Repairing damage according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation;
- Screening incompatible new construction from view through the use of berms, walls, and landscaping in keeping with the historic period and character of the resource; and
- Shielding historic properties from noise generators through the use of sound walls, double glazing, and air conditioning.

Specific types of historical resource reports, outlined in Section III of the Historical Resources Guidelines, are required to document the methods to be used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources, to identify potential impacts from a project, and to evaluate the significance of any historical resources identified. If potentially significant impacts to an identified historical resource are identified, these reports will also recommend appropriate mitigation to reduce the impacts to below a level of significance, where possible. If required, mitigation programs can also be included in the report.

HIST 5.3-2: Archaeological and Tribal Cultural Resources

Prior to issuance of any permit for a future development project implemented in accordance with the project that could directly affect an archaeological or tribal cultural resource, the City shall require that the following steps be taken to determine (1) the presence of archaeological or tribal cultural resources and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources that may be impacted by a development activity. Sites may include, but are not limited to, residential and commercial properties, privies, trash pits, building foundations, and industrial features representing the contributions of people from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Sites may also include resources associated with prehistoric Native American activities.

Initial Determination

The environmental analyst will determine the likelihood for the project site to contain historical resources by reviewing site photographs and existing historic information (e.g., Archaeological Sensitivity Maps, the Archaeological Map Book, and the City's "Historical Inventory of Important Architects, Structures, and People in San Diego") and may conduct a site visit, as needed. If there is any evidence that the site contains archaeological or tribal cultural resources, then an archaeological evaluation consistent with the City Guidelines would be required. All individuals conducting any phase of the

archaeological evaluation program must meet professional qualifications in accordance with the City Guidelines.

Step 1:

Based on the results of the Initial Determination, if there is evidence that the site contains a historical resource, preparation of a historic evaluation is required. The evaluation report would generally include background research, field survey, archaeological testing, and analysis. Before actual field reconnaissance would occur, background research is required, which includes a records search at the SCIC at San Diego State University. Site records from the San Diego Museum of Man are now included in the data provided by the SCIC; however, in some instances, supplemental research at the Museum of Man may be required. A review of the Sacred Lands File maintained by the NAHC must also be conducted at this time. Information about existing archaeological collections should also be obtained from the San Diego Archaeological Center and any tribal repositories or museums.

In addition to the records searches mentioned above, background information may include, but is not limited to, examining primary sources of historical information (e.g., deeds and wills), secondary sources (e.g., local histories and genealogies), Sanborn Fire Maps, and historic cartographic and aerial photograph sources; reviewing previous archaeological research in similar areas, models that predict site distribution, and archaeological, architectural, and historical site inventory files; and conducting informant interviews. The results of the background information would be included in the evaluation report.

Once the background research is complete, a field reconnaissance must be conducted by individuals whose qualifications meet the standards outlined in the City Guidelines. Consultants are encouraged to employ innovative survey techniques when conducting enhanced reconnaissance, including, but not limited to, remote sensing, ground penetrating radar, and other soil resistivity techniques as determined on a case-by-case basis. Native American participation is required for field surveys when there is likelihood that the project site contains prehistoric archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties. If through background research and field surveys historical resources are identified, then an evaluation of significance, based on the City Guidelines, must be performed by a qualified archaeologist.

Step 2

Where a recorded archaeological site or Tribal Cultural Resource (as defined in the Public Resources Code) is identified, the City would be required to initiate consultation with identified California Indian tribes pursuant to the provisions in Public Resources Code Sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2., in accordance with AB 52. It should be noted that during the consultation process, tribal representative(s) will be directly involved in making recommendations regarding the significance of a tribal cultural resource that also could be a prehistoric archaeological site. A testing program may be recommended, which requires reevaluation of the project in consultation with the Native American

representative, which could result in a combination of project redesign to avoid and/or preserve significant resources as well as mitigation in the form of data recovery and monitoring (as recommended by the qualified archaeologist and Native American representative). The archaeological testing program, if required, shall include evaluating the horizontal and vertical dimensions of a site, the chronological placement, site function, artifact/ecofact density and variability, presence/absence of subsurface features, and research potential. A thorough discussion of testing methodologies, including surface and subsurface investigations, can be found in the City Guidelines. Results of the consultation process will determine the nature and extent of any additional archaeological evaluation or changes to the project.

The results from the testing program shall be evaluated against the Significance Thresholds found in the Guidelines. If significant historical resources are identified within the Area of Potential Effects, the site may be eligible for local designation. However, this process would not proceed until such time that the tribal consultation has been concluded and an agreement is reached (or not reached) regarding significance of the resource and appropriate mitigation measures are identified. When appropriate, the final testing report must be submitted to Historical Resources Board staff for eligibility determination and possible designation. An agreement on the appropriate form of mitigation is required prior to distribution of a draft environmental document. If no significant resources are found, and site conditions are such that there is no potential for further discoveries, then no further action is required. Resources found to be non-significant as a result of a survey and/or assessment will require no further work beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation site forms and inclusion of results in the survey and/or assessment report. If no significant resources are found, but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicate there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring is required.

Step 3:

Preferred mitigation for historical resources is to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm shall be taken. For archaeological resources where preservation is not an option, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program is required, which includes a Collections Management Plan for review and approval. When tribal cultural resources are present and also cannot be avoided, appropriate and feasible mitigation will be determined through the tribal consultation process and incorporated into the overall data recovery program, where applicable, or project-specific mitigation measures will be incorporated into the project. The data recovery program shall be based on a written research design and is subject to the provisions as outlined in CEQA Section 21083.2. The data recovery program must be reviewed and approved by the City's Environmental Analyst prior to distribution of a draft CEQA document and shall include the results of the tribal consultation process. Archaeological monitoring may be required during building demolition and/or construction grading when significant resources are known or suspected to be present on a site, but cannot be recovered prior to grading due to obstructions such as, but not limited to, existing development or dense vegetation.

A Native American observer must be retained for all subsurface investigations, including geotechnical testing and other ground-disturbing activities, whenever a Native American tribal cultural resource or any archaeological site located on City property or within the Area of Potential Effects of a City project would be impacted. In the event that human remains are encountered during data recovery and/or a monitoring program, the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 5097 must be followed. In the event that human remains are discovered during project grading, work shall halt in that area and the procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (Section 50987.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Section 7050.5), and in the federal, state, and local regulations described above shall be undertaken. These provisions will be outlined in the MMRP included in a subsequent project-specific environmental document. The Native American monitor shall be consulted during the preparation of the written report, at which time they may express concerns about the treatment of sensitive resources. If the Native American community requests participation of an observer for subsurface investigations on private property, the request shall be honored.

Step 4:

Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared by qualified professionals as determined by the criteria set forth in Appendix B of the Guidelines. The discipline shall be tailored to the resource under evaluation. In cases involving complex resources, such as traditional cultural properties, rural landscape districts, sites involving a combination of prehistoric and historic archaeology, or historic districts, a team of experts will be necessary for a complete evaluation.

Specific types of historical resource reports are required to document the methods (see Section III of the Guidelines) used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources; to identify the potential impacts from proposed development and evaluate the significance of any identified historical resources; to document the appropriate curation of archaeological collections (e.g., collected materials and the associated records); in the case of potentially significant impacts to historical resources, to recommend appropriate mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance; and to document the results of mitigation and monitoring programs, if required.

Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared in conformance with the California Office of Historic Preservation “Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format” (see Appendix C of the Guidelines), which will be used by Environmental staff in the review of archaeological resource reports. Consultants must ensure that archaeological resource reports are prepared consistent with this checklist. This requirement will standardize the content and format of all archaeological technical reports submitted to the City. A confidential appendix must be submitted (under separate cover) along with historical resources reports for archaeological sites and tribal cultural resources containing the confidential resource maps and records search information gathered during the background study. In addition, a Collections Management Plan shall be prepared for projects that result in a substantial collection of artifacts and must address the management and research goals of the project and the types of

materials to be collected and curated based on a sampling strategy that is acceptable to the City. Appendix D (Historical Resources Report Form) may be used when no archaeological resources were identified within the project boundaries.

Step 5:

For Archaeological Resources: All cultural materials, including original maps, field notes, non-burial related artifacts, catalog information, and final reports recovered during public and/or private development projects must be permanently curated with an appropriate institution, one that has the proper facilities and staffing for ensuring research access to the collections consistent with state and federal standards, unless otherwise determined during the tribal consultation process. In the event that a prehistoric and/or historic deposit is encountered during construction monitoring, a Collections Management Plan would be required in accordance with the project MMRP. The disposition of human remains and burial-related artifacts that cannot be avoided or are inadvertently discovered is governed by state (i.e., AB 2641 [Coto] and California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001 [Health and Safety Code 8010-8011]) and federal (i.e., Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [U.S.C. 3001-3013]) law, and must be treated in a dignified and culturally appropriate manner with respect for the deceased individual(s) and their descendants. Any human bones and associated grave goods of Native American origin shall be turned over to the appropriate Native American group for repatriation.

Arrangements for long-term curation of all recovered artifacts must be established between the applicant/property owner and the consultant prior to the initiation of the field reconnaissance. When tribal cultural resources are present, or non-burial-related artifacts associated with tribal cultural resources are suspected to be recovered, the treatment and disposition of such resources will be determined during the tribal consultation process. This information must then be included in the archaeological survey, testing, and/or data recovery report submitted to the City for review and approval. Curation must be accomplished in accordance with the California State Historic Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collection (dated May 7, 1993) and, if federal funding is involved, Title 36 of the CFR, Part 79. Additional information regarding curation is provided in Section II of the Guidelines.

5.3.7 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation

5.3.7.1 Historic Structures, Objects, or Sites

Development implemented in accordance with the project that would potentially result in impacts to significant historical resources would be required to incorporate mitigation measure **HIST 5.3-1**, to be adopted in conjunction with the certification of this PEIR, and consistent with existing requirements of the Historic Resources Regulations and Historic Resources Guidelines. The mitigation framework combined with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of historical resources would reduce the program-level impact related to historical resources of the built environment. However, even with implementation of the mitigation framework, the degree of future

impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at this program level of analysis.

Modifications made to resources within the Marine Corps Recruit Depot National Register Historic District are outside of the City's jurisdiction, and would be addressed in consultation with the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO) through the federal Section 106 process. Because additional development potential is not proposed in that area, implementation of the project would not have an adverse effect on the National Register Historic District. However, in other areas where development potential would increase compared to the adopted Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan and current zoning, potential impacts to historical resources would remain significant and unavoidable. Thus, potential impacts to historical resources, including historic structures, objects, or sites, would be significant and unavoidable.

5.3.7.2 Prehistoric or Historic Archaeological Resources, Sacred Sites, and Human Remains

Development implemented in accordance with the project would potentially result in impacts to significant archaeological resources, and therefore would be required to implement mitigation measure **HIST 5.3-2**, which addresses measures to minimize impacts to archaeological resources. This mitigation, combined with the policies of the General Plan and proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies promoting the identification, protection, and preservation of archaeological resources, in addition to compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation early in the development review process, and the City's Historical Resources Regulations (SDMC Section 143.0212), which requires review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps, would reduce the program-level impact related to prehistoric or historical archaeological resources and avoid potential future project-level impacts. However, even with application of the existing regulatory framework and mitigation framework, the feasibility and efficacy of mitigation measures cannot be determined at this program level of analysis. Thus, impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, sacred sites, and human remains would be minimized but would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.3.7.3 Tribal Cultural Resources

Development implemented in accordance with the project would potentially result in impacts to significant tribal cultural resources, and therefore would be required to implement mitigation measure **HIST 5.3-2**, which addresses measures to minimize impacts to tribal cultural resources. This mitigation, combined with the policies of the General Plan and proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies promoting the identification, protection, and preservation of archaeological resources, in addition to compliance with CEQA and Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1 requiring tribal consultation early in the development review process, and the City's Historical Resources Regulations (SDMC Section 143.0212), which requires review of ministerial and discretionary permit applications for any parcel identified as sensitive on the Historical Resources Sensitivity Maps, would reduce the program-level impact related to tribal cultural resources and avoid potential future project-level impacts. However, even with application of the uniformly applied development policies and the mitigation framework, the feasibility and efficacy of mitigation measures cannot be determined at this program level of analysis. Thus, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be minimized but would remain significant and unavoidable.

5.4 Geologic Conditions

Wilson Geosciences Inc. prepared the Seismic and Geologic Technical Background Report for the City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Community Plan Updates, and Environmental Impact Report, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California (Geotechnical Report [April 2012]). That analysis addresses geotechnical impacts associated with the two proposed CPUs, including the project. AECOM prepared an update letter (AECOM 2017) to the 2012 report that presents recently acquired geologic information. The Geotechnical Report and update letter are included as Appendix F to this PEIR. This section presents a summary of the findings made in the report and update, and the associated analysis of potential impacts.

5.4.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

Soil and geologic conditions are described in detail in Section 2.3.4 of this PEIR. In summary, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is underlain almost exclusively by artificial fill and other surficial deposits, with some areas underlain by old paralic deposits (Qop unit 6). The geologic formations in the Midway Community Plan area include the Mount Soledad Formation, and the San Diego Formation. Figure 2-6 in Chapter 2, Environmental Setting, illustrates the location of the geologic units located within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area.

The City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study, Geologic Hazards and Faults (2008), maps the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area as having a low to high potential for liquefaction (Geologic Hazard Categories 31 and 32), and having low to moderate risk of slope instability (Geologic Hazard Categories 52 and 53). In addition, segments of the Rose Canyon Fault Zone are mapped within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area as fault buffers (Geologic Hazard Category 12) possibly containing faults with a low to moderate risk of surface rupture during an earthquake. Figure 5.4-1 provides a map of geologic hazards and faults for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area as identified in the Geotechnical Report (Appendix F).

5.4.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Thresholds used to evaluate potential impacts to geologic conditions are based on the City of San Diego's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016). Thresholds are modified from the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds to reflect the programmatic analysis for the project. For impacts related to geologic conditions, a significant impact could occur if implementation of the project would result in:

- 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;
- Strong seismic ground shaking;
- Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction; or
- Landslides;

2. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil;
3. 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 on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse; or
4. 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.

This section does not include analysis related to the capacity of soils to support septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems, since sewers are available throughout the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area.


5.4.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Seismic Hazards

Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides?

Future development associated with implementation of the project could result in the exposure of more people, structures, and infrastructure to seismic hazards.

The southern part of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located with the Rose Canyon Fault Zone. Other nearby known active faults are the Coronado Bank and the Newport-Inglewood (offshore) faults, located 11.9 and 30.9 miles from the proposed CPU area, respectively. Table 5.4-1 lists the estimated maximum earthquake magnitude and peak horizontal ground acceleration for faults in relationship to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. This table presents a deterministic analysis (“conservative” or “worst-case”) of the potential earthquake ground shaking effects from the maximum magnitude earthquakes for the faults listed. Using the Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) scale, a measure of the local shaking intensity of earthquakes, the table shows MMIs of VI to VIII, which range from light to moderate/heavy damage to ordinary substantial structures with strong to severe shaking. These intensities generally correspond to peak horizontal ground acceleration levels of greater than 10 percent gravity (0.1g).



Legend

Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area

EXPLANATION

CITY OF SAN DIEGO GEOLOGIC HAZARD CATEGORIES

Fault Zones

- 11 - Active, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone
- 12 - Potentially Active, Inactive, Presumed Inactive, or Activity Unknown
- 13 - Downtown special fault zone

Slide-Prone Formations

- 23 - Friars: neutral or favorable geologic structure
- 24 - Friars: unfavorable geologic structure

Liquefaction

- 31 - High Potential: shallow groundwater, major drainages, hydraulic fills
- 32 - Low Potential: fluctuating groundwater, minor drainages

Other Terrain

- 51 - Level mesas: underlain by terrace deposits and bedrock, nominal risk
- 52 - Other level areas, gently sloping to steep terrain, favorable geologic structure, low risk
- 53 - Level or sloping terrain, unfavorable geologic structure, low to moderate risk.
- 55 - Modified terrain (graded sites), nominal risk

Faults

- Fault
- Inferred Fault
- Concealed Fault
- Shear Zone

Source: SanGIS, City of San Diego, 2011

0 2,000 4,000 Feet

Portions of the DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.4-1
City of San Diego Geologic Hazards and Faults

This page intentionally left blank.

Table 5.4-1 Deterministic Seismic Hazard Parameters				
Fault Name	Distance from Project Area (Miles)	Maximum Magnitude (Mw)	Peak Ground Acceleration (gravity [g])	Estimate Modified Mercalli Intensity[3]
Rose Canyon	0.76	6.7-6.9	0.37-0.56	VIII
Coronado Bank	11.9	7.3-7.4	0.21-0.33	VII
Newport-Inglewood	30.9	6.8-7.0	0.11-0.18	VI
Elsinore (Julian)	41.9	7.3-7.4	0.10-0.17	VI
Elsinore (Temecula)	42.4	6.9-7.1	0.09-0.15	VI
Earthquake Valley	46.6	6.6	0.07-0.11	VI
Elsinore (Coyote Mountain)	52.7	6.7-6.9	0.07-0.11	VI
Palos Verdes	55.2	7.2-7.3	0.08-0.13	VI
San Jacinto (Coyote Creek)	62.7	6.8-7.0	0.06-0.10	VI
San Joaquin Hills	64.5	6.9-7.1	0.07-0.12	VI
San Jacinto (Anza)	64.9	7.2-7.3	0.07-0.11	VI
San Jacinto (Clark)	64.9	6.9-7.1	0.06-0.10	VI
Source: Wilson Geosciences Inc. 2012				

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area could be subject to moderate ground shaking in the event of an earthquake along any of the faults listed in Table 5.4-1 or other faults in the Southern California/Northern Baja California region. The highest peak ground accelerations and MMI intensities would be produced by the Rose Canyon, Coronado Bank, Newport-Inglewood (offshore), and Elsinore (Julian and Temecula segments) faults.

A geotechnical investigation that specifically addresses surface fault-rupture hazard is required for projects located in the fault buffer zones. The Potentially Active, Inactive, Presumed Inactive, or Activity Unknown fault zone (Geologic Hazard Category 12) affects a small portion of the Pacific-Highway corridor, which will require fault activity investigations for habitable structures; setbacks or special foundations may be required. Permit approval for projects within the Potentially Active, Inactive, Presumed Inactive, or Activity Unknown fault zone requires that a site-specific fault investigation be performed.

Seismic/earthquake shaking risk/hazard estimates are also presented in the Geotechnical Report using a probabilistic analysis. A probabilistic analysis considers the full range of possible earthquakes, their location and frequency of occurrence, size, and the propagation of the earthquake motion from the rupture zone to the site, thereby providing a more “realistic” evaluation. Two commonly used frequencies of occurrence for a probabilistic analysis are a 10 percent chance of being exceeded in 50 years and a 2 percent chance of being exceeded in 50 years, corresponding to earthquake return periods of 475 years and 2,475 years, respectively.

A planning level 10 percent in 50 years estimate of the peak ground accelerations and of the spectral accelerations for 0.2-second and 1.0-second frequencies (short and moderately long periods, respectively) are provided (Table 5.4-2). The values for 10 percent probability of being exceeded in 50 years were developed using the California Geological Survey estimation procedures for a “design basis earthquake” and should only be used as planning estimates, not for design.

Table 5.4-2
Estimated Probabilistic Earthquake Ground Acceleration Parameters in the Project Area

Ground Motion	Firm Rock	Soft Rock	Alluvium[2]
Peak Ground Acceleration (in "g" force of gravity)	0.28	0.30	0.34
Spectral Acceleration[1] (0.2 sec)	0.66	0.71	0.81
Spectral Acceleration (1.0 sec)	0.25	0.31	0.39

[1]. Spectral Acceleration = 0.2 second generally represents the natural period for short (one- to three-story) buildings, and 1.0 second for tall buildings (generally ~10 stories). Bridges are generally within the range of 0.3 to 1.2 seconds.
[2]. Denotes the predominant earth material throughout the Project Area.
Source: Wilson Geosciences Inc. 2012

Severe ground shaking is most likely to occur during an earthquake on one of the regional active faults in the area. The Rose Canyon fault is the active fault considered having the most significant effect from a design standpoint due to its location within the proposed CPU area. Based on this analysis, damage from earthquake ground shaking could occur.

Structural design in accordance with the current building code is intended to reduce the impact of earthquake shaking on buildings to an acceptable level of risk. Seismic design of future structures would be evaluated in accordance with the 2016 CBC guidelines or those currently adopted by the City of San Diego. Design in accordance with the CBC would reduce potentially significant impacts to future structures from strong seismic ground shaking to a less than significant level. SDMC Section 145.1803(a)(2) indicates that no building permit shall be issued for construction where the geotechnical investigation report establishes that construction of buildings or structures would be unsafe because of geologic hazards. All new development and redevelopment would be required to comply with the SDMC and the CBC, which include design criteria for seismic loading and other geologic hazards and require that a geotechnical investigation be conducted for all new structures, additions to existing structures, or whenever the occupancy classification of a building changes to a higher relative hazard category (SDMC Section 145.1803).

Liquefaction-induced ground failure can involve a complex interaction among seismic, geologic, soil, topographic, and groundwater factors. Failures can include ground fissures, sand boils, ground settlement, and loss of bearing strength; buoyancy effects; ground oscillation; flow failure; and complex lateral spread landslides. The three key factors that indicate whether an area is potentially susceptible to liquefaction are the capacity for severe ground shaking, shallow groundwater, and low-density granular deposits (mainly finer grained sands). In these areas, where alluvium is sufficiently loose and groundwater is sufficiently shallow that strong earthquake shaking could cause sediments to lose bearing capacity, severe settlement of surface facilities and in some cases uplift of buried structures (e.g., large pipelines) could occur.

The City of San Diego Geologic Hazards (2008) map delineates geologic units within the project area that are deemed susceptible to liquefaction (Geologic Hazard Category 31 and to a lesser extent Hazard Category 32); the high liquefaction hazard boundaries correspond to areas of artificial fill and alluvium throughout the majority of the Midway area and the northwest portion of the Pacific-Highway corridor of the proposed CPU area. The bedrock and older alluvium areas are not considered susceptible to liquefaction. Liquefaction areas have potential land use constraints and liquefaction assessments must be

made for most projects. The depth and intensity of study will naturally vary depending on the location, type, and importance of the project.

Earthquake-induced landslides and other slope failures (e.g., rockfalls) are most typically in hillside areas with steep slopes, and in bedrock formations with clay layers and out-of-slope bedding plane dip angles. Such slope movement often occurs under static conditions with substantial rainfall. Structures, engineered slopes, roadways, utilities, and the general population located on or below these hazard areas could be subject to severe damage or injury. Landslides, debris flows, and soilslips/surficial material failures affect both the area where the material originates and the downslope "runout" areas where the landslide debris accumulates. Damage to structures can be severe in either location with structures being dislocated a few to many tens of feet. As shown in Figure 2-6, no landslides are mapped within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area.

Building construction in accordance with the SDMC and CBC will reduce potential seismic hazards to an acceptable level of risk. Thus, while the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would be subject to seismic events, potential hazards associated with ground shaking and seismically induced hazards such as ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides would be reduced through implementation of site-specific geotechnical requirements associated with future development within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Therefore, impacts related to seismic hazards would be less than significant.

Issue 2 Erosion or Loss of Topsoil

Would the project result in a substantial erosion or loss of topsoil?

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area consists of mainly developed and previously graded land with some minimal open space areas. As stated in the Geotechnical Report, the low topographic gradients and the physical characteristics of the artificial fill and older alluvium would result in a low erosion potential for the Midway area. The Pacific-Highway corridor contains steeper topography and is therefore more susceptible to severe erosion.

Implementation of the project would allow for the intensification of some land uses that could lead to construction and grading activities that could temporarily expose topsoil and increase soil erosion from water and wind. Development of parcels within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area could remove the existing pavement and cover, thereby exposing soils to potential runoff and erosion during construction if protective measures are not taken.

SDMC Section 142.0146 requires grading work to incorporate erosion and siltation control measures in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 4 (Landscape Regulations) and the standards established in the Land Development Manual. The regulations prohibit sediment and pollutants from leaving the work site and require the property owner to implement and maintain temporary and permanent erosion, sedimentation, and water pollution control measures. Controls shall include measures outlined in Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 2 (Storm Water Runoff Control and Drainage Regulations) that address the development's potential erosion and sedimentation impacts. For projects that disturb less than 1 acre of land, a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) is required to identify the pollution prevention measures that will be taken. The WPCP is required to depict the BMPs to be implemented during construction to reduce/eliminate discharges of pollutants to the storm drain conveyance system. The WPCP shall

include, but not be limited to, erosion and sediment control BMPs, phased grading, good housekeeping measures, and site and material management.

Conformance to such mandated City grading requirements would ensure that proposed grading and construction operations would avoid significant soil erosion impacts. Furthermore, any development involving clearing, grading, or excavation that causes soil disturbance of 1 or more acres, or any project involving less than 1 acre that is part of a larger development plan, is subject to NPDES General Construction Storm Water Permit provisions. Additionally, any development of significant size within the City would be required to prepare and comply with an approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that would consider the full range of erosion control BMPS, including any additional site-specific and seasonal conditions. Project compliance with NPDES requirements would significantly reduce the potential for substantial erosion or topsoil loss to occur in association with new development. Impacts would be less than significant.


Issue 3 Geologic Instability

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

The majority of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is mapped as Geologic Hazard Category 31, characterized as having a high potential for liquefaction. These areas have shallow groundwater, major drainages, and hydraulic fills. Fault segments mapped within portions of the Pacific Highway corridor along the Rose Canyon Fault Zone are designated as fault buffers Geologic Hazard Category 12. Small portions of the western area of the Midway area and southeastern portion of the Pacific-Highway corridor are mapped as Geologic Hazard Category 52, low risk and favorable geologic structure. Another small area within the northern portion of the Pacific-Highway corridor is mapped as Category 32, low potential for liquefaction. Refer to Figure 5.4-1 for the location of these Geologic Hazard categories. Liquefaction and lateral spread potential must be considered in the man-placed artificial fill and underlying young alluvium in the Midway area. Formations in the Pacific-Highway corridor and western Midway area with more topographic relief have low landslide susceptibility, with only very small areas having moderate susceptibility. Potential liquefaction-induced lateral spread is more of a concern in the areas adjacent to the San Diego River to the north of the proposed CPU area and the channel extending north from San Diego Bay toward Lytton Street and Barnett Avenue near the southern portion of the proposed CPU area. The primary concern in these areas is the interface between the artificial fill and underlying young alluvium.

Slope instability under non-earthquake conditions was determined to be a potentially significant hazard in the artificial cut/fill slope areas of the proposed CPU. Areas known to have susceptibility to soil slip are shown in Figure 5.4-2. These areas are generally along I-5 in the eastern portion of the Pacific-Highway corridor, and the western portion of the Midway area, adjacent to the Peninsula Community.

In areas where artificial fill may have been placed without proper engineering controls and inspections, the material may be susceptible to dynamic consolidation and subsidence, especially in areas where thick artificial fills have been placed against denser old alluvium or bedrock materials.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 2,000 4,000 Feet

Portions of this DERIVED PRODUCT contain geographic information copyrighted by SanGIS. All Rights Reserved.

Figure 5.4-2
USGS Soil Slip Susceptibility

Future projects built in accordance with the project would be required to prepare a geotechnical investigation that specifically addresses slope stability. Potential hazards associated with slope instability would be addressed by the site-specific recommendations contained within geotechnical investigations as required by the CBC and SDMC. Thus, impacts related to landslide and slope instability would be less than significant.

Issue 4 Expansive Soils

Would the project 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?

Geotechnical and soil hazards, such as consolidation and expansion-prone materials, are most likely to occur in the artificial fill areas in the Midway area. Expansive soils generally contain clay minerals susceptible to expansion under wetting conditions and contraction under drying conditions. This shrinking and swelling of the soil can cause damage to slabs, foundations, and concrete flatwork. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is largely underlain with artificial fill, as shown in Figure 2-6. The artificial fill and paralic deposits (af, Qop_6) are more susceptible to consolidation and may be more likely to have expansive clays due to their fine-grained nature. Special measures would be necessary during design and construction to mitigate the effects of expansive soil.

Site-specific measures based on results of a geotechnical investigation would be necessary during design and construction of future projects to remedy the effects of expansive soil. A site-specific geotechnical investigation required for future projects within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would be required by the SDMC to identify the presence of expansive soils and provide recommendations to be implemented during grading and construction to ensure that potential hazards associated with expansive soils are minimized. Thus, with implementation of the recommendations included in site-specific geotechnical investigations, potential impacts associated with expansive soils would be less than significant.

5.4.4 Significance of Impacts

5.4.4.1 Seismic Hazards

Based on the report prepared by Wilson Geosciences, Inc. and an update letter prepared by AECOM (Appendix F), future projects located within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would not have direct or indirect significant environmental impacts with respect to seismic hazards because future development would be required to occur in accordance with uniformly applied development policies, including existing codes and standards. This regulatory framework includes a requirement for site-specific geotechnical investigations to identify potential geologic hazards or concerns that would need to be addressed during grading and/or construction of a specific development project. Thus, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.4.4.2 Erosion or Loss of Topsoil

SDMC Section 142.0146 requires grading work to incorporate erosion and siltation control measures in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 4 (Landscape Regulations) and the standards established

in the Land Development Manual. Conformance to such mandated City grading requirements would ensure that grading and construction operations for future projects located within the proposed CPU would avoid significant soil erosion impacts. Furthermore, any development involving clearing, grading, or excavation that causes soil disturbance of 1 or more acres, or any project involving less than 1 acre that is part of a larger development plan, is subject to NPDES General Construction Storm Water Permit provisions. Additionally, any development of significant size within the City would be required to prepare and comply with an approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that would consider the full range of erosion control BMPs, including any additional site-specific and seasonal conditions. Thus, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.4.4.3 Geologic Instability

Future projects located in hillside areas within the project area would be required to submit a geotechnical investigation that specifically addresses slope stability. Potential hazards associated with slope instability would be addressed by the site-specific recommendations contained within geotechnical investigations as required by the SDMC or other uniformly applied development policies. Thus, impacts related to landslide and slope instability would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.4.4.4 Expansive Soils

Adherence to the SDMC grading regulations and construction requirements, and implementation of the recommendations and standards of the City's Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports for future projects located within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would preclude significant impacts related to expansive soils. Thus, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.4.5 Mitigation Framework

Impacts of the project related to geologic conditions would be reduced to an acceptable level of risk with implementation of uniformly applied development policies, including existing SDMC requirements for preparation of geotechnical investigations prior to grading and construction and implementation of applicable measures identified in project-specific geotechnical investigations. Thus, no mitigation is required.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.5 Noise

This section addresses the potential noise impacts that would result from implementation of the project. It also discusses the regulations applicable to subsequent projects contemplated by the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and the existing noise setting within the study area. This section is based on the Noise Analysis for the Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Community Plan Updates (Noise Report) prepared by AECOM (2017) for the project (Appendix G).

5.5.1 Existing Conditions


The existing regional environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively. The specific noise conditions for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are discussed in the following sections.

Existing noise sources in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are primarily dominated by transportation-based noise sources. Transportation noise sources include vehicular road traffic; approach and departure of aircraft attributed to SDIA operations; and light rail (Trolley), passenger rail, and freight rail operations. Stationary noise sources include noise from typical industrial, commercial, and infrastructural facility operations.

5.5.1.1 Noise Measurements

As part of the noise assessment, ambient noise levels were measured in the proposed CPU area to provide a characterization of the variability of noise throughout the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and to assist in determining constraints and opportunities for future development. Short-term (ST) daytime noise level measurements, each approximately 15 minutes in duration, were conducted within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The ST measurements were conducted using two Larson Davis (LD) Model LxT Sound Level Meters (serial numbers 4485 and 4486) rated by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) as Type 1 per ANSI S1.4-1983.

Eight sound level measurements were conducted in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area over two measurement surveys on April 10 and May 23, 2017. Table 5.5-1 summarizes the measured existing noise levels at these selected locations, followed by a detailed bulleted list of measurement and observation summaries from each measurement site. Measurement locations are depicted on an aerial map in Figure 5.5-1.



Source: SANDAG 2014; City of San Diego 2017

2,000 1,000 0 2,000 Feet

Scale: 1:30,000 ; 1 inch = 2,500 feet

Figure 5.5-1
Noise Measurement Locations

Path: P:_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\920 GIS\922_Maps\CommunityPlan\Midway_Noise_Measurement_Locations.mxd, 8/17/2017, paul.moreno

Table 5.5-1
Noise Measurements

Meas. ID	Location	Date	Time (hh:mm)	Duration (minutes)	L_{eq}, dBA
MPH-ST1	Sports Arena Boulevard (NW)	4/10/17	10:51	15	64.2
MPH-ST2	Cauby Street	4/10/17	11:24	15	60.6
MPH-ST3	Sports Arena Boulevard (SE)	4/10/17	12:20	12	62.4
MPH-ST4	Hancock Street (SE)	4/10/17	12:45	15	68.4
MPH-ST5	India Street	4/10/17	13:15	15	73.1
MPH-ST6	Hancock Street (NW)	5/23/17	09:55	15	63.9
MPH-ST7	Moore Street	5/23/17	10:25	15	65.6
MPH-ST8	St. Charles Street	5/23/17	12:26	15	58.4

Measurement MPH-ST1 was conducted within a parking lot associated with the Valley View Casino Center (formerly San Diego Sports Arena) entertainment and sports venue/Kobey's Swap Meet, located approximately 90-feet from edge of pavement (EOP) of Sports Arena Boulevard, and located within the CPU-proposed Sports Arena Community Village area. The primary noise sources at this location were traffic on Sports Arena Boulevard, distant traffic on I-8, and intermittent westbound aircraft departures from SDIA.

Measurement MPH-ST2 was conducted at the northern corner of the Loma Village Apartments located at 3175 Cauby Street, approximately 135 feet south of Midway Drive EOP. Due to ongoing construction in the area of the CPU-proposed Kemper Neighborhood Village during both measurement surveys, this measurement was located in the abutting Cauby District and is expected to be representative of noise levels also experienced within the proposed Kemper Neighborhood Village area at similar distances from Midway Drive. The primary noise sources at this location were traffic on Midway Drive and intermittent westbound aircraft departures from SDIA. Additional noise sources included distant rail operations, distant landscape mowing across Midway Drive, and rustling palm fronds along Cauby Street.

Measurement MPH-ST3 was conducted on the southern side of Sports Arena Boulevard, east of Rosecrans Street on a sidewalk within an industrial area, located within the area of the CPU-proposed Dutch Flats Urban Village. The primary noise sources at this location were distant traffic on Pacific Highway and I-5, local traffic on Sports Arena Boulevard, intermittent westbound aircraft departures from SDIA, and intermittent semi-truck engine idling across the roadway at an existing retail shipping facility. Periods of active truck idling during the measurement were removed from the reported data, resulting in the shorter measurement duration shown in Table 5.5-1. Additional noise sources included helicopter and personal fixed-wing aircraft overflights, and speech from pedestrian pass-bys.

Measurement MPH-ST4 was conducted near Hancock Street and Noell Street in the cul-de-sac entrance to the Mission Apartments complex, located within the CPU-proposed Hancock Transit Corridor. The primary noise source at this location was traffic on Pacific Highway and I-5. Additional noise sources included passenger train pass-bys, trolley pass-bys, helicopter overflights, and intermittent westbound aircraft departures from SDIA.

Measurement MPH-ST5 was conducted near 2520 India Street in front of a small row of single-family residences north of West Laurel Street in the CPU-proposed Kettner District. The primary noise sources at this location were traffic on West Laurel Street, India Street, and I-5, as well as frequent aircraft

overflights on approach to SDIA. Additional noise sources were not perceptible due to the elevated existing ambient noise level.

Measurement MPH-ST6 was conducted on a sidewalk area in front of 3538 Hancock Street in the CPU-proposed Camino Del Rio District. The primary noise sources at this location were traffic from I-8, and intermittent westbound aircraft departures from SDIA. Additional noise sources included birds vocalizing, HVAC unit operation, and traffic on Hancock Street and local roadways.

Measurement MPH-ST7 was conducted on the western corner of the intersection of Moore Street and Gaines Street in a warehouse/commercial area between Camino Del Rio West and Rosecrans within the CPU-proposed Kurtz District. The primary noise sources at this location were mechanical sounds from the automotive repair shop immediately to the southwest and traffic from Camino Del Rio West and I-5. Additional noise sources included rustling leaves and intermittent westbound aircraft departures from SDIA.


Measurement MPH-ST8 was conducted on the southwestern corner of the intersection of St. Charles Street and Durham Ridge Place, located within the Gateway Village military housing neighborhood in the CPU-proposed Lytton District. The primary noise sources were distant traffic noise and rustling leaves and palm fronds. Additional noise sources included a distant crying infant and distant intermittent hammering. No aircraft departures from SDIA were observed during the measurement period.

5.5.1.2 Existing Vehicle Traffic Noise

The dominant noise source in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is vehicular traffic on freeways and local roadways. Vehicular traffic noise is directly related to the traffic volume, speed, and mix of vehicle types. Vehicles traveling on I-5 and I-8 dominate the existing ambient environment throughout the majority of the proposed CPU area, further supplemented by arterial roadways that extend into locations more-distant from the interstates. The arterial streets generating the greatest noise level in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are Camino Del Rio West, Midway Drive, Sports Arena Boulevard, Rosecrans Street, Pacific Highway, and Laurel Street. Figure 5.5-2 displays the aggregate predicted existing dBA CNEL generated by each roadway identified in the TIS (May 2017). The predicted contour distances displayed in this figure do not consider attenuation provided by existing structures, topography, or dense vegetation, and are not considered accurate for site-specific assessments, but rather to serve as a general guide to determine when a detailed acoustic analysis should be undertaken. As shown in the figure, existing traffic noise levels within the proposed CPU are responsible for relatively high CNEL levels when proximal to the interstates and arterial roadways.

5.5.1.3 Existing Rail Traffic Noise

Railway noise is generated from the rail traffic on the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo (LOSSAN) rail corridor, consisting of freight trains (BNSF), regional and commuter passenger rail (Amtrak and NCTD Coaster), and LRT (MTS Trolley). Noise associated with these operations includes locomotive engines, wheel-to-rail and switch noise, horn sounding, station approach and disembark bell sounding, emergency signaling devices, and stationary bells associated with the at-grade crossings at Noell Street, West Washington Street, Sassafras Street, and Palm Street, and the partial at-grade crossing at West Laurel



Source: City of San Diego

Figure 5.5-2
Existing (2015) Traffic Noise Contours

Street where trolley traffic utilizes an above-grade viaduct. The rail corridor generally parallels I-5 at varying distances before passing below the I-5 superstructure south of Sassafras Street. Light rail and passenger rail train movements occur through the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area multiple times per hour between 4 a.m. and 1 a.m. every day. The BNSF also operates freight trains along the corridor daily, typically utilizing the rail during evening and nighttime hours. Rail traffic noise levels greater than or equal to 60 dBA L_{dn} (metric used by the Federal Railroad Administration), extend into the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area from the railroad alignment at a distance of approximately 182 feet.

5.5.1.4 Existing Aircraft Noise

SDIA is located generally south of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Flight paths for aircraft approach and departure run largely parallel to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area along the MCRD property line with exception of the southern boundary of the proposed CPU boundary, which is located directly beneath the flight path typically used for aircraft arrival. Aircraft noise is evaluated based on the noise contours developed by the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority and provided in the ALUCP for SDIA (City of San Diego 2014). The projected aircraft noise contours provided in the ALUCP are based on year 2030 forecasted noise exposure. Aircraft noise contours for 2035 are expected to be identical to those shown in the ALUCP, provided that no major changes occur with respect to aircraft types using SDIA, terminal capacities, or FAA flight paths and patterns.

5.5.1.5 Existing Stationary Noise

Stationary sources of noise within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are characterized by specific land uses. As an example, residential areas experience noise sources from typical resident activities such as landscaping, HVAC unit operation, dogs barking, and/or entertainment systems with loudspeakers. As noted in the noise survey measurement summaries, commercial land uses are also prevalent in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, with automotive repair shops contributing hammering, sawing, and air compressor noise, and warehouse facilities featuring idling semi-truck engines with loading/unloading operations. These existing stationary noise contributors are considered typical for an urban environment that features a mixture of land use types and are not generally considered significant sources of noise. In cases of excessive noise levels or durations, the SDMC regulates noises resulting from these types of activities.

5.5.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Thresholds used to evaluate potential noise impacts are based on applicable criteria in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G and the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016). Thresholds are modified from the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds to reflect the programmatic analysis for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. A significant impact related to noise would occur if the project would:

1. Result in or create a significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels;

2. Result in an exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed guidelines established in the Noise Element of the General Plan;

3. Result in land uses which are not compatible with aircraft noise levels as defined by an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP);

4. Result in the exposure of people to noise levels which exceed property line limits established in the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the Municipal Code; or

5. Result in the exposure of people to significant temporary construction noise.

5.5.2.1 Noise

Thresholds used to determine the significance of noise impacts are based on standards in the General Plan Noise Element and the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance (Section 59.5.0101 et seq. of SDMC) as described in the Regulatory Framework chapter, Section 4.5.2.

5.5.2.2 Vibration and Groundborne Noise

While the City has not established vibration and groundborne noise standards, publications of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Caltrans provide guidance for the analysis of environmental impacts due to groundborne noise and vibration relating to transportation and construction projects. A significant vibration impact would occur where structures or human receivers would be exposed to the respective damage and annoyance thresholds, measured in PPV, listed in Table 5.5-2 below.

Table 5.5-2
Maximum Vibration Levels for Construction Equipment for Potential Damage and Annoyance
(PPV in/sec)

Structure Type	Potential Damage Thresholds		"Strongly Perceptible" Annoyance Criteria	
	Transient Sources	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources	Transient Sources	Continuous/Frequent Intermittent Sources
Historic and some old buildings	0.5	0.25	0.9	0.1
Older residential structures	0.5	0.3		
New residential structures	1.0	0.5		
Modern industrial and commercial buildings	2.0	0.5		

Note: Transient sources generate a single vibratory event, such as blasting. Continuous/frequent sources include pile driving equipment and other construction activities generating multiple vibration-intensive events across a given period.
in/sec = inches per second; PPV = peak particle velocity
Source: Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual, Caltrans 2013

5.5.3 Methodology

5.5.3.1 Vehicle Traffic Noise

Existing (2015) and Future (2035) vehicle traffic volumes and mixes were obtained from the TIS conducted for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The traffic data and analyses in the TIS were conducted in accordance with the City of San Diego Traffic Impact Study Guidelines, SANTEC/ITE Guidelines, and the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016).

Traffic mix percentages for the freeways in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area range from 97.2 percent cars and 2.8 percent trucks along I-8, to 95.9 percent cars and 4.1 percent trucks along I-5. Per assumptions made in the TIS, local roadways were modeled with a 98 percent car and 2 percent truck traffic mix, which is generally consistent with traffic mix observations made during the noise survey. Detailed traffic mix and volume data inputs for each analyzed roadway segment are available in the Noise Report (Appendix G).

Predicted dBA CNEL traffic noise level distances were calculated for the existing (2015) and proposed CPU ~~preferred plan~~ (2035) conditions using the FHWA Traffic Noise Model (TNM), Version 2.5, the most recent version approved for use in traffic noise assessments by the FHWA. Parameters input into the FHWA model accounted for traffic mix, vehicle speed, traffic volume, and specific roadway widths for accurate calculations of noise level distances from the roadway EOP. While the model has the capability to account for roadway gradients, and shielding effects from terrain and buildings/barriers, this analysis assumed flat topography throughout the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and omitted existing structures that may offer additional shielding to noise-sensitive receivers. Since these features were not included in the model input, predicted noise levels presented in the analysis are likely higher than what would actually be measured at a location that benefits from noise reductions attributed to these shielding effects.

5.5.4 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Ambient Noise

Would the project result in or create a significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels?

As discussed in Section 5.5.1.1, Noise Measurements, an existing noise measurement survey was conducted in the proposed CPU area to identify ambient noise conditions (shown in Table 5.5-1).

Existing stationary noise sources identified within the proposed CPU area were typical of a developed mixed-use neighborhood, including HVAC units in operation and noise associated with commercial uses such as automotive mechanic shops. Although the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area proposes the development of land uses that may ultimately generate noise during operations, operational noise levels would be required to comply with the SDMC and General Plan guidelines.

Noise from vehicular traffic is the prominent source of noise in the proposed CPU area and has greater potential to affect existing noise-sensitive receivers if annual ADT volumes increase. The freeways generating the greatest noise levels affecting the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are I-5 and I-8. The streets generating the greatest noise levels within the proposed CPU area are Camino Del Rio West, Midway Drive, Sports Arena Boulevard, Rosecrans Street, Pacific Highway, and Laurel Street. Vehicular traffic on roadways in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would generally increase due to the future development projections of the project. Table 5.5-3 summarizes the existing and predicted ambient noise levels along various roadway segments in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Roadway noise is reported in dBA CNEL at 50 feet from the roadway EOP.

Table 5.5-3
Increases in Ambient Noise for the Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area

Roadway	Roadway Segment		Predicted Ambient Noise Level (dBA, CNEL @ 50 Feet from EOP)		
	From	To	Existing (2015)	Future (2035)	Change in dB
Barnett Avenue	Midway Drive	Pacific Highway	70.8	70.3	-0.5
Camino Del Rio West	Rosecrans Street	I-5/I-8 Ramps	68.1	69.4	1.3
Channel Way	**Sports Arena Boulevard**	**Hancock Street**	51.7	58.1	**6.4**
Charles Lindbergh Parkway	Midway Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	Fut. Road	56.4	N/A
	Sports Arena Boulevard	Kurtz Street	Fut. Road	57.7	N/A
Dutch Flats Parkway	Barnett Avenue	Midway Drive	Fut. Road	60.3	N/A
	Midway Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	Fut. Road	58.5	N/A
Frontier Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	Kurtz Street	Fut. Road	59.8	N/A
Greenwood Street	Sports Arena Boulevard	Kurtz Street	Fut. Road	58.0	N/A
Hancock Street	Sports Arena Boulevard	Kurtz Street	56.8	49.9	-6.9
	Kurtz Street	Camino Del Rio West	58.0	62.9	4.9
	Camino Del Rio West	Rosecrans Street	55.8	59.9	4.1
	Old Town Avenue	Witherby Street	61.1	61.9	0.8
	Witherby Street	Washington Street	54.8	58.7	3.9
Kemper Street	Kenyon Street	Midway Drive	58.5	58.8	0.3
	Midway Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	58.1	59.1	1.0
	Sports Arena Boulevard	Hancock Street	Fut. Road	58.7	N/A
Kettner Boulevard	Washington Street	Vine Street	68.3	70.0	1.7
	Vine Street	Sassafras Street	67.9	69.6	1.7
	Sassafras Street	Laurel Street	67.2	69.4	2.2
Kurtz Street	Hancock Street	Rosecrans Street	58.4	62.2	3.8
	Rosecrans Street	Pacific Highway	59.2	59.4	0.2
Laurel Street	Pacific Highway	Kettner Boulevard	63.4	63.9	0.5
Lytton Street / Barnett Avenue	Rosecrans Street	Midway Drive	66.8	67.2	0.4
Midway Drive	W. Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard	Kemper Street	65.3	66.0	0.7
	Kemper Street	East Drive	65.3	65.3	0.0
	East Drive	Rosecrans Street	66.7	66.6	-0.1
	Rosecrans Street	Barnett Avenue	66.0	66.8	0.8
Pacific Highway	Sea World Drive	Taylor Street	63.6	65.1	1.5
	Taylor Street	Kurtz Street	65.9	67.5	1.6
	Kurtz Street	Sports Arena Boulevard	67.9	68.4	0.5
	Sports Arena Boulevard	Barnett Avenue	65.3	67.0	1.7
	Barnett Avenue	Washington Street	74.2	73.8	-0.4
	Washington Street	Sassafras Street	63.6	65.9	2.3
	Sassafras Street	Laurel Street	67.2	69.3	2.1
Rosecrans Street	Lytton Street	Midway Drive	67.7	68.4	0.7
	Midway Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	68.8	68.6	-0.2
	Sports Arena Boulevard	Pacific Highway/ Taylor Street	63.6	65.2	1.6
Sports Arena Boulevard	I-8 EB Ramps	W. Point Loma Boulevard/ Sports Arena Boulevard	66.7	67.7	1.0
	W. Point Loma Boulevard/Midway Drive	Kemper Street	63.9	64.5	0.6
	Kemper Street	East Drive	64.4	65.7	1.3
	East Drive	Rosecrans Street	66.0	64.2	-1.8
	Rosecrans Street	**Pacific Highway**	56.7	62.8	**6.1**

Table 5.5-3
Increases in Ambient Noise for the Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area

Roadway	Roadway Segment		Predicted Ambient Noise Level (dBA, CNEL @ 50 Feet from EOP)		
	From	To	Existing (2015)	Future (2035)	Change in dB
Sassafras Street	Pacific Highway	Kettner Boulevard	58.7	62.5	3.8
Washington Street	Frontage Rd	Pacific Highway	59.1	60.7	1.6
	Pacific Highway	Hancock Street	59.9	62.4	2.5
Vine Street	**California Street**	**Kettner Boulevard**	41.3	52.5	**11.2**
Freeways					
Interstate 5	I-8	Old Town Avenue	80.9	82.4	1.5
	Old Town Avenue	Washington Street	81.6	82.3	0.7
	Washington Street	Pacific Highway	80.3	81.1	0.8
	Pacific Highway	Laurel Street	80.3	81.9	1.6
Interstate 8	Sports Arena Boulevard	I-5	78.6	79.4	0.8

CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level; dBA = A-weighted decibel; EOP = edge of pavement
Bold = 2035 noise level would exceed the established exterior compatibility level for the surrounding land use and noise levels would increase by 3 dB or more, or future noise levels would be below 65 dBA CNEL but ambient noise levels would increase by more than 5 dBA over existing noise levels.
Source: Noise Report (see Appendix G)

As shown in Table 5.5-3, no roadway segments generating existing noise levels greater than 65 dBA CNEL are predicted to generate an increase in noise levels greater than 3 dBA in the future condition.

The following street segments in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU currently generate noise levels lower than 65 dBA CNEL and would remain generating future noise levels lower than 65 dBA CNEL. However, future noise levels would increase by more than 5 dBA over existing ambient noise levels on account of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU projections along the following roadway segments:

- Channel Way from Sports Arena Boulevard to Hancock Street
- Sports Arena Boulevard from Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway
- Vine Street from California Street to Kettner Boulevard

Although these streets on their own may produce traffic noise levels 5 dBA greater than predicted in the existing condition, the ambient noise levels in two of the above roadway segments will be wholly dominated by traffic noise from the nearby freeways.

As displayed in Figure 5.5-2, receivers along Channel Way are currently exposed to existing and future CNEL levels of approximately 66 dBA to greater than 75 dBA due to vehicular traffic on I-8. Although Table 5.5-3 reports a CNEL increase of 6.4 dBA at receivers 50 feet from the Channel Way EOP and a future CNEL value of 58.1 dBA, this future CNEL value is approximately 8–19 dBA less than predicted for existing and future noise levels generated by I-8 as shown in the aforementioned figure. Thus, the increase in traffic noise levels contributed by increased traffic on Channel Way would be less than 1 dBA when combined with I-8 traffic noise levels and imperceptible to the human ear. Similarly, the reported segment of Vine Street also experiences a similar scenario, with a reported 11.2 dBA CNEL increase and a predicted future CNEL of 52.5 dBA, yet this area falls within I-5 CNEL contours of 74 to greater than 75 dBA. Thus, the increase in traffic noise levels contributed by increased traffic on Vine Street would also

be less than 1 dBA when combined with the I-5 traffic noise levels and similarly imperceptible to the human ear.

a. Existing Noise at Sensitive Land Uses

There is a mixture of existing noise-sensitive uses and non-noise-sensitive land uses adjacent to the Sports Arena Boulevard roadway segment, primarily composed of expansive parking lots and storage yards interspersed with warehouse and commercial spaces on both sides of the roadway. The surrounding land uses will be developed into residentially permitted business park and community commercial land uses in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

The increase in ambient noise levels adjacent to the segment of Sports Arena Boulevard would result in the exposure of existing sensitive receptors to a significant increase in ambient noise levels, and impacts would be significant. Possible noise-reduction measures would include retrofitting older structures with acoustically rated windows and doors featuring higher Sound Transmission Class ratings, which is a measure of exterior noise reduction performance.

Impact 5.5-1 The increase in ambient noise levels as a result of the project along the road segment listed below would result in the exposure of existing noise-sensitive receptors to a significant increase in future noise levels, resulting in a significant impact:

- Sports Arena Boulevard from Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway

b. Future Noise-Sensitive Land Uses

An existing regulatory framework and review process exists for new development in areas exposed to high levels of ambient noise. Policies in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and General Plan related to decibel levels, procedures in the SDMC, and regulations (Title 24) would reduce traffic noise exposure, because they set standards for the siting of sensitive land uses. Site-specific noise analyses demonstrating that the project would not subject sensitive receptors to existing or future noise levels exceeding the noise compatibility guidelines of the General Plan would be required as part of the review process for discretionary projects. With the implementation of these regulations and procedures, noise impacts applicable to new discretionary projects would be less than significant as exterior noise would be attenuated. However, in the case of ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise is adequately attenuated. Therefore, exterior noise impacts attributed to ministerial projects located in areas that exceed the applicable land use and noise compatibility level would be significant and unavoidable. Interior noise impacts for all projects, including ministerial projects, would be less than significant because applicants must demonstrate compliance with the relevant interior noise standards through submission and approval of a Title 24 Compliance Report.

The project would result in future noise levels that would increase by more than 5 dBA over existing ambient noise levels on segments of Channel Way, Sports Arena Boulevard, and Vine Street. While future discretionary projects have a framework in place that would ensure exterior noise levels are appropriately attenuated to meet the General Plan Compatibility Standards, there is no similar mechanism in place for ministerial projects, resulting in a significant impact.

Impact 5.5-2 The increase in ambient noise levels as a result of the project along the road segment listed below would result in the exposure of future noise-sensitive receptors (that only require a ministerial permit) to a significant increase in future noise levels, resulting in a significant impact:

- Sports Arena Boulevard from Rosecrans Street to Pacific Highway

For all other street segments in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, the ambient noise impact would be less than significant.

Issue 2 Vehicular Noise

Would the project cause exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Noise Element of the General Plan?

a. Freeway and Roadway Noise

A significant impact would occur if implementation of the project would result in an exposure of sensitive receivers to current or future motor vehicle traffic noise levels that exceed standards established in the Noise Element of the General Plan. The General Plan noise and land use compatibility guidelines are presented in Chapter 4.0, Regulatory Framework, Table 4-1. The project proposes various land uses with compatibility assessed with the following noise levels.

- Single-family residential is compatible up to 60 dBA CNEL and conditionally compatible up to 65 dBA CNEL.
- Multi-family residential and mixed uses are compatible up to 60 CNEL and conditionally compatible up to 70 CNEL.
- Additionally, as stated in Section B of the City's Noise Element, although not generally considered compatible, the City conditionally allows multi-family and mixed-use residential uses in areas experiencing up to 75 dBA CNEL from motor vehicle traffic noise with existing residential uses. Any future residential use exposed to noise levels up to 75 dBA CNEL must include attenuation measures to ensure an interior noise level of 45 dBA CNEL and be located in an area where a community plan allows multi-family and mixed-use residential uses.
- Sales, commercial services, and office uses are compatible up to 65 dBA CNEL and conditionally compatible up to 75 dBA CNEL.
- Institutional uses are compatible up to 60 dBA CNEL and conditionally compatible up to 65 dBA CNEL.
- Visitor accommodations (hotel) uses are compatible up to 60 dBA CNEL and conditionally compatible up to 75 dBA CNEL.
- Neighborhood parks are compatible up to 70 dBA CNEL and conditionally compatible up to 75 dBA CNEL.

The vehicle traffic from adjacent freeways is the dominant noise source affecting the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The freeways generating the greatest noise levels affecting the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are I-5 and I-8. The streets generating the greatest noise levels within the proposed CPU area are Camino Del Rio West, Midway Drive, Sports Arena Boulevard, Rosecrans Street, Pacific Highway, and Laurel Street. The distances to the 60 dBA, 65 dBA, 70 dBA, and 75 dBA CNEL noise contours attributed to traffic volumes associated with the proposed CPU are shown in Table 5.5-4. Distances to the roadway noise contours are based on an assumed hard, flat site, with no intervening barriers or obstructions. Future year noise contours for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are shown in Figure 5.5-3.

Table 5.5-4
Future Vehicle Traffic Noise CNEL Contour Distances for the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area


Roadway	Modeled Roadway Segment		Distance to Predicted dBA CNEL (Approximate Feet from Roadway EOP)			
	From	To	75	70	65	60
Barnett Avenue	Midway Drive	Pacific Highway	<1	55	193	382
Camino Del Rio West	Rosecrans Street	I-5/I-8 Ramps	<1	40	168	392
Channel Way	Sports Arena Boulevard	Hancock Street	<1	<1	<1	21
Charles Lindbergh Parkway	Midway Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	<1	<1	<1	9
Charles Lindbergh Parkway	Sports Arena Boulevard	Kurtz Street	<1	<1	<1	20
Dutch Flats Parkway	Barnett Avenue	Midway Drive	<1	<1	<1	55
Dutch Flats Parkway	Midway Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	<1	<1	<1	21
Frontier Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	Kurtz Street	<1	<1	<1	47
Greenwood Street	Sports Arena Boulevard	Kurtz Street	<1	<1	<1	21
Hancock Street	Sports Arena Boulevard	Kurtz Street	<1	<1	<1	1
Hancock Street	Kurtz Street	Camino Del Rio West	<1	<1	21	102
Hancock Street	Camino Del Rio West	Rosecrans Street	<1	<1	6	49
Hancock Street	Old Town Avenue	Witherby Street	<1	<1	17	83
Hancock Street	Witherby Street	Washington Street	<1	<1	<1	21
Kemper Street	Kenyon Street	Midway Drive	<1	<1	<1	21
Kemper Street	Midway Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	<1	<1	<1	40
Kemper Street	Sports Arena Boulevard	Hancock Street	<1	<1	<1	21
Kettner Boulevard	Washington Street	Vine Street	6	50	146	234
Kettner Boulevard	Vine Street	Sassafras Street	<1	45	150	255
Kettner Boulevard	Sassafras Street	Laurel Street	<1	43	147	250
Kurtz Street	Hancock Street	Rosecrans Street	<1	<1	20	90
Kurtz Street	Rosecrans Street	Pacific Highway	<1	<1	<1	42
Laurel Street	Pacific Highway	Kettner Boulevard	<1	<1	40	134
Lytton Street / Barnett Avenue	Rosecrans Street	Midway Drive	<1	14	96	262
Midway Drive	W. Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard	Kemper Street	<1	7	68	202
Midway Drive	Kemper Street	East Drive	<1	2	55	180
Midway Drive	East Drive	Rosecrans Street	<1	12	80	215
Midway Drive	Rosecrans Street	Barnett Avenue	<1	13	85	222
Pacific Highway	Sea World Drive	Taylor Street	<1	<1	52	180
Pacific Highway	Taylor Street	Kurtz Street	<1	16	106	281
Pacific Highway	Kurtz Street	Sports Arena Boulevard	<1	21	132	317
Pacific Highway	Sports Arena Boulevard	Barnett Avenue	<1	10	93	265
Pacific Highway	Barnett Avenue	Washington Street	21	147	369	561
Pacific Highway	Washington Street	Sassafras Street	<1	11	64	161
Pacific Highway	Sassafras Street	Laurel Street	<1	40	161	375

Table 5.5-4
Future Vehicle Traffic Noise CNEL Contour Distances for the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area

Roadway	Modeled Roadway Segment		Distance to Predicted dBA CNEL (Approximate Feet from Roadway EOP)			
	From	To	75	70	65	60
Rosecrans Street	Lytton Street	Midway Drive	<1	20	135	354
Rosecrans Street	Midway Drive	Sports Arena Boulevard	<1	21	141	365
Rosecrans Street	Sports Arena Boulevard	Pacific Highway/ Taylor Street	<1	1	53	186
Sports Arena Boulevard	I-8 EB Ramps	W. Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard	<1	18	108	277
Sports Arena Boulevard	W. Point Loma Boulevard/Midway Drive	Kemper Street	<1	<1	42	168
Sports Arena Boulevard	Kemper Street	East Drive	<1	<1	62	208
Sports Arena Boulevard	East Drive	Rosecrans Street	<1	<1	40	153
Sports Arena Boulevard	Rosecrans Street	Pacific Highway	<1	<1	20	105
Sassafras Street	Pacific Highway	Kettner Boulevard	<1	<1	20	98
Washington Street	Frontage Rd	Pacific Highway	<1	<1	5	62
Washington Street	Pacific Highway	Hancock Street	<1	<1	18	98
Vine Street	California Street	Kettner Boulevard	<1	<1	<1	<1
Freeways						
Interstate 5	I-8	Old Town Avenue	333	629	891	1242
Interstate 5	Old Town Avenue	Washington Street	322	600	853	1192
Interstate 5	Washington Street	Pacific Highway	255	545	785	1100
Interstate 5	Pacific Highway	Laurel Street	306	603	865	1208
Interstate 8	Sports Arena Boulevard	I-5	181	450	695	971
Source: Noise Report (see Appendix G)						

At any specific noise receptor location, the actual existing noise levels would depend upon not only the source noise level, but also the nature of the sound path from the source to the sensitive receptor. In many cases, structures, terrain, dense vegetation, and other obstacles occlude the direct line-of-sight from the receptor to the traffic noise sources, which could significantly reduce noise levels received at the receptor locations. As an example, a row of buildings would reduce traffic noise levels at receptors in a subsequent row of buildings by 3 to 5 dBA depending on the building-to-gap ratio. Large continuous structures provide an even greater attenuation of traffic noise to receptors in subsequent building rows.

While the General Plan Noise Element has a compatibility level of 60 dBA CNEL or less for residential uses, noise levels up to 65 dBA CNEL for single-family residential and up to 70 dBA CNEL for multi-family residential are considered conditionally compatible, since interior noise levels can be reduced to 45 dBA CNEL through simple means, such as closing/sealing windows and providing mechanical ventilation. Additionally, as stated in Section B of the General Plan Noise Element, although not generally considered compatible, the General Plan conditionally allows multi-family and mixed-use residential uses up to 75 dBA CNEL in areas affected by motor vehicle traffic noise with existing residential uses. Any future residential use exposed to noise levels up to 75 dBA CNEL must include attenuation measures to ensure an interior noise level of 45 dBA CNEL and be located in an area where a community plan allows multi-family and mixed-use residential uses. Broader mitigation, such as noise walls adjacent to freeways and roadways, can also reduce received exterior noise levels to levels compliant with General Plan Noise Element guidelines. Some residential land uses planned for the Midway-Pacific Highway community



Source: City of San Diego

Figure 5.5-3
Future (2035) Traffic Noise Contours

would be located between the 70 and 75 dBA CNEL contours. Multi-family and mixed-use residential uses that meet the requirements of Section B of the General Plan Noise Element would be conditionally compatible up to 75 dBA CNEL and would also be required to provide structural attenuation to reduce noise levels at interior locations.

As shown in Figure 5.5-3, future traffic noise levels with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU at existing and proposed residential use areas would, in cases of residences close to the freeways and major roadways, exceed the General Plan Noise Element conditionally compatible thresholds for residential land uses (70 dBA CNEL for multi-family and conditionally up to 75 dBA CNEL for multi-family and mixed-use developments that meet the requirements of Section B of the Noise Element). Noise levels greater than 75 dBA CNEL are generally considered incompatible for all land use types. Extensive noise attenuation would be needed to ensure a 45 dB interior noise level. Land uses located adjacent to I-5 and I-8 in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and adjacent community plan areas have the potential to be exposed to noise levels greater than 75 dBA CNEL.

In the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, future noise levels for all land uses would be incompatible (i.e., greater than 75 dBA CNEL) at areas located within approximately 255 to 333 feet from I-5 EOP and 181 feet from I-8 EOP. Noise levels for sensitive land uses would be generally incompatible (i.e., greater than 70 dBA CNEL) at areas within approximately 545 to 629 feet from I-5 and 450 feet from I-8. These areas are currently developed; however, the project would result in changes to the land use in these areas, including the introduction of new sensitive land uses. The development of new noise-sensitive land uses as a result of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU may subject receptors to noise levels that exceed General Plan guidelines. This does not take into consideration the existing buildings that would shield future residential uses. Proposed development projects within these areas, such as those located in the immediate vicinity of the freeways within the Channel District, Sports Arena Community Village, Camino Del Rio District, Kurtz District, Hancock Transit Corridor, and Kettner District, all have potential to experience CNEL levels greater than 75 dBA. Per Section B of the General Plan Noise Element, any future residential use in areas above 70 dBA CNEL must include noise attenuation measures to ensure interior levels of 45 dBA CNEL and be located in an area where a community plan allows multi-family and mixed-use residential uses.

Furthermore, policies in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, and General Plan and CCR Title 24 would reduce traffic noise exposure, because they set standards for the siting of sensitive land uses. General Plan Policy NE-A.4 requires an acoustical study consistent with Acoustical Study Guidelines (Table NE-4) for proposed developments in areas where the existing or future noise level exceeds or would exceed the “compatible” noise level thresholds as indicated on the Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines. Site-specific exterior noise analyses that demonstrate that the project would not place sensitive receptors in locations where the exterior existing or future noise levels would exceed the noise compatibility guidelines of the General Plan would be required as part of future discretionary proposals. Additionally, site-specific interior noise analyses demonstrating compliance with the interior noise compatibility guidelines of the General Plan would be required for land uses located in areas where exterior noise levels exceed the noise and land use compatibility thresholds as defined in the General Plan Noise Element, Table N-3. This requirement is implemented through submission of a Title 24 Compliance Report to demonstrate interior noise levels of 45 dBA CNEL. With this framework, exterior traffic noise impacts associated with new development requiring discretionary actions and interior traffic noise impacts for both ministerial and discretionary projects would be less than significant.

However, in the case of exterior noise impacts associated with ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise is adequately attenuated. Therefore, exterior noise impacts for ministerial projects located in areas where the applicable land use and noise compatibility level is exceeded would be significant.

Impact 5.5-3: A significant impact would occur for ministerial projects exposed to vehicular traffic noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element, based on future (2035) noise contours as shown in Figure 5.5-3 of this PEIR.

b. Rail Noise

Railway noise is generated from the rail traffic on LOSSAN rail corridor, consisting of freight trains (BNSF), regional and commuter rail (Amtrak and NCTD Coaster), and LRT (MTS Trolley). Noise associated with these operations include locomotive engines, wheel-to-rail and switch noise, horn sounding, station approach and disembark bell sounding, emergency signaling devices, and stationary bells associated with the at-grade crossings at Noell Street, West Washington Street, Sassafras Street, Palm Street, and the partial at-grade crossing at West Laurel Street where trolley traffic utilizes an above-grade viaduct. The rail corridor generally parallels I-5 at varying distances before passing below the I-5 superstructure south of Sassafras Street. Light rail and passenger rail train movements occur through the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area multiple times per hour between 4 a.m. and 1 a.m. every day. BNSF also operates freight trains along the corridor daily, but typically in the evening and nighttime hours.

Operational noise associated with trolley, Amtrak, Coaster, and freight train operations was modeled using the FTA-recommended Noise Impact Assessment Spreadsheet. Modeling results are shown in Table 5.5-5. The trolleys were modeled at an operative speed of 25 mph. This is based on the distances between trolley stations and the average timing between stations obtained from published trolley schedules as reported in the Noise Technical Report for the City of San Diego Uptown Community Plan Update EIR. Noise contour distances were calculated assuming flat-site conditions and no intervening buildings that would provide noise attenuation, which would represent a conservative, worst-case analysis.

Table 5.5-5
Existing Predicted Railway Noise Levels

Source	Distance of Predicted 60 dBA (Ldn) Noise Levels from Rail Center Alignment
MTS Trolley	38 feet
Amtrak Passenger Rail	82 feet
Coaster Passenger Rail	57 feet
Freight Rail	105 feet
Aggregate of Rail Sources	282 feet

Source: Noise Report (see Appendix G)

The number of Amtrak and Coaster trains operating along the corridor was obtained from existing published schedules. There are approximately 24 Amtrak trains and 22 Coaster trains that travel on the tracks along the western boundary of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area daily. Amtrak trains have an average of eight cars per train and travel at a speed of 30 mph. This is based on the

distances between stations and the average timing between stations obtained from published schedules as reported in the Noise Technical Report for the City of San Diego Uptown Community Plan Update EIR. The number of cars and speed of the Coaster were assumed the same as the Amtrak train.

According to control point data recorded by NCTD from sample weekdays in 2016 (NCTD 2016), there are typically four freight trains that operate through the corridor each day, carrying an average of 59 cars per train. Freight train speed was modeled identical to the Amtrak and Coaster trains. Freight train activity typically occurs in the evening (7 p.m. to 10 p.m.) and nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) hours, and was modeled assuming one train passing through during the evening time window, and the remaining three events occurring during nighttime hours.

The railroad alignment cuts directly through the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area in the vicinity of Pacific Highway; thus, the distances predicted above would apply, in certain areas, to both sides of the railroad. Noise-sensitive land uses are located on both sides of the railroad alignment and include commercial spaces/warehouses, single-family residences, and multi-family residences immediately abutting the railroad right-of-way.

SANDAG is currently constructing the infrastructure to facilitate the planned 2021 start-date of the Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project. This project will result in additional MTS Trolley service along the existing light rail corridor within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. This additional service will introduce an additional 128 light rail events per day (SANDAG 2014). As shown in Table 5.5-6, the aggregate operation of existing rail uses and the anticipated Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Blue Line trolley will generate 60 dBA L_{dn} approximately 15 feet farther into the study area. No future change in service is expected to occur for other rail uses along the corridor.

Table 5.5-6
Future (2021) Predicted Railway Noise Levels

Source	Distance of Predicted 60 dBA (Ldn) Noise Levels from Rail Center Alignment
MTS Trolley	64 feet
Amtrak Passenger Rail	82 feet
Coaster Passenger Rail	57 feet
Freight Rail	105 feet
Aggregate of Rail Sources	308 feet

Source: Noise Report (see Appendix G)

The proposed CPU Noise Element contains policies to minimize excess train horn noise through the establishment of train horn “quiet zones.” Quiet zones are allowed by the federal government through implementation of safety measures to compensate for the loss of train horn usage. The proposed CPU Mobility Element supports roadway-rail grade separation, which would eliminate the need for bells and horns.

The nearest sensitive land uses are located on both sides of the railroad alignment, with some residential receivers abutting the railroad right-of-way at distances as close as 12 feet from the nearest track. Although these receivers are in proximity to railroad operations, Figures 5.5-2 and 5.5-3 show that vehicle traffic noise from Pacific Highway and I-5 produces CNEL noise levels from 70 to 75 dBA, which far exceed the contribution of noise from railroad operations. In addition, as discussed above, interior noise

impacts for all projects, including ministerial projects, would be less than significant because applicants must demonstrate compliance with the relevant interior noise standards through submission and approval of a Title 24 Compliance Report. Therefore, noise level impacts resulting from trolley and train operations would be less than significant.

Issue 3 Airport Compatibility


Would the project result in land uses which are not compatible with aircraft noise levels as defined by an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)?

SDIA is located south and west of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Most aircraft flying over the proposed CPU area are approaching SDIA; departures over the proposed CPU area occur irregularly and are typically dependent on adverse meteorological conditions precluding westbound departures. Aircraft noise is evaluated based on the noise contours developed by the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority and provided in the ALUCP for SDIA (2014). The aircraft noise contours are based on year 2030 forecast noise exposure.

A significant impact would occur if implementation of the project would result in land uses that are not compatible with aircraft noise levels as defined by an adopted ALUCP. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area immediately abuts a large portion of the SDIA boundary with military and commercial land uses, and thus experiences levels ranging from 60 to greater than 75 dBA CNEL, as depicted in Figure 5.5-4. Residential uses are primarily located within the northwestern portion of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, with sparse single-family and multi-family residences in the southeastern vicinity. The majority of residences have the potential to be exposed to aircraft levels exceeding 60 dB CNEL. The ALUCP conditionally allows future residential uses in areas above the 65 dBA CNEL in locations where community plans have allowed residential. Future residential buildings would include noise attenuation consistent with the Noise Element of the General Plan and the ALUCP for SDIA.

The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority has an Airport Noise Mitigation Office and has implemented a number of programs to reduce the aircraft noise impact on the community. Actions include the enforcement of a curfew on departing aircraft and the Quieter Home Program (QHP). The QHP provides sound insulation retrofits for residences located within the 65 dBA CNEL contour with the goal of reducing interior noise levels by at least 5 dBA. Existing residences located within the 65 dBA CNEL contour for SDIA in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are eligible for this program. (Note that eligibility to participate in the program is based on the noise exposure maps prepared under 14 CFR Part 150, which are different than the ALUCP contour maps.) According to the latest program maps on the QHP website, shown in Figure 5.5-5, none of the eligible residences in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area have participated in the program. It cannot be determined at the program level whether these eligible existing structures contain adequate attenuation to reduce interior noise to the 45 dBA CNEL standard.

Per the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, if a future project implemented under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is within the 60 dBA CNEL and greater contour (as shown in Figure 5.5-4), the potential exterior noise impacts from aircraft noise would not constitute a significant environmental impact. However, interior noise impacts would be regulated by the requirement for residential development within the 60 dBA CNEL and greater to reduce interior noise levels attributed to




Source: SANDAG 2014; City of San Diego 2017

2,000 1,000 0 2,000 Feet

Scale: 1:30,000 ; 1 inch = 2,500 feet

Figure 5.5-4
Airport Noise Contours

Path: P:_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\920 GIS\922_Maps\CommunityPlan\Midway_Airport_Noise_Contours.mxd, 8/31/2017, augellop



Source: PSOMAS 2016

Figure 5.5-5
Quieter Home Program Participation for the Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area

This page intentionally left blank.

airport noise to 45 dBA CNEL. The City currently submits both discretionary and ministerial projects that increase residential units and non-residential floor area and result in change in use to the ALUC for a consistency determination with the ALUCP. As discussed in Section 5.1.3, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority determined that the proposed CPU is conditionally consistent with the ALUCP, and that all future projects under the proposed CPU would be required to submit project-level consistency determination applications until such time as the ALUC determines that the City has incorporated the noise policies and standards of the ALUCP into the Municipal Code. Interior noise levels for new construction are also addressed through implementation of General Plan policies NE-D.2, NE-D.3, NE-I.1, and NE-I.2, and Title 24 of the CCR, which requires submission of a Title 24 Compliance Report to demonstrate interior noise levels of 45 dBA CNEL. With this framework, airport noise impacts to new development would be less than significant.

The project would not result in land use compatibility impacts related to airports because the proposed CPU would not result in a change to these existing uses or a change in SDIA operations. Because future development is required to provide interior noise attenuation consistent with the Noise Element of the General Plan and the ALUCP for SDIA and follow regulations in SDMC Section 132.1510, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact from exposure to noise from aircraft.

Issue 4 Noise Ordinance Compliance

Would the project result in the exposure of people to noise levels which exceed property line limits established in the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the Municipal Code?

A significant impact would occur if implementation of the project results in the exposure of people to noise levels that exceed property line limits established in the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the SDMC. Stationary sources of noise include activities associated with a given land use. For example, noise sources in commercial uses would include fast food restaurants, auto repair facilities, parking lots, and a variety of other uses.

Mixed-use areas would contain residential, commercial, and industrially permitted developments. Mixed-use and areas where residential uses are located in proximity to commercial or industrial sites could result in an exposure of sensitive receptors to additional noise. The interface between commercial and residential uses would be exposed to noise due to operations traffic, loading docks, mechanical equipment (such as generators and HVAC units), deliveries, trash-hauling activities, and customer and employee use of commercial facilities. Limiting truck idling time and enclosing external equipment (HVAC units) adjacent to residential uses would reduce stationary noise levels.

While noise-sensitive residential land uses would be exposed to noise associated with the operation of commercial uses, policies are in place to control noise and reduce noise impacts between various land uses. Noise policies are contained in the General Plan Noise Element and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, and regulations are included in the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the SDMC. These include the requirement for noise studies, limits on hours of operation for various noise-generating activities, and standards for the compatibility of various land uses with the existing and future noise environment. In addition, enforcement of state noise regulations in Title 24 of the CCR would control impacts. Given implementation of these policies and enforcement of the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the SDMC, impacts would be less than significant.

Issue 5 Temporary Construction Noise

Would the project result in the exposure of people to significant temporary construction noise?

a. Construction Noise

A significant impact would occur if implementation of the project results in the exposure of people to significant temporary construction noise. Future development as allowed under the project could potentially result in temporary ambient noise increase due to construction activities.

Although no specific construction or development is proposed under the project at this time, construction noise impacts could occur as future development occurs. Due to the developed nature of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, there is a high likelihood that construction activities would take place adjacent to existing noise-sensitive structures.

Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and varies depending upon the phase of construction (e.g., demolition/clearing, grading and excavation, etc.), type and size of equipment being operated, and duration of construction. Typical construction noise levels are discussed in Appendix G.

Construction equipment could generate maximum noise levels (L_{max}) between 85 and 90 dBA at 50 feet from the source when operating. Hourly average noise levels would vary depending on the duration of equipment operation, type of equipment, relative location of the construction equipment to the noise-sensitive receptor, and presence of intervening barriers. As detailed in Appendix G, construction equipment predictions followed the FTA "general assessment" technique, which focuses on predicting noise emissions from the two loudest potential pieces of construction equipment from a given construction phase. Using maximum sound level (L_{max}) references and utilization factors as recommended for FTA detailed assessment, a predicted maximum hourly L_{eq} of 83.7 dBA could be achieved at 50 feet from the source. This level would attenuate to 75 dBA Hourly L_{eq} at approximately 177 feet. It should be noted, however, that the SDMC assesses construction noise via a 12-hour L_{eq} average value. Thus, if the above equipment is operating for less than 12 hours of the workday, this impact distance may be drastically shortened. Under a 12-hour operating schedule, significant impacts would occur if sensitive land uses are located within 177 feet of construction activities.

The City regulates noise associated with construction equipment and activities through its Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance, which puts limits on the days of the week and hours of operation allowed for construction. The City also imposes conditions of approval for building and grading permits related to noise. However, there is also a procedure in place that allows for a permit to deviate from the noise ordinance. Due to the highly developed nature of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area with sensitive receivers potentially located in proximity to construction sites, there is a potential for construction of future projects to expose existing residences to significant noise levels (see Impact 5.5-4).

Impact 5.5-4: A significant noise impact due to construction noise would occur if noise-sensitive receptors are exposed to 12-hour L_{eq} levels of 75 dBA or higher between the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., or noise generated from construction activity during nighttime hours (7 p.m. to 7 a.m.), legal holidays, or Sundays.

b. Vibration – Construction

Construction activities can generate groundborne vibration of varying degrees based on the construction activity and equipment being used. Groundborne vibration and noise associated with construction activities would only occur temporarily during groundbreaking activities such as demolition, pile driving or caisson drilling, and excavation for underground levels, and vibratory pile driving could be used to stabilize the walls of excavated areas.

Construction vibration levels during any phase may be perceptible at times. However, non-pile driving or foundation work construction phases that have the highest potential of producing vibration (such as jackhammering and other power tools) would be intermittent and would only occur for short periods of time on a given project site. By use of administrative controls, such as scheduling vibration-intensive construction activities to hours with the least potential to affect nearby properties, perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum and, as such, would result in a less than significant impact with respect to mere perception.

Pile driving has the potential to generate the highest groundborne vibration levels and is the primary concern for vibratory structural damage when it occurs within critical distances of structures of varying age and/or construction. The Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (Caltrans 2013) identifies potential vibration damage thresholds for these structures as measured by PPV, in inches per second. For pile driving or other intermittent or continuous vibratory construction activities as they apply to structure types in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, maximum PPV values range from 0.25 PPV for historic and certain older buildings, to 0.5 PPV for modern industrial/commercial buildings. The manual also identifies thresholds for potential human vibration annoyance from intermittent and continuous sources, which varies from “barely perceptible” at 0.01 PPV, to “severe” at 0.4 PPV. Reports of annoyance will typically occur when vibration levels reach 0.1 PPV, which is the “strongly perceptible” response level.

Vibration levels generated by pile-driving activities would vary depending on project conditions, such as soil conditions, construction methods, and equipment used. The FTA Transit Noise and Impact Assessment Manual (FTA 2006) identifies reference vibration source levels for impact pile driving equipment of 1.518 PPV at 25 feet. Equation 10 from the Caltrans manual provides a formula for vibration attenuation through generic soil using the reference PPV level at 25 feet, and predicted receiver distance. Pile driving activities are expected to exceed threshold levels for structural damage and human annoyance, as previously reported in Table 5.5-2 of this PEIR, at the calculated receptor distances listed below in Table 5.5-7.

Table 5.5-7
Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment and Applicable Criteria

Structure Type	Maximum Distance (feet) for Potential Structural Damage	Maximum Distance (feet) for “Strongly Perceptible” Human Response
Historic and some old buildings	129	300
Older residential structures	109	300
New residential structures	69	300
Modern industrial and commercial buildings	69	300

Note: Structure types, damage thresholds, and human perception thresholds used in the calculation of these values are found in Tables 19 and 20 of the Caltrans Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual (Caltrans 2013).

Although the mere perception of vibration is not considered a discrete impact threshold, the 300 foot perception distance above highlights potential for responses of annoyance by persons located within this proximity to pile driving activities. Additionally, pile driving within the structure-specific distances listed above has the potential to result in structural damage. Thus, implementation of future land uses under the project would have the potential to result in a significant impact related to vibration associated with construction.

Impact 5.5-5: If future pile driving occurs within the distances to structures or receivers reported in Table 5.5-7, a significant impact associated with vibration would result.

c. Vibration – Operation

Commercial operations, on occasion, utilize equipment or processes that have a potential to generate groundborne vibration. However, vibrations found to be excessive for human exposure that are the result of commercial machinery are generally addressed from an occupational health and safety perspective. The residual vibrations are typically of such low amplitude that they quickly dissipate into the surrounding soil and are rarely perceivable at the surrounding land uses. Additionally, the commercial uses that may be constructed under the project would include uses such as retail, restaurants, and small offices that would not require heavy mechanical equipment that would generate groundborne vibration or heavy truck deliveries. Residential and civic uses do not typically generate vibration. Thus, operational vibration impacts associated with the project's implementation would be less than significant.

5.5.5 Significance of Impacts

5.5.5.1 Ambient Noise

An increase in ambient vehicular traffic noise in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would result from the future development projections of the project and increases in traffic due to regional growth. A significant increase would occur adjacent to one street segment in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area that contains existing noise-sensitive land uses. The increase in ambient noise levels could result in the exposure of existing noise-sensitive land uses to an increase in noise level greater than 5 dBA, and impacts would be significant (**Impact 5.5-1**).

For new discretionary development, there is an existing regulatory framework in place that would ensure future projects implemented in accordance with the project would not be exposed to ambient noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels in the General Plan. Thus, noise impacts to new discretionary projects would be less than significant.

However, in the case of ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise would be adequately attenuated. Therefore, exterior noise impacts for ministerial projects located in areas that exceed the applicable land use and noise compatibility level would be significant (**Impact 5.5-2**).

5.5.5.2 Vehicular Noise

In the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, noise levels for all land uses would be incompatible (i.e., greater than 75 dBA CNEL) closest to the freeways and specific segments of Pacific Highway.

These areas are currently developed and the project would change land use designations in some of these areas. While land uses in these areas would be exposed to noise levels that exceed General Plan standards, Section B of the General Plan Noise Element requires future residential uses in areas above 70 dBA CNEL to include noise attenuation measures to ensure interior levels of 45 dBA CNEL and that they be located in an area where a community plan allows multi-family and mixed-use residential uses. An existing regulatory framework and review process exists for new discretionary development, requiring projects to demonstrate that exterior and interior noise levels would be compatible with City standards. Noise compatibility impacts associated with future discretionary projects implemented in accordance with the project would be less than significant with implementation of existing regulations and noise standards. However, in the case of ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that exterior noise is adequately attenuated. Therefore, exterior noise impacts for ministerial projects located in areas that exceed the applicable land use and noise compatibility level would be significant (**Impact 5.5-3**).

Amtrak, Coaster, and freight train noise levels at the nearest planning area boundary and the nearest sensitive receptors would exceed 60 dBA L_{dn}. Although levels at these boundaries may exceed the compatibility standards of the General Plan, all sensitive receptors located within the 60 dBA L_{dn} distance buffer experience predicted existing and future traffic noise levels in excess of 70 dBA CNEL. Thus, impacts specifically from rail noise would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.5.5.3 Airport Compatibility

Based on the projected airport noise contours for SDIA, there are sensitive receptors in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area that are located where noise levels due to aircraft operations exceed 60 dBA CNEL. At the project level, future development must include interior noise attenuation consistent with the Noise Element of the General Plan and the ALUCP for SDIA; therefore, impacts related to airport noise would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.5.5.4 Noise Ordinance Compliance

Mixed-use sites and areas where residential uses are located in proximity to commercial sites would expose sensitive receptors to noise. Although noise-sensitive residential land uses would be exposed to noise associated with the operation of these commercial uses, City policies and regulations would control noise and reduce noise impacts between various land uses. In addition, enforcement of state noise regulations in Title 24 of the CCR would control impacts. With implementation of these policies and enforcement of the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the SDMC, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required at the program level.

5.5.5.5 Temporary Construction Noise

a. Construction Noise

Construction activities related to implementation of the project would potentially generate short-term noise levels in excess of 75 dBA L_{eq} at adjacent properties. While the City regulates noise associated with construction equipment and activities through enforcement of noise ordinance standards (e.g., days of the week and hours of operation) and imposition of conditions of approval for building or grading permits, there is a procedure in place that allows for variance to the noise ordinance. Due to the highly developed

nature of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area with sensitive receivers potentially located in close proximity to any given construction site, there is a potential for construction of future projects to expose existing sensitive land uses to significant noise levels. While future development projects would be required to incorporate feasible mitigation measures, due to the proximity of sensitive receivers to potential construction sites, the program-level impact related to construction noise would be potentially significant (**Impact 5.5-4**).

b. Vibration – Construction

By use of administrative controls, such as scheduling construction activities with the highest potential to produce perceptible vibration to hours with least potential to affect nearby properties, perceptible vibration can be kept to a minimum and, as such, would result in a less than significant impact with respect to perception. However, due to the highly developed nature of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area with existing structures occupying the majority of parcels, pile driving within distances of existing structures listed in Table 5.5-7 has the potential to exceed damage thresholds and would be potentially significant (**Impact 5.5-5**).

c. Vibration – Operation

Post-construction operational vibration impacts could occur as a result of commercial operations that are implemented in accordance with the project. The commercial uses that would be constructed under the project would include uses such as retail, restaurants, and small offices that would not require heavy mechanical equipment that would generate groundborne vibration or heavy truck deliveries. Residential and civic uses do not typically generate vibration. Thus, operational vibration impacts associated with the project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.5.6 Mitigation Framework

Increases in ambient noise levels resulting in the exposure of existing noise-sensitive land uses to noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element would be significant and unavoidable (**Impact 5.5-1**). No feasible mitigation has been identified at the program level to reduce this impact to less than significant.

While mitigation measure **NOISE 5.5-1** would reduce potentially significant impacts related to noise-sensitive land uses that require only a ministerial permit (**Impact 5.5-2**) and future ministerial projects exposed to vehicular traffic noise in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element (**Impact 5.5-3**), the measure would be infeasible as there is no procedure to ensure that an acoustical analysis would be required for ministerial projects.

~~To mitigate traffic noise impacts related to noise-sensitive land uses that require only a ministerial permit (**Impact 5.5-2**) and to mitigate impacts to future ministerial projects exposed to vehicular traffic noise in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element (**Impact 5.5-3**), the following mitigation measure would be implemented.~~

NOISE 5.5-1 Prior to approval of a development permit for any ministerial development within 900 feet of the I-5 edge-of-pavement, 700 feet of the I-8 edge-of-pavement, or adjacent to any roadway featuring ADT volumes greater than 6,000, an acoustical analysis shall be

performed to determine if any required outdoor open space areas would be exposed to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL.

To mitigate impacts related to construction noise (**Impact 5.5-4**), the following mitigation measure would be implemented.

NOISE 5.5-2: At the project level, future discretionary projects will be required to incorporate feasible mitigation measures. Typically, noise can be controlled to comply with City standards when standard construction noise control measures are enforced at the project site and when the duration of the noise-generating construction period is limited to one construction season (typically 1 year) or less.

- Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Construction is not allowed on legal holidays as specified in Section 21.04 of the SDMC, with exception of Columbus Day and Washington's Birthday, or on Sundays (consistent with Section 59.5.0404 of the SDMC).

- Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with appropriately-sized intake and/or exhaust mufflers that are properly operating and maintained consistent with manufacturer's standards.

- Stationary noise-generating equipment (e.g., compressors or generators) shall be located as far as possible from adjacent residential receivers and oriented so that emitted noise is directed away from sensitive receptors, whenever feasible.

- If levels are expected to potentially exceed SDMC thresholds, temporary noise barriers with a minimum height of 8 feet shall be located around pertinent active construction equipment or entire work areas to shield nearby sensitive receivers.

- Utilize "quiet" air compressors, generators, and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.

- The contractor shall prepare a detailed construction plan identifying the schedule for major noise-generating construction activities. The construction plan shall identify a procedure for coordination with adjacent residential land uses so that construction activities can be scheduled to minimize noise disturbance.

- Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for receiving and responding to any complaints about construction noise or vibration. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint and, if identified as a sound generated by construction area activities, will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem.

To mitigate impacts relative to Vibration – Construction (**Impact 5.5-5**), the following mitigation measure would be implemented.

NOISE 5.5-3: For discretionary projects where construction would include vibration-generating activities, such as pile driving, within the distances of specific structures listed in Table 5.5-7, site-specific vibration studies shall be conducted to ensure the development project would not adversely affect adjacent properties to the satisfaction of the Chief Building Official. Such efforts shall be conducted by a qualified structural engineer and could include:

- Identify sites that would include vibration compaction activities such as pile driving and have the potential to generate groundborne vibration and the sensitivity of nearby structures to groundborne vibration.

- Develop a vibration monitoring and construction contingency plan to identify structures where monitoring would be conducted; set up a vibration monitoring schedule; define structure-specific vibration limits; and address the need to conduct photo, elevation, and crack surveys to document before and after construction conditions. Construction contingencies would be identified for when vibration levels approach the limits.

- Monitor vibration during initial demolition activities and during pile-driving activities. Monitoring results may indicate the need for more or less intensive measurements.

- Designate a "disturbance coordinator" who would be responsible for receiving and responding to any complaints about construction vibration. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint and will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem.

- When vibration levels approach limits, suspend construction and implement contingencies to either lower vibration levels or secure the affected structures.

- Conduct post-activity survey on structures where either monitoring has indicated high levels or complaints of damage have been made. Make appropriate repairs or compensation where damage has occurred as a result of construction activities.

5.5.7 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation

Exterior noise impacts to existing noise-sensitive land uses due to the increase in ambient noise levels associated with the project would remain significant and unavoidable (**Impact 5.5-1**). No feasible mitigation measures have been identified to address this impact because there is no mechanism in place to ensure noise attenuation occurs at existing structures that would be exposed to ambient noise increases. Exterior noise attenuation features such as berms or walls may also not be physically feasible given specific site layouts or be able to reduce impacts to acceptable levels given size and placement limitations.

Impacts from ambient noise level increases associated with future ministerial development within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area (**Impact 5.5 2**) and exterior noise impacts associated with future ministerial projects exposed to vehicular traffic noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element, based on future (2035) noise contours (**Impact 5.5-3**)

would remain significant and unavoidable. While implementation of mitigation measure **NOISE 5.5-1** has the potential to reduce impacts associated with ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that an acoustical analysis would be required for a ministerial project; therefore, the mitigation measure is infeasible. Even if there were a procedure to require an acoustical analysis for a ministerial development, which would require the incorporation of controls to reduce traffic noise impacts on required open space areas, without knowing the exact spatial relationship between the open space areas and the contributing traffic noise source(s) for each future development, it is impossible to know whether every future development would be able to maintain noise levels below 65 dBA CNEL within their respective open spaces. Furthermore, if it is determined that the only feasible approach to reducing traffic noise to acceptable levels within the space would require the construction of an enclosure, such an attenuation measure may be contrary to the basic goal of creating "outdoor" open space.

~~Regarding impacts from ambient noise level increases associated with future ministerial development within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area (**Impact 5.5-2**) and exterior noise impacts associated with future ministerial projects exposed to vehicular traffic noise levels in excess of the compatibility levels established in the General Plan Noise Element, based on future (2035) noise contours (**Impact 5.5-3**), future ministerial projects would be required to perform an acoustical analysis as outlined in mitigation measure **NOISE 5.5-1**, which would determine if any required outdoor open space areas would be exposed to noise levels in excess of 65 dBA CNEL. Preparation of an acoustical analysis has the potential to identify potential impacts and lead to the incorporation of controls to reduce traffic noise impacts on required open space areas; however, without knowing the exact spatial relationship between the open space areas and the contributing traffic noise source(s) for each future development, it is impossible to know whether every future development would be able to maintain noise levels below 65 dBA CNEL within their respective open spaces. Furthermore, if it is determined that the only feasible approach to reducing traffic noise to acceptable levels within the space would require the construction of an enclosure, such an attenuation measure may be contrary to the basic goal of creating "outdoor" open space. Thus, even within implementation of mitigation measure **NOISE 5.5-1**, traffic and vehicular exterior noise impacts associated with ministerial development would be significant and unavoidable.~~

Regarding temporary construction noise impacts (**Impact 5.5-4**), future construction projects would be required to incorporate the standard controls outlined in mitigation measure **NOISE 5.5-2**, which would reduce construction noise levels emanating from the site, limit construction hours, and minimize disruption and annoyance. With the implementation of these controls, and the limited duration of the noise-generating construction period, the substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels would be less than significant.

Regarding vibration impacts during construction (**Impact 5.5-5**), pile driving within structure-specific distances listed in Table 5.5-7 has the potential to exceed damage and annoyance thresholds, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measure **NOISE 5.5-3** would reduce construction-related vibration impacts; however, at the program level it cannot be known whether the measures would be adequate to minimize vibration levels to less than significant. Thus, even with implementation of mitigation measure **NOISE 5.5-2**, construction-related vibration impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.6 Health and Safety

Ninyo & Moore prepared the Hazardous Materials Technical Study for the City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Community Plan Updates (April 2012). That analysis addresses existing environmental conditions of the project area as well as potential impacts related to hazardous materials and waste associated with the two proposed CPUs, including the project. The Hazardous Materials Technical Study is included as Appendix J to this PEIR. This section presents a summary of the findings made in the report and the associated analysis of potential impacts.

5.6.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.6.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Thresholds used to evaluate potential impacts related to health and safety effects are based on the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016). Thresholds are modified from the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds to reflect the programmatic analysis for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. A significant impact to health and safety would occur if implementation of the project would:

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

2. Result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school;

3. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan;

4. Be located on a site which 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 environment; or

5. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from off-airport aircraft operational accidents.

5.6.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Wildland Fire Risk

Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including when wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area lies within the western portion of the City of San Diego. It is a highly urbanized area, with little to no open space. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is not identified as a fire hazard zone of state or local responsibility (CAL FIRE 2009). The adjacent Old Town community does contain some Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones.

Other policies and regulations intended to reduce the risk of wildfires are included in the General Plan, the 2010 California Fire Code, Section 145.07 of the LDC, and Chapter 7 of the CBC. As stated previously, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area does not contain any fire hazard zones. In addition to this, adherence to previously stated regulations and policies would reduce the risk of wildland fires from surrounding areas. Therefore, the impact related to wildfires is less than significant.

Issue 2 Hazardous Emissions and Materials

Would the project result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school?

Several existing schools and/or day care/educational centers are located within the project area, and other proposed and/or existing schools may be located within a quarter-mile of the project area. While it is possible that hazardous materials/wastes may be disturbed during project activities, implementation of the proposed CPU would be expected to result in the overall decreased exposure of sensitive receptors to hazardous materials.

In accordance with City, state, and federal requirements, any new development that involves contaminated property would necessitate the cleanup and/or remediation of the property in accordance with applicable requirements and regulations. No construction would be permitted to occur at such locations until a “no further action” clearance letter from the County DEH, or similar determination is issued by the City’s Fire Rescue Department, DTSC, RWQCB, or other responsible agency.

For any new schools that would be constructed within a quarter-mile of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, the individual school district is responsible for planning, siting, building, and operating the schools. It is the responsibility of the school district to perform an in-depth analysis of any potential hazards at the project level.

Through the implementation of existing regulations, impacts to schools from hazardous materials, substances, or waste would be less than significant.

Issue 3 Emergency Plan Consistency

Would the project impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The San Diego County Emergency Operations Plan (County of San Diego 2014) identifies a broad range of potential hazards and a response plan for public protection. The plan identifies major interstates and highways within San Diego County that could be used as primary routes for evacuation. Two interstates identified, I-5 and I-8, are located directly adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The land use changes identified in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would not physically interfere with any known adopted emergency plans. As identified in the Mobility Element, the proposed CPU actually includes improvements to the existing transportation infrastructure, which could improve evacuation times. Policies and objectives included in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Issue 4 Hazardous Materials Site

Would the project be located on a site which 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 environment?

Hazardous materials are typically utilized by land uses such as industrial, retail/office, commercial, residential, agriculture, medical, and recreational uses, among other activities. According to a search of federal, state, and local regulatory databases, 73 documented hazardous material release cases were identified within the proposed CPU area, 13 of which are open and the remaining 60 are closed cleanup program sites (Table 2-4).

Federal and state regulations require adherence to specific guidelines regarding the use, transportation, disposal, and accidental release of hazardous materials. In accordance with local, state, and federal requirements, any new development that involves contaminated property would necessitate the cleanup and/or remediation of the property in accordance with applicable requirements and regulations. No construction would be permitted at such locations until a “no further action” clearance letter from the County DEH, or similar determination is issued by the City’s Fire-Rescue Department, DTSC, RWQCB, or other responsible agency.

Because the proposed Land Use Plan does not demonstrate a significant increase in land uses that have potential to be hazardous materials sites, there are no policies in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU relative to hazardous materials. However, the General Plan includes policies to protect the health, safety, and welfare of residents relating to industrial land uses, documentation of hazardous materials investigations, and requiring soil remediation in land use changes from industrial or heavy commercial to residential or mixed residential development. Therefore, impacts related to hazardous materials sites and health hazards would be less than significant.

Issue 5 Aircraft Hazards

Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from off-airport aircraft operational accidents?

As discussed in Section 5.1 of this PEIR, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area falls within the AIA for SDIA. There are no private airstrips or heliport facilities within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The ALUCP for SDIA is designed to safeguard the general welfare of people within the vicinity of the airport. As established in Section 5.1 of this PEIR, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is consistent with the ALUCP for SDIA. It was concluded in that section that impacts related to safety hazards for people residing or working in a designated AIA would be less than significant. Therefore, impacts related to the exposure of people or structures to aircraft hazards would be less than significant.

5.6.4 Significance of Impacts

5.6.4.1 Wildland Fire Risk

As stated previously, the proposed CPU area is not identified in a fire hazard zone of state or local responsibility. In addition to this, adherence to previously stated regulations and policies would reduce the risk of wildland fires from surrounding areas. Therefore, the program-level impact related to wildfires would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.6.4.2 Hazardous Emissions and Materials

The project would not result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter-mile of any existing or proposed school. Impacts to schools would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.6.4.3 Emergency Plan Consistency

The project would not impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.6.4.4 Hazardous Materials Site

According to a search of federal, state, and local regulatory databases, 73 documented hazardous material release cases were identified within the proposed CPU area, 13 of which are open and the remaining 60 are closed cleanup program sites. Compliance with federal, state, and local regulations will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.

5.6.4.5 Aircraft Hazards

Impacts from safety hazards related to being located within an AIA are less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.6.5 Mitigation Framework

All impacts related to health and safety would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

This section addresses the potential hydrology and surface and groundwater quality impacts that would result from the project. It relies on secondary source information and policies contained within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. This section also details applicable regulations, receiving waters, flood hazards, and other relevant existing conditions within the project area.

5.7.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.7.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Based on the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, which have been adapted to guide a programmatic analysis of the project, a significant hydrology/water quality impact would occur if implementation of the project would:

1. Result in flooding due to an increase in impervious surfaces, changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate of surface runoff;

2. Result in a substantial increase in pollutant discharge to receiving waters and increase discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body; or

3. Deplete groundwater supplies, degrade groundwater quality, or interfere with groundwater recharge.

5.7.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Flooding and Drainage Patterns

Would the project result in flooding due to an increase in impervious surfaces, changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate of surface runoff?

The Midway-Pacific Highway community is an urban community and the majority of the proposed CPU area is developed. Large areas of impervious surfaces (buildings, roadways, and surface parking) are mixed with a smaller amount of pervious (landscaped or ruderal) areas.

Future projects that could occur in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area may result in an increase in impervious areas due to the new buildings, hardscape, and parking areas; however, only approximately 6 acres of land in the community is currently vacant and future projects would mostly consist of infill development. In addition, landscaping, as well as pervious pavements used in lieu of standard pavement, diminishes a project's increase in impervious areas and, therefore, diminishes a project's potential increase in runoff and associated urban pollutants. Implementation of the project would also have the potential to change surface runoff characteristics, including the volume of runoff, rate of runoff, and drainage patterns. An increase in the volume or rate of runoff or change in drainage patterns could result in flooding and/or erosion.

Future projects would be required to comply with the NPDES and Hydromodification Management Plan (HMP) requirements as described in the City of San Diego Storm Water Standards Manual. Storm water detention and HMP facilities would be implemented to accommodate the potential increase in storm water runoff rates due to the proposed increase in impervious areas. To fulfill the HMP requirements, projects would need to be designed so that runoff rates and durations are controlled to maintain or reduce pre-project downstream erosion conditions and protect stream habitat. Projects would typically manage the increase in runoff by implementing a series of storm water BMPs and detention facilities that have been specifically designed for hydromodification management. However, future development projects proposed within CPU areas draining to San Diego Bay would typically be exempt from hydromodification management requirements because of the location and hardened drainage systems. Exemptions from hydromodification management requirements shall adhere to the City's Storm Water Standards Manual. Projects discharging into underground storm drains discharging directly to bays or the ocean are exempt, subject to conditions listed in the City's Storm Water Standards Manual.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU elements include policies that address hydrology and water quality. The Conservation Element of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains a policy related to the improvement of the hydrology and drainage within the proposed CPU area, specifically the application of sustainable urban runoff management techniques applied to support the surrounding landscape and protect the water quality in the nearby streams, bays, and the ocean. Other proposed Conservation Element policies address incorporating storm water BMPs in public infrastructure and private development to limit water pollution, erosion, and sedimentation.

All development in the City is subject to drainage regulations through the SDMC, which requires that the existing flows of a property proposed for development are maintained to ensure that the existing structures and systems handling the flows are sufficient. Since future development would be required to adhere to existing drainage regulations, development would not result in alterations to existing drainage patterns in a manner that would result in flooding or erosion on- or off-site. Adherence to the requirements of the City's Drainage Design Manual and Storm Water Standards Manual, which require installation of LID practices, such as bioretention areas, pervious pavements, cisterns, and/or rain barrels, would improve surface drainage conditions or, at a minimum, not exacerbate flooding or cause erosion. Furthermore, future development would be required to comply with NPDES permit requirements, which would result in a reduction in the volume and rate of surface runoff compared to existing conditions. The quantity of runoff reduction would depend on the design of open space, pervious areas runoff retention, and implementation of LID practices. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact related to flooding and drainage patterns.

Issue 2 Water Quality

Would the project result in a substantial increase in pollutant discharge to receiving waters and increase discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body?

Future development projects that could occur in the Midway-Pacific Highway community under the project would have the potential to change pollutant discharges. However, as future development in accordance with the project occurs, applicable NPDES permit requirements would require the retention and/or treatment of storm water through the implementation of BMPs. Future development would be required to demonstrate how pollutants such as various trace metals (e.g., copper, lead, zinc, and mercury), fecal coliform, low dissolved oxygen, phosphorus, and total dissolved solids that could be associated with future development would be treated to prevent discharge into receiving waters. Much of the existing development in the area was constructed before current storm water regulations were adopted. Thus, future development and redevelopment would be subject to current, more stringent requirements, which would likely improve water quality.

Under current storm water regulations in the City, all projects requiring approvals are subject to certain minimum storm water requirements to protect water quality. Types of storm water BMPs required for new developments include site design, source control, and treatment control practices, many of which overlap with LID practices (see Section 5.4.3, Issue 2). Storm water BMPs would reduce the amount of pollutants transported from a future proposed development project to receiving waters. Subsequent projects implemented in accordance with the proposed CPU would be subject to existing regulations in place at the time projects are implemented. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact related to water quality.

Issue 3 Groundwater

Would the project deplete groundwater supplies, degrade groundwater quality, or interfere with groundwater recharge?

Based on the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin, most of the groundwater in the region has been extensively developed; the availability of potential future uses of groundwater resources is limited (California Regional Water Quality Control Board 2016). Further development of groundwater resources would most likely necessitate groundwater recharge programs to maintain adequate groundwater table elevations. Groundwater within the Point Loma hydrologic area of the Pueblo San Diego hydrologic unit is exempt from municipal and domestic supply beneficial use, as it was determined by the 1989 RWQCB's Resolution No. 89-33 that this area does not support municipal and domestic supply. Groundwater within the Mission San Diego hydrologic subarea of the Lower San Diego hydrologic area of the San Diego hydrologic unit has a potential beneficial use for municipal and domestic supply and existing beneficial uses for agricultural supply, industrial service supply, and industrial process supply.

As discussed under Issues 1 and 2 above, current storm water regulations encourage infiltration of storm water runoff and protection of water quality, which would also protect the quality of groundwater resources and support infiltration, where appropriate. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and quality.

5.7.4 Significance of Impacts

5.7.4.1 Flooding and Drainage Patterns

All development is subject to drainage and floodplain regulations in the SDMC, and would be required to adhere to the City's Drainage Design Manual and Storm Water Standards Manual. Therefore, with future development, the volume and rate of overall surface runoff within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would be reduced when compared to existing conditions. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.7.4.2 Water Quality

New development under the project would be required to implement LID and storm water BMPs into the project design to address the potential for transport of pollutants of concern through retention or filtration. The implementation of LID practices and storm water BMPs would reduce the amount of pollutants transported from the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area to receiving waters. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Future development would adhere to the requirements of the MS4 permit for the San Diego Region and the City's Storm Water Standards Manual; therefore, no pollutant discharges would occur and there would be no adverse effect on water quality. Additionally, the City has adopted the Master Storm Water System Maintenance Program to address flood control issues by cleaning and maintaining the channels to reduce the volume of pollutants that enter the receiving waters. Impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.7.4.3 Groundwater

Groundwater within the Point Loma hydrologic area of the Pueblo San Diego hydrologic unit is exempt from municipal and domestic supply beneficial use and does not support municipal and domestic supply. Groundwater within the Mission San Diego hydrologic subarea of the Lower San Diego hydrologic area of the San Diego hydrologic unit has a potential beneficial use for municipal and domestic supply. Storm water regulations that encourage infiltration of storm water runoff and protection of water quality would protect the quality of groundwater resources and support infiltration, where appropriate. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact on groundwater supply and quality, and no mitigation is required.

5.7.5 Mitigation Framework

Implementation of the project would result in less than significant impacts to hydrology and water quality. No mitigation is required.

5.8 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

This section addresses visual effects of the project, and potential for impacts on neighborhood character, and includes a description of the built and natural visual resources within the proposed CPU area. In addition, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU's consistency with relevant development regulations, policies, and guidelines is assessed, including the adopted General Plan and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan elements, as well as the LDC.

5.8.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.8.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Thresholds used to evaluate potential impacts related to visual effects and neighborhood character are based on the City of San Diego CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016). Thresholds are modified from the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds to reflect the programmatic analysis for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. A significant impact on visual effects and neighborhood character would occur if implementation of the project would:

1. Result in a substantial obstruction of a vista or scenic view from a public viewing area as identified in the community plan;
2. Result in a substantial adverse alteration (e.g., bulk, scale, materials or style) to the existing or planned (adopted) character of the area;
3. Result in the loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or stand of mature trees as identified in the community plan;
4. Result in a substantial change in the existing landform; or
5. Create substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime and nighttime views in the area.

5.8.3 Impact Analysis

Potential impacts resulting from implementation of the project were evaluated based on information from existing conditions assessments of urban design, recreation, and conservation in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The assessment was made using data from observation, spatial analysis, and a photographic inventory.

Issue 1 Scenic Vistas or Views

Would the project result in a substantial obstruction of a vista or scenic view from a public viewing area as identified in the community plan?

Due to the location of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, its topography and the topography of adjacent communities, and the physical and visual barriers constituted by I-5, I-8, rail infrastructure, and SDIA, the possibilities for vistas and scenic views from public viewing areas within the proposed CPU area are limited to certain locations within the public right-of-way at the southeastern corner of the community and in the area north of I-8. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area does not have prominent view corridors, designated scenic vistas, or designated scenic highways.

Given the developed nature of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, future projects in the southeastern corner of the proposed CPU area would blend with the existing urban framework through established and regulated height and setback regulations, and would not result in new obstructions to view corridors along public streets where view opportunities largely exist. For areas north of I-8, which are located within the California Coastal Zone, the Proposed Parks land use designation for these areas in the proposed CPU and the proposed policies within the Coastal Resources section of the Conservation Element would provide protection for public views of the San Diego River Channel from public vantage points such as public rights-of-way and parks.

Implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would not result in a substantial alteration or blockage of public views from critical view corridors, designated open space areas, public roads, or public parks; new development within the community would take place within the constraints of the existing urban framework and development pattern. Thus, future development would not impact view corridors or viewsheds as viewed from identified public vantage points. Public view impacts would be less than significant.

Issue 2 Neighborhood Character

Would the project result in a substantial alteration (e.g., bulk, scale, materials or style) to the existing or planned (adopted) character of the area?

Midway -Pacific Highway is a developed, urbanized community, although not all lot or building sites are built to their allowable capacity under the adopted Community Plan and base zones. Future development projects would be undertaken in accordance with the General Plan and LDC in addition to proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes Urban Design Element policies intended to direct future development in a manner that improves the community's sense of place by transforming it into a pedestrian-friendly community with unique districts and villages.

The proposed Urban Design Element provides policies relative to streetscape (publicly owned street rights-of-way) and public spaces (publicly accessible open spaces such as parks, squares, plazas, courtyards, and alleys) that would shape the area's character and function as future development occurs. Proposed streetscape policies would address the siting of street furnishings, design character, and provision of plazas and pedestrian nodes to enhance the pedestrian realm. Urban forestry policies are

also proposed that would maximize the benefits of trees, including their contribution to the character, identity, and comfort of the community's streets. Trees also contribute to the spatial definition of a street, providing both a comfortable sense of scale and enclosure to the public realm. They may add shade, which contributes to pedestrian comfort, and color, texture, and pattern that contribute to the street's visual quality.

The proposed Urban Design Element and Land Use, Villages and Districts Element of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would also provide policies addressing commercial and mixed-use development, and residential in-fill development. Policies are related to street wall articulation, ground-level uses, windows, building materials, lighting, signs, corners, architectural projections, rooftop and mechanical screening, public space, public art, street orientation and setbacks, sustainable building design, height and massing, and development transitions. Implementation of these policies would provide specific policy support to ensure that the bulk and scale of development is not out of character with the existing environment.

Additionally, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Land Use, Villages and Design Element includes specific goals and policies for creating distinctive villages and districts within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. These policies cover vision, uses, mobility, parks, and urban design and public realm. Figure 3-4 shows the proposed CPIOZ associated with the proposed CPU, which would implement required additional specific planning or master planning for the City-owned properties within the Sports Arena Community Village, and allow density and/or intensity to be calculated based on site area before dedication of the right-of-way for planned streets or area for planned linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies; enhanced streetscape requirements for Sports Arena Boulevard near Rosecrans Street; and planned linear parks, and allow density and/or intensity to be calculated based on site area before dedication of the right-of-way for planned streets or area for planned linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies in the Dutch Flats Urban Village.

With the implementation of the proposed Urban Design and Land Use, Villages and Districts Element policies, zoning, and LDC regulations, new development would be consistent with, and even improve, the existing neighborhood character. Thus, impacts related to substantial alterations to the existing or planned character of the area would be less than significant.

Issue 3 Distinctive or Landmark Trees

Would the project result in the loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or stand of mature trees as identified in the community plan?

The City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area Historic Resources Survey Report: Historic Context & Reconnaissance Survey (included as Appendix D to this PEIR) identifies one tree as having historical importance: the olive tree located west of the intersection of Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street. The olive tree was planted as part of an effort by the San Diego Historical Society to mark the La Playa Trail, which was also known as an ancient Kumeyaay path. The La Playa Trail is considered the oldest European Trail on the Pacific Coast, and was marked by the San Diego Historical Society in the early 1930s. A 4-foot-high concrete marker was placed in six locations, with olive trees planted at half-mile intervals along the trail.

Although the olive tree near the intersection of Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street is not officially a designated historical resource, it could be considered a landmark tree. Any alteration or proposed removal of this historical resource would be subject to discretionary review before it could be removed or modified. Thus, existing protective measures for the olive tree are in place that would prevent the loss or alteration of this designated tree, except as required because of the tree's health or public safety. As such, implementation of the project would not result in the loss of any distinctive or landmark trees or any stand of mature trees.

In addition, street trees present within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are subject to City Council Policy 900-19, which provides for protection of street trees. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Urban Design Element includes Urban Forestry policies that would promote the planting of new trees. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact related to losses of distinctive or landmark trees or mature stands of trees.

Issue 4 Landform Alteration

Would the project result in a substantial change in the existing landform?

It is not anticipated that future development allowed by the project would result in significant landform alteration. The community is largely developed with existing urban land uses. While the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would intensify some uses, the proposed CPU contains policies to ensure that redevelopment takes into account existing development as well as the landform. Of particular importance are the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Conservation Element and Urban Design Element policies that would support conservation of existing landforms and open space, and would support the design of buildings that respect existing landforms.

Because the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is an adoption of a plan, development would occur in the future over an extended time period, and specific grading quantities associated with future development are currently unknown. However, no mass grading is anticipated since the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is relatively flat and already nearly fully developed with urban uses. As future development proposals come forward resulting from the project, they would be reviewed to determine whether grading plans demonstrate compliance with the City's LDC for grading and if a permit is needed, or if the development proposal is exempt from a grading permit per the LDC (i.e., excavation). Therefore, impacts to the landform from future development resulting from the project would be less than significant.

Issue 5 Light and Glare

Would the project create substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?

The Midway-Pacific Highway community is a developed urban community. Sources of light currently include those typical of an urban community, such as building lighting for residential and non-residential land uses, roadway infrastructure lighting, and signage. Future development implemented in accordance with the project would necessitate the use of additional light fixtures and may contribute to existing conditions of light and glare. New light sources may include residential and non-residential interior and

exterior lighting, parking lot lighting, commercial signage lighting, and lamps for streetscape and public recreational areas.

Lighting policies within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Urban Design Element would support pedestrian-oriented street lighting with appropriate shielding and low heights to minimize light spillage. Other proposed policies would utilize design measures for signage and materials that would reduce glare without negatively impacting visibility. These policies would support existing lighting regulations in the LDC. Outdoor lighting is regulated by Section 142.0740 of the LDC. The purpose of the City's outdoor lighting regulations is to minimize negative impacts from light pollution including light trespass, glare, and urban sky glow in order to preserve enjoyment of the night sky and minimize conflict caused by unnecessary illumination. Regulation of outdoor lighting is also intended to promote lighting design that provides for public safety and conserves electrical energy. New outdoor lighting fixtures must minimize light trespass in accordance with the Green Building Regulations, where applicable, or otherwise shall direct, shield, and control light to keep it from falling onto surrounding properties. The regulations prohibit direct-beam illumination from leaving the premises and requires that most outdoor lighting be turned off between 11:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. with some exceptions (such as lighting provided for commercial and industrial uses that continue to be fully operational after 11:00 p.m. for public safety).

Section 142.0730 of the City's LDC regulates glare. Section 142.0730 limits a maximum of 50 percent of the exterior of a building to be composed of reflective material that has a light reflectivity factor greater than 30 percent. Additionally, per Section 142.0730(b), reflective building materials are not permitted where the City Manager determines that their use would contribute to potential traffic hazards, diminished quality of riparian habitat, or reduced enjoyment of public open space. Lighting impacts to MHPA areas that occur adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area (along the San Diego River) would be regulated through compliance with MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, which requires lighting of all developed areas adjacent to the MHPA to be directed away from the MHPA. With requisite implementation of both the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and General Plan/LDC regulations, as well as requirement of the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, lighting and glare impacts would be less than significant.

5.8.4 Significance of Impacts

5.8.4.1 Scenic Vistas or Views

Implementation of the project would not result in substantial alteration or blockage of public views or scenic highways from critical view corridors, designated open space areas, public roads, or public parks; new development within the community would take place within the constraints of the existing urban framework and development pattern, thereby not impacting public view corridors and viewsheds along public right-of-way. Therefore, public view impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.8.4.2 Neighborhood Character

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies that would encourage residential and mixed-use development that would be consistent with and improve the existing neighborhood character, and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.8.4.3 Distinctive or Landmark Trees

There are protective measures for the existing olive tree located west of the intersection of Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street, and the implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would prevent the loss of existing mature trees except as required because of tree health or public safety. The implementation of the project would not result in the loss of any distinctive or landmark trees, or any stand of mature trees; therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.8.4.4 Landform Alteration

Implementation of the project would result in less than significant impacts related to landform alteration as the area is already largely developed. Thus, impacts related to landform alteration would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.8.4.5 Light and Glare

Impacts relative to lighting and glare would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.8.5 Mitigation Framework

Potential impacts on visual effects and neighborhood character resulting from implementation of the project would be less than significant. Thus, no mitigation is required.

5.9 Air Quality

This section addresses the potential air quality impacts that would result from implementation of the project. This section is based on the Air Quality Technical Study for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update (Air Quality Report) prepared by AECOM (2017) for the project (Appendix H).

5.9.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.9.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

5.9.2.1 CEQA Guidelines

Thresholds used to evaluate potential impacts to air quality are based on applicable criteria in the CEQA Guidelines Appendix G and the City of San Diego Significance Determination Thresholds (2016), and applicable air district standards described below. A significant impact could occur if implementation of the project would:

1. Conflict or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan;
2. Result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation;
3. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including toxins; or
4. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people;

5.9.2.2 San Diego Air Pollution Control District

a. Conflict with Air Quality Plan

Regarding Issue 1 above, the federal Clean Air Act and the California Clean Air Act require that air basins designated nonattainment for criteria pollutants prepare and implement plans to attain the standards. At the time of this analysis, the air quality plans for the SDAB include the CO maintenance plan, the federal 2012 maintenance plan for ozone NAAQS, and the RAQS. The two pollutants addressed in the RAQS are volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_X), which are precursors to the formation of ozone. Projected increases in motor vehicle usage, population, and industrial growth create

challenges in controlling emissions to maintain and further improve air quality. The RAQS, in conjunction with the Transportation Control Measures, were most recently revised in December 2016.

The basis for the mobile source emission estimates in the RAQS is the distribution of population in the region as projected by SANDAG. The San Diego APCD refers to approved general plans to forecast, inventory, and allocate regional emissions from land use and development-related sources. These emissions budgets are used in statewide air quality attainment planning efforts. As such, projects that are consistent with the General Plan and the assumptions used in the development of the RAQS would not conflict with or obstruct attainment of the air quality levels, which would help the region achieve ambient air quality standards. Projects that propose development at an intensity equal to or less than population growth projections and land use intensity are inherently consistent. However, projects that amend or propose development greater than the projections in the RAQS would not necessarily result in an inconsistency with the air quality plan. Since the focus of the RAQS is on emissions, amending the adopted Community Plan to change land use development would require further analysis to determine consistency with RAQS and the SIP.

b. Air Quality Standards

Regarding Issue 2 above, the San Diego APCD has established trigger levels that determine when a new or modified stationary source would require an air quality analysis. These trigger levels are utilized by the City of San Diego in their Significance Determination Thresholds (City of San Diego 2016) as one of the considerations when determining the potential significance of air quality impacts for projects within the City. These thresholds would be applicable to future, individual development projects implemented within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The air quality impact screening levels applicable to future development within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are shown in Table 5.9-1.

Table 5.9-1
Air Quality Impact Screening Levels

	Emission Rate		
	Pounds/Hour	Pounds/Day	Tons/Year
NO_X	25	250	40
SO_X	25	250	40
CO	100	550	100
PM_{10}	--	100	15
Lead	--	3.2	0.6
VOC, ROG[1]	--	137[2]	15
$PM_{2.5}$	--	100[3]	--

NO_x = oxides of nitrogen, SO_X = oxides of sulfur, CO = carbon monoxide, PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter, $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter, VOC/ROG = volatile organic compounds/reactive organic gases.

Notes:

[1] The terms ROG and VOC are essentially synonymous and are used interchangeably.

[2] VOC thresholds are based on levels per the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and Monterey Bay Air Pollution Control District, which have similar federal and state attainment status as San Diego.

[3] $PM_{2.5}$ threshold developed from the SCAQMD *Final Methodology to Calculate $PM_{2.5}$ and $PM_{2.5}$ Significance Thresholds* (SCAQMD 2006) and the PM_{10} standard of the San Diego APCD.

Source: APCD, Rule 20.2 (12/17/1998); City of San Diego 2016

The project level thresholds are intended to ensure many individual projects would not obstruct the timely attainment of the NAAQS and CAAQS. However, the above thresholds are applicable to individual development projects and not a program level analysis such as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. Generally, discretionary program-level planning activities, such as general plans, community plans, and specific plans, are evaluated for consistency with the local air quality plans as a measure of significance. However, for a conservative analysis, the net change in emissions between the adopted Community Plan and~~from~~ the proposed CPU is compared to the thresholds of significance.

c. Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Localized Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots Impacts

Although the SDAB is currently an attainment/maintenance area for CO, exhaust emissions can potentially cause a direct, localized "hotspot" impact at or near proposed development. Because increased CO concentrations are usually associated with roadways that are congested and with heavy traffic volumes, many agencies have established preliminary screening criteria to determine with fair certainty that, if not violated, project-generated, long-term operational local mobile-source emissions of CO would not result in, or substantially contribute to, emissions concentrations that exceed the 1-hour ambient air quality standard of 20 parts per million (ppm) or the 8-hour standard of 9.0 ppm.

The City of San Diego has developed screening thresholds to analyze the potential impacts to the localized effect of CO. A project resulting in longer queues at traffic signals could cause a potential localized significant air quality impact if a proposed development causes a four- or six-lane road to deteriorate to LOS E or worse. The TIS analyzed LOS for the proposed CPU (Chen Ryan 2017).

Toxic Air Contaminants

For San Diego APCD permitted stationary projects, the APCD does not identify a significant impact if the potential health risks from the project would not exceed the health risk public notification thresholds specified by San Diego APCD Rule 1210.

For operational impacts, the analysis considers whether the proposed CPU would be consistent with the siting distances recommended by ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective, which provides guidance on land use compatibility with sources of TACs (CARB 2005). The handbook is not a law or adopted policy but offers advisory recommendations for the siting of sensitive receptors near uses associated with TACs, such as freeways and high-traffic roads, commercial distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, dry cleaners, gasoline stations, and industrial facilities, to help protect children and other sensitive members of the population.

d. Odors

Regarding Issue 4 above, two situations increase the potential for odor problems. The first occurs when a new odor source is located near existing receptors. The second occurs when new receptors are developed near existing sources of odor. San Diego APCD Rule 51 (Nuisance) prohibits the emission of any material which causes nuisance to a considerable number of persons or endangers the comfort, health, or safety of the public. Projects required to obtain permits from APCD, typically industrial and

some commercial projects, are evaluated by APCD staff for potential odor nuisance and conditions, where necessary, to prevent occurrence of public nuisance.

The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depend on numerous factors, including the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the presence of sensitive receptors. While offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they still can be very unpleasant, leading to considerable distress and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and regulatory agencies.

5.9.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1. Conflict with Air Quality Plan

Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Projects that are consistent with the assumptions and emission forecasts used in development of the applicable air quality plan are considered to not conflict with or obstruct the attainment of the air quality levels identified in the plan. Emission forecasts rely on projections of VMT by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations, such as SANDAG, and population, employment, and land use projections made by local jurisdictions during development of the area and general plans. While the RAQS acknowledges mobile and area sources, minor changes in the assumptions relative to these sources would not obstruct successful implementation of the strategies for improvement of SDAB's air quality. ~~The project would change the planned land use mix as follows:~~

- ~~Increase the projected number of multi-family residential units by approximately 40 percent;~~
- ~~Increase the amount of land designated for commercial development by 13 percent; and~~
- ~~Decrease the amount of land designated for institutional development by 3 percent.~~

The consistency with the RAQS is further evaluated by comparing emissions that would occur under build-out of the adopted Community Plan to the emissions that would occur under the project.

As presented below in Tables 5.9-2 and 5.9-3, construction and operational emissions under the project would result in a slight increase compared to future operational emissions under the adopted Community Plan. However, the net increase from the adopted Community Plan would not exceed any of the significance thresholds presented in Table 5.9-1 above. Therefore, the proposed CPU would be consistent with the growth projections and emission forecasts used in the RAQS.

In addition, the General Plan and Community Plan work together to establish the policy framework for growth and development in the proposed CPU area, and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would build upon the goals and strategies in the General Plan. The proposed CPU is intended to further express General Plan policies through the provision of site-specific recommendations and policies that implement Citywide goals and policies at the Community Plan-level, address community needs, and guide zoning.

Thus, because the proposed CPU would be consistent with the General Plan and the land use changes associated with the project would not result in a significant increase in operational emissions, the project would be consistent with assumptions contained in the RAQS, and impacts would be less than significant.

Issue 2. Air Quality Standards

Would the project result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Air quality impacts can result from the construction and operation of a project. Construction impacts are short-term and result from fugitive dust, equipment exhaust, and indirect effects associated with construction workers and deliveries. Operational impacts can occur on two levels: regional impacts resulting from development or local effects stemming from sensitive receivers being placed close to roadways or stationary sources. In the case of the project, operational impacts are primarily due to emissions from area and mobile sources associated with activities such as natural gas combustion for space and water heating and vehicular travel along roadways. Construction and operational impacts of the project are discussed below.

a. Construction

Construction-related activities are temporary, short-term sources of air emissions. Sources of construction-related air emissions include:

- Fugitive dust from grading activities;
- Construction equipment exhaust;
- Construction-related trips by workers, delivery trucks, and material-hauling trucks; and
- Construction-related power consumption.

The intensity of construction activity associated with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU could be the same during each year. It is more likely, however, that some period of construction (and associated emissions) would be more intense than other periods due to changes in market conditions and according to the preferences of the project applicants. As explained previously, the levels identified in the City of San Diego Significance Determination Thresholds are applicable to future, individual development projects and not a program level analysis. While neither the San Diego APCD nor the City of San Diego provides additional guidance on construction assumptions for plan level analyses, some air districts such as the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) suggest that lead agencies conservatively assume that construction-generated emissions associated with a plan should be evaluated assuming 25 percent of the total land uses would be constructed in a single year (SMAQMD 2016). Therefore, in order to illustrate the potential construction-related air quality impacts from projects that could occur under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, a conservative approach using the methodology recommended by the SMAQMD was used. Similar to evaluating construction emissions associated with an individual project, the maximum daily construction-generated emissions were then compared to the thresholds of significance.

The proposed land uses in 2035 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and the adopted Community Plan were compared to the existing land uses to determine the total land use that would be constructed over the life of the plans. Assuming 25 percent of those total land uses would be constructed in a single year under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU results in construction of ~~208,341~~73,400 square feet of commercial land uses and approximately ~~13.8 acres (579 dwelling units) of~~ 2,404 multi-family residential ~~land uses~~dwelling units. The analysis also ~~conservatively~~ assumed 25

percent of the reduction in other land uses (e.g., industrial, retail commercial, etc.) would occur via demolition in the same year.~~demolition of the 150,000-square-foot Sports Arena would occur in the same year~~. As the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU provides a long-range guide for the future physical development of the community through 2035, assuming 25 percent of total land uses would be constructed in a single year is a conservative approach. The 25 percent of the total land uses under the adopted Community Plan would consist of approximately 222,747 square feet of commercial land uses, approximately 768 dwelling units, and 81,801 square feet of industrial land uses.

Criteria air pollutant emissions were calculated using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.1. CalEEMod is a tool used to estimate air emissions resulting from land development projects based on California specific emission factors. CalEEMod includes default estimates on the required construction equipment, phases, and activities when project specific information is unavailable. The default estimates are based on surveys of typical construction projects which provide a basis for scaling equipment needs and schedule with a project's size. Emission estimates in CalEEMod are based on the duration of construction phases; construction equipment type, quantity, and usage; grading area; season; and ambient temperature, among other parameters.

Given that exhaust emissions from the construction equipment fleet are expected to decrease over time as stricter standards take effect, construction emissions were conservatively modeled to occur in 2018. As construction occurs in later years, advancements in engine technology, retrofits, and turnover in the equipment fleet are anticipated to result in lower levels of emissions. The analysis assumed that standard dust and emission control during grading operations would be implemented to reduce potential nuisance impacts and to ensure compliance with San Diego APCD Rule 50 (Visible Emissions), Rule 51 (Nuisance), and Rule 55 (Fugitive Dust Control). An architectural coating VOC limit of 50 grams per liter was used for residential interior coatings to reflect the requirements of San Diego APCD, Rule 67 (Architectural Coatings).

A summary of the modeling results is shown in Table 5.9-2. Additional modeling details are shown in Appendix H.

Table 5.9-2
2018 Maximum Daily Unmitigated Construction Emissions
(pounds/day)

Pollutant	VOC	NO_x	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Adopted Community Plan	70.12	209.78	147.19	0.30	30.09	17.46
~~2018~~Project	141.43~~76.8~~	232.70~~220.7~~	195.21~~142.6~~	0.45~~0.3~~	42.15~~33.7~~	20.82~~17.9~~
Net Change	71.32	22.92	48.03	0.15	12.06	3.36
Threshold of Significance[1]	137	250	550	250	100	100
Exceed Threshold?	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Notes: NO_x = oxides of nitrogen, SO_X = oxides of sulfur, CO = carbon monoxide, PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter, $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter, VOC/ROG = volatile organic compounds/reactive organic gases.
Source: [1]City of San Diego 2016. Estimated by AECOM in 2017

Emissions summarized in Table 5.9-2 are the maximum daily emissions for each pollutant across different phases of construction. Although construction phases would not necessarily occur simultaneously, overlapping construction activities could result in the worst-case daily emissions. As shown in Table 5.9-2, construction of 25 percent of total build-out in a single year would not exceed the applicable thresholds. Additionally, the regulations at the federal, state, and local levels provide a framework for developing project-level air quality protection measures for future discretionary projects. The City's process for the evaluation of discretionary projects includes environmental review and documentation pursuant to CEQA, as well as an analysis of those projects for consistency with the goals, policies and recommendations of the General Plan. Ministerial projects would not require a formal environmental review. Generally, ministerial permits require a public official to determine only that the project conforms to applicable zoning and building code requirements, and that applicable fees have been paid. Ministerial projects are generally smaller in size than those requiring discretionary review and construction would be less intensive than the scenario evaluated in this analysis. As such and as shown in Table 5.9-2, construction related air quality impacts would be less than significant.

b. Operation

Operational emissions may be both direct and indirect emissions, and would be generated by mobile and area sources. Sources of operational emissions associated with future projects developed under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU include:

- Traffic generated by the project; and
- Area source emissions from the use of natural gas, fireplaces, and consumer products.

Air pollutants generated by all land uses within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area were modeled based on average emissions from land use types. For the purposes of this analysis, it was assumed that the land use changes contained in the project would be fully constructed in 2035.

Generally, discretionary, program-level planning activities, such as general plans, community plans, specific plans, etc., are evaluated for consistency with the local air quality plan. In contrast, project-level thresholds are applied to individual project-specific approvals, such as a proposed development project. At the program level, the analysis looks at the emissions of build-out of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU in relation to the adopted Community Plan to determine if the emissions would exceed the emissions forecasts included in the RAQS. Considering that the adopted Community Plan projects have not yet been completed at the time of this analysis, an analysis of existing emissions compared with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU improvements would not accurately disclose the impacts of the project. Rather, comparing future operations with the adopted Community Plan and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU provides the best indicator of the project's long-term effect on emissions. Therefore, the analysis of the project is based on the net change in future emissions estimates derived from the adopted Community Plan.

As such, the analysis evaluates the potential for future development within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area to result in, or contribute to, a violation of any air quality standard based on the net change in pollutant emissions that would result from the adopted Community Plan in the year 2035 compared to the emissions resulting from the project in the year 2035.

The operational emissions associated with the activities for the adopted Community Plan and the project in the year 2035 were quantified using CalEEMod. Regional mobile-source emissions were estimated based on CARB's Emission Factor model (EMFAC2014) and the VMT for the area estimated in the TIS (Chen Ryan 2017). EMFAC2014 can be used to develop emission factors based on the location, operational year, vehicle type, fuel type, and vehicle speed. EMFAC2014 is the most current on-road mobile source emissions model at the time of this analysis. For this analysis, all traffic modeling was conducted for the 2035 build-out year. San Diego County was selected as the geographical location, which is the most specific geography to the project available in EMFAC. The VMT for the area provided in the TIS was weighted by the percentage of VMT for each vehicle type and multiplied by the aggregate speed emission factor to estimate daily emissions. Additional details are available in Appendix H.

Table 5.9-3 summarizes the estimated maximum operational emissions for the adopted Community Plan and the project by source. As shown in Table 5.9-3, operational emissions associated with the project would be higher for all pollutants when compared to the adopted Community Plan. Additional modeling details are shown in Appendix H.

Table 5.9-3
Total Operational Emissions for the Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Area

Condition	Source	Pollutant (pounds per day)					
		VOC	NO_X	CO	SO_2	PM_{10}	$PM_{2.5}$
Adopted Community Plan	Area	381.8738 5.8	226.5148 .5	159.1527 1.6	1.440.3	18.405.1	18.365.1
	Energy	5.966.8	53.4361. 1	40.2146. 7	0.320.4	4.124.7	4.124.7
	Mobile	48.1248. 1	200.9120 0.9	951.5595 1.6	4.944.9	94.2894. 3	38.7038. 7
	Total	435.9444 0.7	480.8631 0.5	1,150.91 1,269.9	6.715.6	116.8010 4.1	61.1748. 5
Project	Area	494.5041 2.1	365.3868 .1	218.8938 0.6	2.330.4	29.637.1	29.637.1
	Energy	7.717.3	68.4665. 7	46.7548. 8	0.420.4	5.335.1	5.335.1
	Mobile	48.3548. 4	201.8720 1.9	956.0995 6.1	4.975.0	94.7394. 7	38.8838. 9
	Total	550.5746 7.8	635.7133 5.6	1,221.74 1,385.4	7.725.8	129.6910 6.9	73.8051. 1
Net Change		**114.62 27.1**	**154.86 25.1**	**70.8211 5.5**	**1.010.2**	**12.892. 9**	**12.632.6**
Threshold of Significance[1]		137	250	550	250	100	100
Exceed Threshold?		NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding. NO_X = oxides of nitrogen, SO_X = oxides of sulfur, CO = carbon monoxide, PM_{10} = particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter, $PM_{2.5}$ = particulate matter less than 2.5 micrometers in diameter, VOC/ROG = volatile organic compounds/reactive organic gases.
Source: Estimated by AECOM in 2017. [1]City of San Diego, 2016

As shown in Table 5.9-3, the net increase from the adopted Community Plan would not exceed any of the significance thresholds. Therefore, air emissions from build-out of the project would not cause a significant increase of air pollutants in the region, would not further increase the frequency of existing violations of NAAQS or CAAQS, or result in new exceedances. Air quality impacts associated with the adoption of the project would result in less than significant impacts.

Issue 3 Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

a. Localized Carbon Monoxide Hot Spots Impacts

As explained in Section 5.2, Transportation and Circulation, the TIS (Chen Ryan 2017) evaluated LOS for roadway segments and intersections based on the roadway geometrics, existing or forecasted traffic volumes, and other characteristics. The City of San Diego guidelines indicate that if a proposed development causes a four- or six-lane road to deteriorate to (LOS E or worse, the resulting longer queue at the traffic signals could cause a localized significant air quality impact. Table 5.9-4 shows the four- and six-lane roadway segments, classification, and LOS under existing conditions and the project.

Table 5.9-4
Build-out Summary of Roadway Segment Analysis

Roadway Segment	Roadway Functional Classification	Existing LOS	2035 Projected LOS
Midway Drive			
Rosecrans Street to Barnett Avenue	4-Lane Collector (CLTL)	D	**E**
Camino Del Rio West			
Rosecrans Street to I-5/I-8 Ramps	6-Lane Prime Arterial	D	**F**

Notes:
Capacity for non-standard roadway classifications were provided by City of San Diego staff.
Bold values indicate roadway segments operating at LOS E or F.
CLTL = Center left turn lane
Source: Table 4-3 in TIS Appendix B (Chen Ryan 2017)

As shown in Table 5.9-4, two roadway segments would deteriorate to LOS E or worse from implementation of the project compared to existing conditions.

In addition to the changes in LOS as required by the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, overall traffic volumes and how they affect V/C ratio also affect the ability of a roadway or intersection to result in a CO hot spot. While the City of San Diego does not provide additional guidance on traffic volumes, other agencies throughout the state have provided estimates of traffic volumes that could result in a CO hot spot. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) CEQA Guidelines (BAAQMD 2012) suggest that projects would not result in a CO impact if the project traffic would not increase traffic volumes at affected intersections to more than 44,000 vehicles per hour. Furthermore, the SMAQMD screening criteria find that a project would not result in significant localized CO impacts if it would not result in an affected intersection experiencing more than 31,600 vehicles per hour (SMAQMD 2016).

Midway Drive (Rosecrans Street to Barnett Avenue) has a maximum volume of approximately 28,300 vehicles per day in 2035. Camino Del Rio West (Rosecrans Street to I-5/I-8 Ramps) has a maximum volume of approximately 67,300 vehicles per day in 2035. Therefore, the peak hour volume at any point

during the day, which is typically 10 percent of the daily volume, would not exceed any of the screening thresholds that are anticipated to result in a CO hot spot.

Furthermore, as shown in Table 2-5, the maximum CO concentration registered in the proposed CPU area in the last 5 years (i.e., 3.0 ppm in 2013) is approximately 15 percent of the one-hour CAAQS. As a result of improvements in technology and vehicle emission standards, CO emission factors are projected to decrease in future years. These improvements would also reduce the concentration of CO emissions. Given these conditions, it is unlikely that the proposed CPU would cause an exceedance of the CAAQS. Thus, this impact would be would be less than significant.

b. Toxic Air Contaminants

Construction

Implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would result in the construction of new buildings, structures, paved areas, roadways, utilities, and other improvements. Heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, on-site generators, and construction worker vehicles associated with this construction could generate diesel PM, which the CARB identified as a TAC. Generation of diesel PM from construction projects typically occurs in a single area (e.g., at the project site) for a short period of time. Because construction activities and subsequent emissions vary depending on the phase of construction (e.g., grading, building construction), the construction-related emissions to which nearby receptors are exposed to would also vary throughout the construction period. During some equipment-intensive phases such as grading, construction-related emissions would be higher than other less equipment-intensive phases such as building construction or architectural coatings. Concentrations of mobile-source diesel PM emissions are typically reduced by 70 percent at a distance of approximately 500 feet (CARB 2005).

The dose (of TAC) to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance in the environment and the extent of exposure a person has with the substance; a longer exposure period to a fixed amount of emissions would result in higher health risks. Building construction activities for individual projects, as part of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU implementation, are anticipated to last approximately 6 months to a year. According to the Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), health risk assessments (HRAs) used to determine the exposure of sensitive receptors to TAC emissions should be based on a 30-year exposure period; however, such assessments should also be limited to the period/duration associated with construction activities which implement the proposed CPU. Thus, if the duration of potentially harmful construction activities near a sensitive receptor was one year, the exposure would be approximately three percent of the total exposure period used for typical health risk calculations. Considering this information, the highly dispersive nature of diesel PM, and the fact that construction activities would occur intermittently and at various locations over approximately 18 years (i.e., 2017 to 2035), it is not anticipated that the implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would expose sensitive receptors to substantial construction-related TAC concentrations. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Stationary Sources

The project includes land uses that may generate air pollutants affecting adjacent sensitive land uses. The primary concern with stationary sources is local; however, they also contribute to air pollution in the SDAB. Stationary sources include gasoline stations, power plants, dry cleaners, and other commercial and industrial uses. Stationary sources are regulated by the local air pollution control or management district through the issuance of permits; in this case, the agency is the San Diego APCD.

The California Air Toxics Program establishes the process for the identification and control of toxic air contaminants and includes provisions to make the public aware of significant toxic exposures and for reducing risk. In accordance with AB 2588, if adverse health impacts exceeding public notification levels are identified, the facility would provide public notice, and if the facility poses a potentially significant public health risk, the facility must submit a risk reduction audit and plan to demonstrate how the facility would reduce health risks. Thus, with this regulatory framework, at the program level, impacts associated with stationary sources in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would be less than significant.

Operation

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would include the development of residential and commercial land uses. Residential land uses do not typically generate substantial TAC emissions. Commercial land uses may potentially include stationary sources of TACs, such as dry-cleaning establishments and diesel-fueled back-up generators. As discussed above, these types of stationary sources, in addition to any other stationary sources (including industrial land uses) that may emit TACs would be subject to San Diego AQMD Rules and Regulations. Land uses that are more likely to generate substantial TAC emissions include industrial land uses that involve stationary sources and manufacturing processes.

CARB has developed the Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective to provide guidance on land use compatibility with sources of TACs (CARB 2005). The recommendations relevant to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU include:

- Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 500 feet of a freeway, urban roads with 100,000 vehicles per day, or rural roads with 50,000 vehicles per day.
- Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 1,000 feet of a distribution center (that accommodates more than 100 trucks per day, more than 40 trucks with operating transport refrigeration units (TRUs) per day, or where TRU unit operations exceed 300 hours per week).
- Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of any dry cleaning operation.
- Avoid siting new sensitive land uses within 300 feet of a large gas station (defined as a facility with a throughput of 3.6 million gallons per year or greater). A 50 foot separation is recommended for typical gas dispensing facilities.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains the following policies related to siting of land uses and air quality:

CE-4.1 Consider air quality and air pollution sources in the siting, design, and construction of residential development and other development with sensitive receptors.

CE-4.2 Incorporate building features into new buildings with residential units and other sensitive receptors located within 500 feet of the outside freeway travel lane to reduce the effects of air pollution.

Even with implementation of Policies CE-4.1 and CE-4.2, individual development projects could be located within the siting distances recommended by ARB's Air Quality and Land Use Handbook. However, CARB notes that these recommendations are advisory and should not be interpreted as defined "buffer zones," and that local agencies must balance other considerations such as transportation needs, the benefits of urban infill, community economic development priorities, and other quality-of-life issues. With careful evaluation of exposure, health risks, and affirmative steps to reduce risk, where necessary, ARB's position is that infill development, mixed use, higher density, transit-oriented development, and other concepts that benefit regional air quality can be compatible with protecting the health of individuals at the neighborhood level. Therefore, implementation of the project is consistent with the goals of the CARB handbook and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations This impact would be less than significant.

Issue 4 Odors

Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

A potential odor impact can occur from two different situations: 1) the project would introduce receptors in a location where they would be affected by an existing or future planned odor source, or 2) proposed uses within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would generate odors that could adversely affect a substantial number of persons.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include equipment exhaust. Odors from these sources would be localized and generally confined to the immediate area surrounding the development area. Exhaust odors from diesel engines, as well as emissions associated with asphalt paving and the application of architectural coatings, may be considered offensive to some individuals. Similarly, diesel-fueled trucks traveling on local roadways would produce associated diesel exhaust fumes. However, odors associated with diesel fumes, asphalt paving, and architectural coatings would be temporary and would disperse rapidly with distance from the source. Projects constructed under the proposed CPU would use typical construction techniques, and the odors would be typical of most construction sites and temporary in nature. Therefore, construction-generated odors would not result in frequent exposure of on-site receptors to objectionable odor emissions.

The project would allow for development of multi-family residential and commercial land uses within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. While specific developments within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are not known at this program level of analysis, planned land uses would not encourage or support uses that would be associated with significant odor generation. Major sources of odors would include wastewater treatment and pumping facilities, sanitary landfills, painting/coating operations (e.g., auto body shops), and compositing facilities. Minor sources of odors associated with the proposed CPU could include restaurants, coffee roasters, and other urban land uses that are not typically

associated with numerous odor complaints. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes residential uses in proximity to commercial areas. A typical commercial land use in the proposed CPU area that would generate odors would be restaurants. Odors associated with restaurants or other commercial uses would be similar to existing residential and food service uses throughout the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and would not generally be considered adverse. Thus, implementation of the project would not create operational-related objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

5.9.4 Significance of Impacts

5.9.4.1 Conflict with Air Quality Plan

The net increase in construction and operational emissions under the project over the adopted Community Plan would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutants that would exceed any of the thresholds. Thus, emissions associated with the project are already accounted for in the RAQS, and adoption of the project would not conflict with the RAQS. Thus, regarding Issue 1, impacts related to conflicts with applicable air quality plans would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

5.9.4.2 Air Quality Standards

Regarding construction emissions under Issue 2, based on the worst case construction emission analysis with an intensive year of construction discussed previously, air emissions associated with build-out of individual projects under the project would not exceed any of the significance thresholds. Thus, construction emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Regarding operational emissions under Issue 2, the net increase in emissions compared to the existing Community Plan would not exceed the applicable thresholds of significance. Therefore, air emissions from build-out of the project would not significantly increase air pollutants in the region, would not further increase the frequency of existing violations of NAAQS or CAAQS, or would not result in new exceedances. Therefore, operational air quality impacts associated with implementation of the project would be less than significant. Thus, no mitigation is required.

5.9.4.3 Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Regarding impacts to sensitive receptors (Issue 3), implementation of the project would not result in any CO hotspots. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains policies related to the siting of land uses and air quality, and implementation of the project is consistent with the goals of the CARB handbook. Thus, air quality impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.9.4.4 Odors

Regarding Issue 4, as the project does not propose land uses associated with generation of adverse odors, impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation is required.

5.9.5 Mitigation Framework

All impacts related to air quality impacts would be less than significant. Thus, no mitigation is required.

5.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This section addresses the potential GHG emissions and impacts associated with the project. This section is based on the Greenhouse Gas Analysis for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update (Greenhouse Gas Report) prepared by AECOM (2017) for the project (Appendix I).

5.10.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.10.1.1 Methodology and Assumptions

Annual GHG emissions were calculated for both the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan and the proposed CPU at project build-out using California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) version 2016.3.1. The emissions sources include construction (off-road vehicles), mobile (on-road vehicles), area (fireplaces, consumer products [cleansers, aerosols, and solvents], landscape maintenance equipment, and architectural coatings), water and wastewater, and solid waste sources. Where project-specific data was not available, model inputs were based on default CalEEMod estimates.

GHG emissions are estimated in terms of metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO_2e). CO_2e emissions are the preferred way to assess combined GHG emissions because they give weight to the global-warming potential (GWP) of different gases. The GWP is the potential of a gas to warm the global climate in the same amount as an equivalent amount of emissions of carbon dioxide (CO_2). For example, CO_2 has a GWP of 1, methane (CH_4) has a GWP of 25, and nitrous oxide (N_2O) has a GWP of 298, which means CH_4 and N_2O have 25 and 298 times greater global warming effect than CO_2, respectively (IPCC 2007).

a. Estimating Construction Emissions

At a program level, it would be speculative to estimate the schedule and construction requirements of each individual project that could occur in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. In Section 5.9, Air Quality, the emissions estimated to occur were based on an assumption that up to 25 percent of the total land uses would be constructed in a single year. However, GHG emissions would occur based on the entire construction activities through 2035. Thus, consistent with the methodology used in the San Diego County Updated Greenhouse Gas Inventory 2013, which forecasts that between 2015 and 2035 construction emissions would comprise roughly 2.1 percent of total GHG emissions within the County of San Diego, total construction emissions associated with the planning area are estimated at 2.1 percent of the total operational GHG emissions. Therefore, based on the operational GHG emissions estimated in

Table 5.10-1, total construction emissions for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would be 4,248~~3,603~~ MT CO_2e.

b. Estimating Vehicle Emissions

Vehicle emissions are calculated based on the vehicle type, the trip rate, and trip length for each land use. GHG emissions generated from mobile sources were estimated based on CARB's Emission Factor (EMFAC2014) model. EMFAC2014 includes GHG reducing effects from the implementation of Pavley I (Clean Car Standards) and the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, and are thus considered in the calculation of emissions.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU encourages increased development diversity by increasing commercial and multi-family land uses in certain areas and decreasing the number of planned institutional land uses. The project proposes an increase in multi-family residences in close proximity to transit and existing commercial uses.

c. Estimating Energy Use Emissions

CalEEMod estimates GHG emissions from energy use by multiplying average rates of residential and non-residential energy consumption by the number of residential units and non-residential square footage to obtain total projected energy use. This value is then multiplied by electricity and natural gas GHG emission factors applicable to the project location and utility provider.

Building energy use is typically divided into energy consumed by the built environment and energy consumed by uses that are independent of the construction of the building such as plug-in appliances. In California, Title 24 governs energy consumed by the built environment, mechanical systems, and some types of fixed lighting. Non-building energy use, or "plug-in energy use," can be further subdivided by specific end-use (refrigeration, cooking, office equipment, etc.).

Energy consumption values are based on the CEC sponsored *California Commercial End Use Survey and Residential Appliance Saturation Survey* studies, which identify energy use by building type and climate zone. CalEEMod 2016.3.1 is based on the 2013 Title 24 energy code (Part 6 of the Building Code).

The Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would be served by SDG&E. Therefore, SDG&E's specific energy intensity factors (i.e., the amount of CO_2, CH_4, and N_2O per kilowatt-hour) are used in the calculations of GHG emissions. The state mandate for renewable energy is 33 percent by 2020 and 50 percent by 2030 under the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS). However, the analysis conservatively assumes the same RPS as existing conditions.

d. Estimating Area Source Emissions

Area sources include GHG emissions that would occur from the use of landscaping and related equipment. The use of landscape equipment emits GHGs associated with the equipment's fuel combustion. Emissions from landscape maintenance equipment within CalEEMod are based on statewide average number of usage hours, number of dwelling units, and non-residential square footage. However, statewide landscape equipment usage on a per dwelling unit or per square foot basis is not

representative of the urban and higher-density land uses of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area. For example, landscape equipment usage would not increase in proportion to the increase in units for high density multi-family residential and square footage for multi-story buildings. Higher density buildings are typically multi-story and thus would not result in an increase in landscape areas. Therefore, emissions associated with landscape equipment were calculated off-model and based on San Diego County annual emission estimates for lawn and garden equipment for the San Diego Air Basin and acres of development for the San Diego region. Additional details are available in Appendix I.

Area source emissions also include natural gas combustion from the use of natural gas fireplaces. CalEEMod defaults for the number of natural gas fireplaces were adjusted to account for the supplemental development regulations which limit the use of dwelling unit fireplaces within the Sports Arena Community Village and Dutch Flats Urban Village Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones. However, the analysis conservatively assumes the remaining dwelling units would still include natural gas fireplaces. Based on recent studies, only between 4 and 5 percent of new multi-family residential buildings built in 2014 and 2015 had fireplaces. Additional details are available in Appendix I.

e. Estimating Water and Wastewater Emissions

The amount of water used and wastewater generated by a project has indirect GHG emissions associated with it. These emissions are a result of the energy used to supply, distribute, and treat the water and wastewater. In addition to the indirect GHG emissions associated with energy use, wastewater treatment can directly emit both CH_4 and N_2O.

The indoor and outdoor water use consumption data in CalEEMod for each land use subtype comes from the Pacific Institute's *Waste Not, Want Not: The Potential for Urban Water Conservation in California* (2003) and the American Water Works Association Research Foundation's *Commercial and Institutional End Uses of Water* (2000). Based on those reports, a percentage of total water consumption was dedicated to landscape irrigation, which is used to determine outdoor water use. Wastewater generation was similarly based on a reported percentage of total indoor water use (CAPCOA 2016).

In addition to water reductions under the California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen), the GHG emissions from the energy used to transport the water are affected by RPS. As discussed previously, the analysis conservatively assumes existing RPS.

f. Estimating Solid Waste Emissions

The disposal of solid waste produces GHG emissions from anaerobic decomposition in landfills, incineration, and transportation of waste. To calculate the GHG emissions generated by disposing of solid waste for the project, CalEEMod uses waste disposal rates identified by California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery to calculate the total volume of solid waste. The methods for quantifying GHG emissions from solid waste are based on the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) method using the degradable organic content of waste. GHG emissions associated with the project's waste disposal were calculated using these parameters. No solid waste reductions were modeled.

5.10.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

According to the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, a project may have a significant effect on the environment with respect to GHG emissions if it would:

1. Generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
2. Conflict with the City's Climate Action Plan or another applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs?

The CAP was originally adopted in December 2015, and future implementing actions necessary for the CAP PEIR to serve as a Qualified GHG Reduction Plan under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 were adopted by City Council on July 12, 2016. This section of the CEQA Guidelines permits for discretionary projects under CEQA that are consistent with the CAP, to be able to tier off the GHG analysis set forth in the CAP Final EIR, which was certified on December 15, 2015, with an addendum certified on July 12, 2016. Analysis within this PEIR directly tiers off of the CAP PEIR for cumulative GHG Emissions under Section 15183.5. As such consistency with the City's CAP is used to evaluate the significance of the project's GHG impact. A consistency analysis of the proposed CPU and associated discretionary actions with the CAP is evaluated first through a comparison of the land use and transportation assumptions for which the CAP was developed, and secondly through a qualitative analysis of policies associated with the proposed CPU.

5.10.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

As compared to the existing land uses, the project would reduce institutional land uses while increasing the development of commercial uses and multi-family dwelling units. This change represents a change in the percentage of land use types and density in the Community Plan area. ~~The project would change the planned land use mix as follows:~~

- ~~Increase the projected number of multi-family residential units by approximately 40 percent;~~
- ~~Increase the amount of land designated for commercial development by 13 percent; and~~
- ~~Decrease the amount of land designated for institutional development by three percent.~~

Based on the methodology summarized above, GHG emissions were calculated for the existing land uses (baseline), the land uses at build-out of the adopted Community Plan (in Year 2035), and the land uses of the project (in Year 2035). Table 5.10-1 summarizes the GHG emissions under each scenario. Appendix I contains additional details.

Table 5.10-1
GHG Emissions for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area
(MT CO_2e per Year)

Emission Source	Existing	Adopted Community Plan	Project	Difference (Project – Adopted)
Mobile Sources	120,762	83,889	84,289	401
Energy Use	57,000	64,885~~63,976~~	74,691~~64,242~~	9,806~~266~~
Area Sources	3,056~~3,026~~	10,838~~2,216~~	17,471~~3,109~~	6,633~~893~~
Solid Waste Disposal	5,816	7,196~~6,642~~	8,306~~6,525~~	1,110~~-118~~[4]
Water Use	11,825	14,202~~12,974~~	17,514~~13,425~~	3,311~~451~~
Construction	n/a	3,801~~3,564~~	4,248~~3,603~~	446~~40~~
TOTAL	**198,460~~198,429~~**	**184,811~~173,259~~**	**206,518~~175,193~~**	**21,707~~1,933~~**

Source: Appendix I 2017~~Notes:~~

~~[4] Solid waste disposal associated with GHG emissions decrease based on changes in land use from the adopted Community Plan to the proposed CPU. Waste generation rates vary for each land use; the largest decrease in solid waste is a result of the reduction in some existing industrial uses.~~

For the purposes of determining significance, GHG emissions attributable to the project in Year 2035 were compared to the adopted Community Plan GHG emissions. This comparison is appropriate because the GHG emissions from the adopted Community Plan were used when developing the City's CAP GHG Inventory.

As shown in Table 5.10-1, the project would result in an increase in GHG emissions of ~~1,933~~21,707 MT CO_2e per year when compared to the emissions that would occur under the adopted Community Plan. ~~With the exception of solid waste disposal, emissions~~ Emissions from all sources would increase under the proposed CPU when compared to the adopted Community Plan. This is because, as shown in Table 5.10-1, the project would include ~~an~~ additional ~~1,230~~ multi-family dwelling units over the adopted Community Plan. However, ~~T~~the majority of the new multi-family dwelling units are planned either within, or within a 0.5-mile radius of, two Community Villages (Sports Arena Community Village and Dutch Flats Urban Village), the Kemper Neighborhood Village, and the Hancock Transit Corridor Village, all of which are also designated Transit Priority Areas (TPAs). These TPAs/community villages and districts would implement CAP and City of Villages strategies by focusing projected future growth into mixed-use and multiple-use activity centers that are pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly and linked to transit. Consistency with the CAP and City of Villages strategy however would result in community plan areas having an increase in aggregated GHG emissions from increased population, however on a per capita basis a decrease of GHG emissions would occur. Further, overall citywide GHG emissions per capita would result, consistent with the City's CAP targets for citywide GHG emissions reductions.

Therefore, while the project would increase aggregated GHG emissions over those of the adopted Community Plan at buildout (Year 2035), this increase in GHG is a direct result of the implementation of CAP Strategies and the General Plan's City of Villages Strategy. Increasing residential and commercial density in transit corridors and Community Villages within a TPA would support the City of San Diego in achieving the GHG emissions reduction targets of the CAP, and thus, impacts associated with GHG emissions would be less than significant.

Issue 2 Conflicts with Plans or Policies

Would the project conflict with the City's Climate Action Plan or another applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases?

The regulatory plans and policies discussed in Section 4.0 of this PEIR aim to reduce national, state, and local GHG emissions by primarily targeting the largest emitters of GHGs: the transportation and energy sectors. Plan goals and regulatory standards are, thus, largely focused on the automobile industry and public utilities. For the transportation sector, the reduction strategy is generally three-pronged: to reduce GHG emissions from vehicles by improving engine design; to reduce the carbon content of transportation fuels through research, funding and incentives to fuel suppliers; and to reduce the miles these vehicles travel through land use change and infrastructure investments.

For the energy sector, the reduction strategies aim to: reduce energy demand; impose emission caps on energy providers; establish minimum building energy and green building standards; transition to renewable non-fossil fuels; incentivize homeowners and builders; fully recover landfill gas for energy; and expand research and development.

a. Consistency with State Plans

As discussed earlier, Executive Order S-3-05 establishes GHG emission reduction targets for the state, and AB 32 launched the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) that outlines the reduction measures needed to reach these targets. In December 2017, CARB adopted the 2017 Scoping Plan Update that provides a framework for actions to reduce California's GHG emission and requires CARB and other State agencies to adopt regulations and other initiatives to reduce GHGs. As such, the Scoping Plan is not directly applicable to City planning efforts and projects, although there are several regulatory measures aimed at the identification and reduction of GHG emissions. Most of these regulatory measures focus on area source emissions (e.g., energy usage, high-global warming-potential GHGs in consumer products) and changes to the vehicle fleet (e.g., more fuel-efficient vehicles, reduced VMT, fuel economy). The project would be generally consistent with the Scoping Plans framework to reduce electricity demand by increasing the efficiency of Utility Energy Programs and adoption of more stringent building and appliance standards. The new construction associated with implementation of the project would be required to include all mandatory green building measures under the CalGreen Code. Therefore, the project is consistent with the Scoping Plan.

b. Consistency with Regional Plans

The project is consistent with the goals of the SANDAG RTP/SCS to develop compact, walkable, and bicycle-friendly communities close to transit connections and consistent with smart growth principles. The project would reinforce transit corridors, bicycle lanes, and establish three pedestrian-oriented, urban, and mixed-use villages that would reduce reliance on the automobile, and promote walking and biking and the use of alternative transportation. Policies contained within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Land Use and Mobility Elements serve to promote bus transit use as well as other forms of mobility, including walking and bicycling. These measures are consistent with the RP's Sustainable Communities Strategy. Thus, the project is consistent with the RP.

c. Consistency with Local Plans

New land use designations and policies within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU have been designed to reflect and implement the CAP and the GHG reduction recommendations of the General Plan. Specifically, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes updated Land Use, Villages and Districts; Mobility; and Conservation Elements that include multiple policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions from target emission sources and adapting to climate change. The proposed policies refine existing General Plan policies with site-specific recommendations applicable to the Midway-Pacific Highway community.

The CAP establishes five primary strategies for achieving the citywide goals of the plan. Strategy 1 (Energy & Water Efficient Buildings) includes goals, actions, and targets with the aim of reducing building energy consumption. Policies in the proposed CPU's Urban Design and Conservation Elements address this strategy. Energy reduction can be achieved through the continued use or adaptive reuse of the existing building stock along with any needed energy efficiency upgrades. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes narrative and policies in the Urban Design (UD) Element and Conservation Element (CE) for the creation of energy- and water-efficient buildings. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes discussion and policies to address water usage within the Urban Design (UD) Element and Conservation Element (CE), and encourages sustainable building design and incorporation of building features that would reduce water consumption. This is coupled with reducing the dependency on non-renewable energy sources and the maximization of daylight and natural ventilation, the minimization of solar heat gain, and the reduction of emissions.

Regarding CAP Strategy 2 (Clean & Renewable Energy), the Urban Design and Conservation Elements of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies to encourage development that incorporates renewable energy, such as photo-voltaic panels on roof tops. The Conservation Element of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU also contains an overarching goal to reduce dependence on non-renewable energy sources, and policies that include the use of sustainable building techniques for construction and operation of buildings that could include solar energy installations, electric vehicle charging stations, and solar water heating.

Strategy 3 (Bicycling, Walking, Transit & Land Use) of the CAP has a number of goals that relate to land use and planning. Action 3.1 in Strategy 3 of the CAP calls for implementation of the General Plan's Mobility Element and the City of Villages strategy in Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) to increase the use of transit. As discussed in Section 5.1.3 of this PEIR, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is consistent with the General Plan's Mobility Element and the City of Villages strategy and is thus consistent with Action 3.1 of the CAP. Further, a majority of the community is also within a half-mile walking distance to an existing or future transit stop, and thus, within a TPA. Policies have been included to promote walkability and connectivity through the construction of sidewalks and intersections, prioritization of multi-use urban path system improvements, support of a continuous and safe bicycle, and implementation of separated bicycle facilities where feasible.

Consistent with Actions 3.4 and 3.5 of Strategy 3, the proposed CPU Mobility and Conservation elements includes policies to support intelligent transportation systems to improve roadway and parking efficiency, congestion, and install roundabouts where needed and feasible to reduce vehicle fuel consumption. Consistent with Action 3.6 of Strategy 3 of the CAP, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would

implement transit-oriented development, particularly within and around two Community Villages (Sports Arena Community Village and Dutch Flats Urban Village), the Kemper Neighborhood Village, and the Hancock Transit Corridor Village. Specific Mobility Element policies include, but are not limited to, coordinating with MTS and SANDAG to implement transit priority measures, encouraging the implementation of Rapid Bus to serve the areas of future residential and employment uses, and coordinating with MTS, SANDAG, and adjacent property owners to improve accessibility and the environment at transit stops.

The primary goal of CAP Strategy 4 (Zero Waste – Gas & Waste Management) is to divert solid waste and capture landfill methane gas emissions. This strategy is Citywide in nature; however, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU furthers this strategy by including policies in the Urban Design Element that support the use of recycled materials in public improvements, encouraging recycled or rapidly renewable source materials, and recycling of building materials for both public and private new development.

Strategy 5 (Climate Resiliency) of the CAP calls for further analysis of the resiliency issues that face the various areas of the City. Resiliency is addressed throughout the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU as it pertains to water usage, energy efficiency, and sustainable development practices as noted above. Also included within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU are policies supporting and encouraging green roofs and rooftop gardens, as well as an increase in the tree canopy within the community to reduce summer heat temperatures, increase absorption of pollutants and carbon dioxide, and contribute to more inviting business districts for pedestrians. The selection, siting, and management of the planting of street trees within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area are outlined within the proposed CPU to ensure successful establishment of trees to meet the CAP goals.

As discussed above, analysis within this PEIR directly tiers off of the CAP PEIR for cumulative GHG emissions under Section 15183.5. The proposed CPU and associated discretionary actions are consistent with the adopted CAP, and contain goals and objectives that implement all of the five primary CAP strategies. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the City's CAP or any other applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases impacts, and impacts would be less than significant.

5.10.4 Significance of Impacts

5.10.4.1 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Potential impacts related to GHG emissions from implementation of the project would be less than significant, as the increase in aggregated GHG emissions from the project is attributable to increased residential densities and employment intensity in TPAs are outlined in the CAP and City of Villages strategy. However on a per capita basis, a decrease of GHG emissions would occur. Further, overall citywide GHG emissions per capita would result, consistent with the City's CAP targets for citywide GHG emissions reductions Thus, the project is consistent with the CAP and would result in a less than significant impact related to GHG emissions. No mitigation is required.

5.10.4.2 Conflicts with Plans or Policies

As discussed above, the project is consistent with the adopted CAP, and contains goals and objectives that implement all of the five primary CAP strategies. It is concluded that the project would be consistent with each of the CAP strategies by:

- Increasing the number of residential units and commercial development within the Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) within the community to support transit;
- Implementing transit-oriented development;
- Promoting pedestrian improvements;
- Encouraging the use of passive or zero net energy strategies;
- Supporting waste reduction, recovery, and recycling;
- Encouraging the planting of native and drought-tolerant landscaping; and
- Increasing the tree canopy.

Therefore, the project would not conflict with the City's CAP or any other applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases impacts, and impacts would be less than significant.

5.10.5 Mitigation Framework

All impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant. Thus, no mitigation is required.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.11 Public Services and Facilities

Public services are those functions that serve residents on a community-wide basis. These functions include police protection, parks and recreation facilities, fire/life safety protection, libraries, and schools. The following provides a discussion of these services and facilities as they relate to the project. This section is based on email correspondence from service providers, which are included in Appendix K of this ~~Draft~~ PEIR.

5.11.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.11.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Based on the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, which have been adapted to guide a programmatic analysis of the project, a significant public services and facilities impact would occur if implementation of the project would:

1. Promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered public facilities (including police protection, parks, or other recreational facilities, fire/life safety protection, libraries, or schools, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.

Methodology and Assumptions

Potential impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed CPU were evaluated based on relevant information from the City of San Diego General Plan, the SDUSD, the City's Police and Fire Departments, and Existing Conditions Reports for the proposed CPU area. Based on a review of relevant public facility and safety standards, policies, and population buildout and capacity estimates, the analysis presents the potential for impacts related to constructing public services and facilities within the proposed CPU area. Programmatic impacts are discussed in broad, qualitative terms as no projects are proposed within the proposed CPU. This assessment does not satisfy the need for project-level CEQA analysis for individual projects. Individual projects under the proposed CPU may require a project-level analysis at the time they are proposed based on the details of these projects and the existing conditions at the time such projects are pursued.

Summary of Impacts

Implementation of the proposed CPU would result in population increase at buildout, which would contribute to the demand for police protection, parks and other recreational facilities, fire and public safety, libraries, and schools. Police and fire protection must meet standards stated in the City's General Plan, and are further supported by the IFS and proposed CPU policies. Implementation of the proposed CPU would provide for a greater ratio of usable park acres per person than under existing conditions. The proposed CPU would also provide policies for the provision of additional school facilities as needed.

5.11.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Public Facilities

Would the project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered public facilities (including police protection, parks or other recreational facilities, fire/life safety protection, libraries, or schools), the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives?

a. Police Protection

Within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, the Western Division of the SDPD operates under the Citywide response time goals for emergency calls and Priority 1 calls (Appendix K). The Western Division average response times for Priority 2 through Priority 4 calls currently exceed the Citywide response time goals. There are no current plans for additional police substations in Midway-Pacific Highway; however, there is support for operation of a police storefront within the community. The average response times for the Western Division for 2016 were 6.1 minutes for emergency calls, 11.8 minutes for Priority 1 calls, 30 minutes for Priority 2 calls, 83.1 minutes for Priority 3 calls, and 156 minutes for Priority 4 calls. It is likely that police response times within the Midway-Pacific Highway community will continue to increase under the future development projections of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, which could ultimately result in the need for new or expanded police services. However, as future development is proposed within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, individual projects would be subject to applicable Development Impact Fees (DIF) for public facilities financing in accordance with SDMC Section 142.0640. Should a police station be considered in the future, individual projects proposed with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area may be subject to payment of DIF, which would provide facilities financing in accordance with SDMC Section 142.0640.

Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies support provision of police services within the proposed CPU area by providing guidelines to reduce incidence of criminal activity within Midway-Pacific Highway neighborhoods, including support for the operation of a police storefront within Midway-Pacific Highway (CPU Policy PF-1.1), and adequate lighting to ensure that commercial and industrial areas have an increased level of street lighting to enhance security and safety (CPU Policy PF-2.1).

Despite the population growth assumed in the proposed CPU, no new police facilities have been identified. Thus, implementation of the project would result in less than significant environmental impacts associated with the construction of new facilities in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives related to police services.

b. Parks and Recreation

Based on the projected population for the Midway-Pacific Highway Community, 27,070, General Plan standards for population-based parks and recreation facilities would require the community to be served by a minimum of 75.80 usable acres of parkland at full community development. Additionally, at full community development, the projected population warrants more than one full 17,000 square foot recreation center (18,400 square feet), and approximately one-half (54 percent) of an aquatic complex.

Opportunities for additional parkland and recreation facilities within the Midway-Pacific Highway Community are anticipated to come primarily through redevelopment of private and public properties, and through the development of park equivalencies as detailed below. Facilities that may be considered as population-based park equivalencies include:

- Joint use facilities;
- Portions of resource-based parks;
- Privately owned, publicly used parks; and
- Non-traditional parks, such as linear parks.

The General Plan allows park equivalencies to be used when vacant land is limited, unavailable, or is cost-prohibitive. The application of park equivalencies is determined by the community and City staff through a set of guidelines. The community and City identified and evaluated population-based park and recreation opportunities, as well as potential park equivalency sites, for their recreational value, possible uses and functions, public accessibility, and consistency with General Plan policies and guidelines and other land use policy documents. Figure 5.11-1 shows the locations of proposed park facilities. Tables 5.11-1 and 5.11-2 summarize the proposed parks and equivalencies that have been selected by the Midway-Pacific Highway community.

A total of 75.80 acres of population-based parks would be needed to serve Midway-Pacific Highway at full community development. Through the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU effort, City staff and community members have identified 29.86 acres of proposed new population-based parkland and park equivalency sites within the Midway-Pacific Highway community that, when implemented, would reduce the population-based park deficit to 45.94 acres.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Recreation Element provides a policy framework that supports acquisition and development of new public parks and park equivalencies; encourages coordination with the SDUSD for joint use and the exploration of park opportunities on public land with local, state and federal agencies; encourages new infill developments throughout the community to satisfy the population-based park requirements by incorporating parks within their development footprint (privately or publicly owned); and encourages increasing recreational opportunities by acquiring and developing land through street vacations, where appropriate, to provide public parks. While implementation of the project would provide policy support for increasing the acreage of population-based parks in the proposed CPU area, it does not propose any specific facilities at this time.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP

0 1,600 3,200 Feet

Note:
Park locations, configurations, and sizes shown may change as part of the development process.

Figure 5.11-1
Parks, Recreation Facilities, and Open Space

Table 5.11-1
Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities

Parks/ Recreation Facilities	Existing Useable Acreage	Future Useable Acreage	Parks and Recreation Facilities Locations and Descriptions	Parks and Recreation Facilities Recommendations
Neighborhood Parks				
Sports Arena Green		3.30	Proposed park site located within the Sports Arena Community Village.	Design and construction of plazas, children's play area, multi-purpose courts, multi-purpose turf areas, site furniture, picnic areas, comfort station, walkways, and landscaping.
Dutch Flats Green		3.70	Proposed park site located within the Dutch Flats Urban Village.	Acquisition, design and construction of multi-purpose turf areas, picnic area, children's play area, comfort station, small multi-purpose courts, walkways, and landscaping.
Mini-Parks				
Sports Arena Square		2.80	Proposed park site located within the Sports Arena Community Village.	Design and construction of plazas, multi-purpose turf areas, picnic areas, paths and landscaping for cultural and community events.
Recreation Centers				
Midway-Pacific Highway Recreation Center		1.75	Proposed recreation facility to be located on City-owned property within the Camino del Rio District or another location identified within the community.	Design and construct an approximately 18,400 sq. ft. recreation center which could include a gymnasium, community meeting and multi-purpose rooms, arts and crafts, and fitness rooms.
NTC Recreation Center		N/A	Proposed recreation center located at NTC/Liberty Station.	
Aquatic Complexes				
NTC/Liberty Station Aquatic Complex		N/A	Proposed aquatic complex located at NTC/Liberty Station.	Design and construct an aquatic complex which could include a swimming pool, universal access and water amenities such as a children's pool and a therapeutic pool, and a pool house including locker rooms, staff offices, and equipment storage facilities.
Aquatic Complex		N/A	Proposed aquatic complex located within the Peninsula or Midway communities, at a site to be identified.	
Joint Use Facilities				
Dewey Elementary Joint Use Facility		1.50	Proposed joint use facility at Dewey Elementary School.	Design and construct multi-purpose fields, hardcourts, children's play area, and walking track. Project will require a joint use agreement with San Diego Unified School District.
Portion of Resource-Based Parks				
San Diego River Park Pathway within Mission Bay Park		3.30	Proposed pathway improvements along the San Diego River within Mission Bay Park and Caltrans right-of-way.	Design and construct interpretive signs, picnic areas, seating, and exercise equipment along the San Diego River Pathway consistent with the San Diego River Park Master Plan.
Privately Owned Park Sites				
Kurtz Street Pocket Park		0.25	Proposed park site on Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) owned property, located in the 2100 Block of	Design and construction of a children's play area, multi-purpose turf area, multi-purpose courts, site furniture, picnic areas, walkways and landscaping.

Table 5.11-1 Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities				
Parks/ Recreation Facilities	Existing Useable Acreage	Future Useable Acreage	Parks and Recreation Facilities Locations and Descriptions	Parks and Recreation Facilities Recommendations
			Hancock Street.	Project may require a lease agreement from MTS.
San Diego River Mini Park		1.80	Proposed park site on Caltrans right-of-way, located on the north side of I-8 east of the West Mission Bay Drive off-ramp.	Design and construct a children's play area, picnic areas, seating and exercise equipment along the San Diego River Pathway consistent with the San Diego River Park Master Plan.
Non-Traditional Park Sites				
Sports Arena Linear Park		7.30	Proposed linear park, approximately 30 feet wide, along Sports Arena boulevard located on city owned property.	Design and construction of a group picnic area, shade structure, plaza or amphitheater, a jogging trail or bike path separated from the primary pedestrian sidewalk, comfort station, multi-purpose hardcourt, children's play area or a skateboard area, site furniture, fitness stations, game tables, public art, drinking fountain, interpretive signage, and landscaping. Private property (4.16 acres) would need to be acquired.
Dutch Flats Linear Park		4.16	Proposed linear park, approximately 30 feet wide, on privately owned land and public right-of-way along Sports Arena Boulevard, and along the proposed Dutch Flats Parkway and Charles Lindbergh Parkway.	

Table 5.11-2 Summary of Existing and Proposed Population-Based Parks and Recreation Facilities	
Population-Based Parks	Useable Acres
Existing Population-based Parks and Park Equivalencies	0.00 acres
Proposed Population-based Parks and Park Equivalencies	29.86 acres
Total Existing and Proposed Population-based Parks and Equivalencies	29.86 acres
Population-based Park Requirements at full community development	75.80 acres
Population-based park deficit at full community development	45.94 acres
Recreation Centers	Square Feet
Existing Recreation Centers	0 SF
Proposed NTC Recreation Center	3,570 SF[a]
Proposed Recreation Center: Midway-Pacific Highway Recreation Center	14,830 SF
Total Existing and Proposed Recreation Centers	18,400 SF
Recreation Center Requirement at full community development	18,400 SF
Aquatic Complex	Percentage
Existing Aquatic Complexes	0%
Proposed Aquatic Complexes: NTC/Liberty Station Aquatic Complex	17%[b]
Proposed Aquatic Complexes: Aquatic Complex	37%[c]
Total Existing and Proposed Aquatic Complexes	54%
Aquatic Complexes Requirement at full community development	54%

Notes:
[a] NTC/Liberty Station Recreation Center will be shared as follows: Peninsula 79% and Midway-Pacific Highway 21%
[b] NTC/Liberty Station Aquatic Complex will be shared as follows: Peninsula 60%, Ocean Beach 22%, Midway-Pacific Highway 17%, and Old Town 1%
[c] Aquatic Complex will be shared as follows: Midway-Pacific Highway 37%, Peninsula 17%, Ocean Beach 8%, Old Town 4%

As described in Chapter 3.0 Project Description, the project allows for development of the parks and recreational facilities generally described in the proposed CPU's Recreation Element (discussed in Section 3.4.1.7) as well as implementation of the Dutch Flats Village CPIOZ Type A and the Sports Arena Boulevard Streetscape CPIOZ Type A, which would reserve land for the future implementation of planned linear parks as new development is proposed (discussed in Section 3.4.2.1). While the proposed CPU proposes acreages and allows for the development of parks, no specific facilities have been identified in the proposed CPU; therefore, no specific impacts can be identified. The General Development Plan process for parks would be required for any park facility to determine use and layout of facilities and without that information and process, no impacts can be identified. Individual park projects under the proposed CPU may require a project-level analysis at the time they are proposed, based on the details of the parks and the existing conditions at the time such projects are pursued. Thus, although the existing and projected deficit in population-based parks and facilities will remain, the proposed CPU contains policies to promote future parks and park equivalencies and facilitates the development of parks through the Dutch Flats Village CPIOZ Type A and the Sports Arena Boulevard CPIOZ Type A. As such, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact associated with the construction of new facilities in order to achieve General Plan standards for parks and recreation facilities.

c. Fire/Life Safety Protection

With implementation of the project, there would be an increase in overall population, which could result in a change in response times. Future facilities would be planned to meet community needs based on General Plan Public Facilities Element standards detailed in Chapter 4.0, Regulatory Framework, of this PEIR. The expected increase in population would not require that the Fire-Rescue Department expand or construct new facilities. Despite the population growth assumed in the proposed CPU, no new fire/life safety facilities have been identified. Therefore, at the program-level of analysis provided in this PEIR, impacts related to the expansion/construction of new facilities would be less than significant.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains a policy framework that addresses maintaining sufficient fire and rescue services throughout the Midway-Pacific Highway community. As future development is proposed within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, individual projects may be subject to payment of DIF, which would provide facilities financing in accordance with SDMC Section 142.0640. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes a comprehensive Impact Fee Study that will define applicable DIF fees for future development, including funding for fire/life safety facilities. The Impact Fee Study will include future projects to expand and replace Fire Station 8 in Uptown, Fire Station 15 in Ocean Beach, and Fire Station 20 in Midway-Pacific Highway; however, no funding has yet been identified. The design and construction of the future facilities would be scheduled once funding is identified.

d. Libraries

As identified above, the Point Loma/Hervey Library in the Peninsula community and the Mission Hills Library in the Uptown community serve Midway-Pacific Highway. Correspondence with the Library Department (Appendix K) confirms that the City does not require the construction of any additional facilities to meet library service requirements of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. Ideally, branch libraries should serve a resident population of 30,000 within a two-mile radius maximum service area (City of San Diego 2011). All Midway-Pacific Highway residents live within two miles of the Point

Loma/Hervey Library or the Mission Hills Library; therefore, the service area is adequate to meet Midway-Pacific Highway community needs. The community's existing population of 4,600 does not warrant the establishment of a branch library at this time, and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is estimated to have a population of 27,070 in 2035.

In addition, there are plans to build a new 15,000-square-foot facility to replace the current 3,850-square-foot Mission Hills Library, which would meet the minimum branch library size of 15,000 square feet as established in the General Plan. The project does not include the construction of library facilities and facility needs would be met within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Impacts related to library facilities would be less than significant.

e. Schools

Student generation is based on housing units. For the Midway-Pacific Highway community, based on Series 13 Forecast data from SANDAG for the year 2012, there are 1,851 existing units. An additional 9,734 residential units are estimated within the proposed CPU in 2035. Per correspondence with SDUSD (May 2017), student generation rates vary based on the type of project, number of units, bedroom mix, affordable or senior housing component, proximity to schools and other amenities, neighborhood, and other factors. There are no district standard or school-specific rates.

Typically, to provide student generation rates for a new project, SDUSD demographers would research similar nearby developments and their student generation rates as a guide for how many students a new project may generate. For the project, however, many factors are not yet determined, such as the specific type of housing and bedroom mix that may be constructed with the potential increase in housing stock at some future point in time. To estimate the number of students potentially generated by future development of the Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan, SDUSD demographers referenced the number of existing housing units in the Midway-Pacific Highway community and the current number of students who reside in Midway-Pacific Highway (based on SDUSD data), to determine the current Midway-Pacific Highway communitywide student generation rates. This information is summarized in Table 5.11-3.

Table 5.11-3
Midway-Pacific Highway Student Generation Rates from Existing Housing Units

Housing Type	Number of Existing Units	2016 Students (K-4, 5-8, 9-12, and K-12 total)	Student Generation Rate (per unit)
Single Family	37	K-5: 4	K-5: 0.108
		6-8: 0	6-8: 0
		9-12: 1	9-12: 0.027
		K-12: 5	**K-12: 0.135**
Multi-Family	1,354	K-5: 131	K-5: 0.097
		6-8: 61	6-8: 0.045
		9-12: 87	9-12: 0.064
		K-12: 279	**K-12: 0.206**
Military Housing	460	K-5: 326	K-5: 0.709
		6-8: 77	6-8: 0.167
		9-12: 67	9-12: 0.146
		K-12: 470	**K-12: 1.022**

Source: Appendix K

Based on the number of additional units proposed by the project and student generation rates included in Table 5.11-3, potential student generation for future development of Midway-Pacific Highway is shown in Table 5.11-4. The generation rates are shown as a range. The current generation rate is the low range and the high range is double the low range (current generation rate). A key assumption is that future additional housing units will generate students at a rate similar to current housing units; this is represented by the low range. If future additional housing units are significantly different from the current units in terms of student generation, the number of students could be higher, as indicated by the high range.

Table 5.11-4
Midway-Pacific Highway Potential Student Generation Rates from Future Additional Housing Units

Housing Type	Number of Additional Units	Potential Student Generation Rates	Number of Potential Students
Single Family	None	N/A (all single family units will be replaced with multi-family units)	N/A
Multi-Family	9,771	K-5: 0.097-0.194	K-5: 948-1,896
		6-8: 0.045-0.090	6-8: 440-880
		0.064-0.128	625-1,250
		K-12: 0.206-0.412	**K-12: 2,103-4,026**
Military Housing	460 (unchanged)	K-5: 0.709	K-5: 326
		6-8: 0.167	6-8: 77
		9-12: 0.146	9-12: 67
		K-12: 1.022	**K-12: 470**

Source: Appendix K

The SDUSD demographers indicated that the cumulative potential increase in students from the number of future additional housing units suggested in the project would likely impact district schools to the point of reaching or exceeding capacity. Therefore, new or expanded school facilities would be needed.

Government Code Section 65995 and Education Code Section 53080 authorize school districts to impose facility mitigation fees on new development to address any increased enrollment that may result. Senate Bill (SB) 50, enacted on August 27, 1998, significantly revised developer fee and mitigation procedures for school facilities as set forth in Government Code Section 65996. The legislation holds that an acceptable method of offsetting a project's effect on the adequacy of school facilities is payment of a school impact fee prior to issuance of a building permit. Once paid, the school impact fees would serve as mitigation for any project-related impacts to school facilities. As such, the City is legally prohibited from imposing any additional mitigation related to school facilities, as payment of the school impact fees constitutes full and complete mitigation. The school district will be responsible for potential expansion or development of new facilities. Therefore, impacts to schools resulting from future development would be less than significant through implementation of SB 50 (City of San Diego 2016).

5.11.4 Significance of Impacts

a. Police Protection

Regarding police protection, implementation of the project would result in an increase in overall population which could result in a change in police protection needs and a demand for new or expanded facilities. At the program level, the proposed increase in population would not require that SPDP construct new facilities. Therefore, at the program-level of analysis provided in this PEIR, impacts related to the expansion/construction of new facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

b. Parks and Recreation

Regarding park and recreational facilities, there is an existing and projected deficit in population-based parks and recreational facilities, which is an adverse impact but not considered a significant physical impact at the program level. Implementation of the project would provide policy support for increasing the acreage of population-based parks and recreational facilities in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, but do not propose design and construction of new facilities. The effects of these policies have been analyzed throughout this PEIR. Thus, implementation of the project would result in a less than significant impact related to parks and recreation facilities, and no mitigation is required.

c. Fire/Life Safety Protection

Regarding fire/life safety protection, implementation of the project would result in an increase in overall population which could result in a change in fire-rescue response times and a demand for new or expanded facilities. At the program level, the proposed increase in population would not require that the Fire-Rescue Department expand or construct new facilities. Therefore, at the program-level of analysis provided in this PEIR, impacts related to the expansion/construction of new facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

d. Libraries

Since the project does not include the construction of library facilities and facility needs would be met within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, impacts related to library facilities would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

e. Schools

Regarding school facilities, future residential development that occurs in accordance with the project would be required to pay school fees as outlined in Government Code Section 65995, Education Code Section 53080, and Senate Bill 50 to mitigate any potential impact on district schools. The City is legally prohibited from imposing any additional mitigation related to school facilities through implementation of Senate Bill 50, and the school district would be responsible for potential expansion or development of new facilities. Therefore, impacts to schools would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.11.5 Mitigation Framework

Impacts to police protection, parks and recreation facilities, fire/life safety protection, library services, and schools would be less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

This page intentionally left blank.

5.12 Public Utilities

This section analyzes the impacts of the project on existing public utilities, including those for water supply, sewer, storm water, communications systems, and solid waste. This section includes a discussion of the Water Supply Assessment (WSA) prepared by the City's Public Utilities Department (PUD), which is included as Appendix L of this PEIR.

5.12.1 Existing Conditions

A discussion of existing conditions for water supply, sewer, storm water, communications systems, and solid waste in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is provided in Chapter 2.0. The existing regulatory framework is summarized in Chapter 4.0.

5.12.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Based on the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, which have been adapted to guide a programmatic analysis of the project, impacts related to water distribution, sewer, storm water, communications systems, and solid waste would be significant if the project would:

1. Result in the use of excessive amounts of water beyond projected available supplies;

2. Promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain service ratios, or other performance objectives; or

3. Result in impacts to solid waste management, including the need for construction of new solid waste infrastructure including organics management, materials recovery facilities, and/or landfills; or result in a land use plan that would not promote the achievement of a 75 percent target for waste diversion and recycling as required under AB 341 and the City's Climate Action Plan.

5.12.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Water Supply

Would the project use excessive amounts of water beyond projected available supplies?

A WSA was prepared for the project to assess whether sufficient water supplies are, or will be, available to meet the projected water demands of the project. Because no subdivision of land is proposed as part of this project, this WSA was prepared in compliance with the requirements of Senate Bill 610. The WSA

includes, among other information, identification of existing water supply entitlements, water rights, water service contracts, or agreements relevant to the identified water supply for the proposed CPU, and quantities of water received in prior years pursuant to those entitlements, rights, contracts, and agreements. The WSA evaluated water supplies that are, or will be, available during a normal, single-dry year, and multiple-dry year (20-year) period, to meet the estimated demands of the project.

The Metropolitan Water District (MWD) and the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) have developed water supply plans to improve reliability and reduce dependence upon existing imported supplies. MWD's Regional Urban Water Management Plan (RUWMP) and Integrated Water Resources Plan, and the SDCWA's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) and annual water supply report include water infrastructure projects that meet long-term supply needs through securing water from the State Water Project, Colorado River, local water supply development, and recycled water.

As discussed in the WSA, the City's 2015 UWMP demonstrates that there will be sufficient water supplies available to meet demands for existing and planned future developments that are projected to occur by 2035. Based on a normal water supply year, the estimated water supply projected in five-year increments for a 20-year projection will meet the City's projected water demand of 200,984 acre-feet in 2020; 242,038 acre-feet in 2025; 264,840 acre-feet in 2030; 273,748 acre-feet in 2035; and 273,408 acre-feet in 2040. Based on a single-dry year forecast, the estimated water supply will meet the projected water demand of 213,161 acre-feet in 2020; 256,883 acre-feet in 2025; 281,167 acre-feet in 2030; 290,654 acre-feet in 2035; and 290,292 acre-feet in 2040. Based on a multiple-dry year, third year supply, the estimated water supply will meet the projected demands of 208,665 acre-feet in 2020; 251,402 acre-feet in 2025; 275,139 acre-feet in 2030; 284,412 acre-feet in 2035; and 284,058 in 2040.

As demonstrated in the WSA (Appendix L), there is sufficient water planned to supply the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU's estimated annual average usage. The projected water demands of the project are 1,978,476 gallons per day (gpd) or 2,216 acre feet per year, as planned in the City's 2015 UWMP. As a result, the water demand resulting from the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would result in no unforeseen demands.

In summary, the WSA concluded that the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is consistent with the water demands assumptions included in the regional water resource planning documents of the SDCWA and MWD. Current and future water supplies, as well as the actions necessary to develop these supplies, have been identified in the water resources planning documents of the PUD, the SDCWA, and MWD to serve the projected demands of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, in addition to existing and planned future water demand of the PUD. Therefore, impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

Issue 2 Utilities

Would the project promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts in order to maintain service ratios, or other performance objectives?

The General Plan calls for future growth to be focused into mixed-use activity centers linked to the regional transit system. Implementation of the project would result in redevelopment occurring in villages

and districts with their own distinct range of uses. The City's existing built areas are currently served by storm water, wastewater, water infrastructure, and various communications systems; however, some of the City's built areas, including those within the Midway-Pacific Highway community, have existing infrastructure deficiencies and would require capacity improvements to serve the existing and projected population. The following is a program-level analysis of the significance of impacts for each applicable utility.

a. Storm Water

Because the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is highly impervious and there is limited land available for new development, the volume or rates of runoff are not likely to be increased by new development. It is more likely that the volume and rate of runoff could be slightly decreased due to implementation of current storm water quality regulations as new development occurs, which requires implementation of LID practices that retain a portion of storm water on-site for infiltration, re-use, or evaporation.

With implementation of the project, there would be an increase in overall population, which could result in a need for installation of new storm water infrastructure. However, no storm drains, or other community-wide drainage facilities, are proposed for construction in conjunction with implementation of the project. The location and extent of future storm water facilities is not known at this time; therefore, no impacts can be identified. Thus, impacts associated with storm water facilities as a result of the project would be less than significant.

b. Sewer

The project does not propose any specific development but provides the framework for future growth. No new sewer collection or wastewater treatment facilities are proposed in conjunction with the project, and the location and extent of future facilities is not known at this time; therefore, no impacts can be identified. Thus, impacts associated with sewer facilities as a result of the project would be less than significant. Any future development would be required to comply with the SDMC regulations regarding sewers and wastewater facilities (Chapter 6, Article 4) and would be required to follow the City's Sewer Design Guidelines.

c. Water Facilities

The potable water distribution system is continually upgraded and repaired on an ongoing basis through the City's Capital Improvements Program. These improvements are determined based on continued monitoring by the Public Works Department (PWD) Engineering Division to determine remaining levels of capacity. The PWD Engineering Division plans its capital improvement projects several years prior to pipelines actually reaching capacity. Such improvements would be required of the water system regardless of implementation of the project.

As future development takes place in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, demand for water is likely to increase and create a potential need to increase sizing of existing pipelines and mains. No new water distribution or treatment facilities are proposed in conjunction with the project, and the location and extent of future facilities is not known at this time; therefore, no impacts can be identified. Thus, impacts associated with water facilities as a result of the project would be less than significant.

d. Communications Systems

Private utility companies currently provide communications systems within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. New development will likely result in the need for new communications systems; however, no specific communications systems upgrades are proposed with this project, and the location and extent of future facilities is not known at this time; therefore, no impacts can be identified. Additionally, future siting of communications infrastructure would be in accordance with the LDC, including Section 141.0420 regulating wireless communications facilities, as well as the City's Wireless Communications Facilities Guidelines, which seek to minimize visual impacts. Adhering to General Plan policies supporting the City's undergrounding program would also ensure that visual impacts of new facilities are minimized. Similarly, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains policies supporting utility undergrounding in the Midway-Pacific Highway community. Thus, impacts associated with communications systems as a result of the project would be less than significant.

Issue 3 Solid Waste and Recycling

Would the project result in impacts to solid waste management, including the need for construction of new solid waste infrastructure; or result in a land use plan that would not promote the achievement of a 75 percent waste diversion as targeted in AB 341 and the City's Climate Action Plan?

The California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) provides estimates of solid waste generation rates for different types of land uses. These rates estimate the amount of solid waste created by residences or businesses over a certain amount of time (day, year, etc.). Waste generation rates include all materials discarded, whether or not they are later recycled or disposed of in a landfill, since under state law the total amount of waste "generated" is considered to be the sum of the waste "disposed of" plus the waste "diverted" from disposal. Waste generation rates can be used to estimate the impact of new development on the local solid waste infrastructure, although it should be noted that impacts to solid waste infrastructure are not necessarily the amount of waste but whether any increase would require the development of new facilities. Since the majority of waste is managed through waste diversion, solid waste facilities include those necessary to provide composting, recycling, and other collection, separation, and diversion services. Furthermore, it is specifically the amount of waste remaining for disposal that is considered for compliance with the City's CAP and has the greatest potential for impacts associated with GHG emissions.

For the purposes of determining significance, solid waste disposal rates attributable to the project in 2035 was compared to the adopted Community Plan solid waste disposal rates. This comparison is appropriate because the solid waste disposal rate from the adopted Community Plan was used when developing the City's CAP GHG Inventory. Solid waste disposal rates are determined based on the types and amounts of land uses proposed under the adopted Community Plan and the proposed CPU.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would result in a decrease in tons of solid waste compared to the adopted Community Plan (see Appendix I). While density would increase under the proposed CPU, decreases in certain types and amounts of land uses would cause an overall net decrease in solid waste generation. The largest decrease in solid waste generation comes from the expected reduction in some industrial land uses under the proposed CPU. Nonetheless, future projects that could occur in the Midway-Pacific Highway community with implementation of the project would be required to comply with

City regulations, including the City's Recycling Ordinance (updated December 2016). In addition, a WMP would be required for any project which exceeds the City's threshold, currently the generation of 60 or more tons of solid waste for projects of 40,000 square feet or more. The WMP shall include measures to provide sufficient interior and exterior storage space for refuse and recyclable materials, and measures to handle landscaping and green waste materials associated with the occupancy of the proposed development. In tandem with the WMP, all new development projects must comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Ordinance and Section 142.0801 et seq. of the LDC, which outlines the requirements for refuse and recyclable materials storage.

Despite the population growth assumed in the proposed CPU, no new solid waste disposal facilities have been identified. The General Plan addresses waste management in Policies PF-I.1 through PF-I.5, focusing on waste recycling and diversion of materials in PF-I.2. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would result in a less than significant impact to existing recycling operations within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and surrounding areas, and would not affect the City's overall ability to attain a 75 percent recycling target as required under AB 341. Additionally, the City has adopted a Zero Waste Plan, which would result in 70 percent waste diversion by 2020, 90 percent waste diversion by 2035, and 100 percent diversion by 2040. Furthermore, mandatory compliance with the SDMC and the City's Recycling Ordinance for all new development projects would continue to reduce solid waste generation and increase recycling efforts, thereby resulting in a less than significant impact.

5.12.4 Significance of Impacts

5.12.4.1 Water Supply

Based on the findings of the WSA, there is sufficient water supply to serve existing and projected demands of the project, and future water demands within the PUD's service area in normal and dry year forecasts during a 20-year projection. Therefore, less than significant impacts to water supply are anticipated for implementation of the project. No mitigation is required.

5.12.4.2 Utilities

a. Storm Water

With implementation of the project, there would be an increase in overall population, which could result in a need for installation of new storm water infrastructure. However, no storm drains, or other community-wide drainage facilities, are proposed for construction in conjunction with implementation of the project. Thus, impacts associated with storm water facilities as a result of the project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

b. Sewer

Sewer line upgrades are administered by the PWD and are handled on a project-by-project basis. The project does not propose any specific development but provides the framework for future growth. No new sewer collection or wastewater treatment facilities are proposed in conjunction with the project. Thus, impacts associated with sewer facilities as a result of the project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

c. Water Facilities

No new water distribution or treatment facilities are proposed in conjunction with the project. Thus, impacts associated with water facilities as a result of the project would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

d. Communications Systems

No specific communications systems upgrades are proposed with this project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.12.4.3 Solid Waste and Recycling

To ensure that waste generation and recycling efforts during construction and post-construction future land use occupancy and operation (i.e., residential, commercial, industrial, mixed-use, etc.) are addressed, a WMP shall be prepared for any project proposed under the project exceeding the 60 tons or more threshold for projects of 40,000 square feet or more. Implementation of these WMPs would ensure that future development project impacts would be less than significant. Ministerial projects and discretionary projects that would fall below the 60 ton threshold, would be required to comply with the SDMC sections addressing construction and demolition debris, waste and recyclable materials storage, and recyclable materials (and in the future, organic materials) collection. Therefore, at this program level of review, the project would not require increased landfill capacity, and impacts associated with solid waste would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.12.5 Mitigation Framework

All impacts to public utilities would be less than significant; thus, no mitigation is required.

5.13 Biological Resources

The following section describes the existing biological conditions within and adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, identifies current applicable regulations, and evaluates potential biological resource impacts associated with implementation of the project.

5.13.1 Existing Conditions

The Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan area is northwest of Downtown San Diego and consists of approximately 1,300 acres (about 2 square miles). The area is bounded on the north by I-8, on the east by I-5, Old Town San Diego, and the Uptown community, on the south by the SDIA, and on the west by the north end of the Peninsula Community Plan area. The Midway-Pacific Highway community is located on low, flat land along the San Diego River between Mission Bay and San Diego Bay. The proposed CPU area includes the Midway area, the Pacific Highway corridor, and MCRD. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area falls under the City's MSCP; a section of MHPA is present within the San Diego River, which is adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area.

The existing environmental setting, which includes discussion and description of sensitive biological resources, and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively.

5.13.1.1 Methodology

The analysis of biological resources for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area was performed at the plan-level using existing databases and literature as cited in the sections below. No field work was conducted as part of the analysis of biological resources. The discussion of biological resources focuses on the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area plus a 500-foot buffer, herein collectively referred to as the biological study area (BSA) (Figure 5.13-1).

The most current vegetation data available from the SanGIS-SANDAG Regional Data Warehouse (County of San Diego 2015) was used to describe existing vegetation communities and other cover types in the BSA. Vegetation communities and cover types are described in accordance with the *Draft Vegetation Communities of San Diego County* (Oberbauer et al. 2008), based on the *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California* (Holland 1986). Assessments of the sensitivity of habitats are based primarily on the CNPS (CNPS 2015), the CNDDB (CDFW 2017), City of San Diego, USFWS, and Holland (1986).



Source: SANDAG 2014; City of San Diego 2017

2,000 1,000 0 2,000 Feet

Scale: 1:30,000 ; 1 inch = 2,500 feet

Figure 5.13-1
Biological Study Area

Path: P:_604\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\920 GIS\922_Maps\CommunityPlan\Midway_BSA.mxd, 8/17/2017, paul.moreno

Data from the CNDDB (CDFW 2017) was used to provide information on potential sensitive plant and wildlife species occurrences. In addition, potential for sensitive species occurrence was evaluated based on examination of habitat in aerial photography and based on AECOM's knowledge of the region. Sensitive species are plant and wildlife species that have been afforded protection or special recognition by federal, state, or local resource agencies or organizations. Sensitive species typically have relatively limited distribution and may require specialized habitat conditions. For the purposes of this report, species were considered sensitive if they met at least one of the following criteria:

- Listed or proposed for listing (including candidate species[2]) under the federal Endangered Species Act and California Endangered Species Act (CESA).
- CDFW Species of Special Concern.
- CDFW Fully Protected species.
- California Rare Plant Rank Species (formerly CNPS listed species[3]): (CRPR) 1A (presumed extinct in California and rare/extinct elsewhere), 1B (rare, threatened, and endangered in California and elsewhere), 2A (presumed extinct in California, but more common elsewhere), 2B (rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere), or 3 (plants are those for which more information is needed [a review list]) (CNPS 2015). All plants constituting CRPR 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, and 3 meet the definitions of Sections 2062 and 2067 (CESA) of the California Fish and Game Code.
- Some (as specified in CNDDB), but not all, CRPR 4 plant species meet the definitions of Sections 2062 and 2067 (CESA) of the California Fish and Game Code (CNPS 2015). CRPR 4 plants are those of limited distribution (watch list) (CNPS 2015).
- Species covered by the City of San Diego MSCP and considered sensitive by the SDMC (City of San Diego 2012).

5.13.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

Based on the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (2016), which have been adapted to guide a programmatic analysis for the project, impacts on biological resources would be significant if the project would result in:

1. A substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP or other local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by CDFW or USFWS;

[2] Candidate species are those petitioned species that are actively being considered for listing under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), as well as those species for which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) has initiated an ESA status review, as announced in the Federal Register. Proposed species are those candidate species that warrant listing as determined by USFWS and have been officially proposed for listing in the Federal Register. Under the California Endangered Species Act, candidate species are those species currently petitioned for state-listing status.

[3] In 2010, CDFW changed the name of the CNPS Lists in its publications to "California Rare Plant Rank," The change was intended to correct a public misimpression that the CNPS was solely responsible for the rank assignments. Rare Plant Status Review groups (300+ botanical experts from government, academia, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector) produce the rank assignments for rare plants and both CDFW and CNPS jointly manage this collaborative effort.

2. A substantial adverse impact on any Tier I Habitats, Tier II Habitats, Tier IIIA Habitats, or Tier IIIB Habitats as identified in the Biology Guidelines of the Land Development Manual or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS;

3. A substantial adverse impact on wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, riparian, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means;

4. Interfering substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, including linkages identified in the MSCP Plan, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites; or

5. A conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, either within the MSCP plan area or in the surrounding region.

5.13.3 Impact Analysis

This section discusses potential impacts associated with the project relative to the biological resources. The impact analysis is based on the existing conditions provided in Section 5.13.1 and Section 2.3.13. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU places emphasis on directing growth into mixed-use activity centers that are pedestrian-friendly and linked to an improved regional transit system. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU proposes future development and growth outside the River Influence Area of the City of San Diego's San Diego River Master Plan (City of San Diego 2013). The River Influence Area is defined as areas within 200 feet of the River Corridor Area. The River Corridor Area is defined as all areas within 35 feet of the FEMA 100-year floodway. A small community park is proposed for development and would occur within 235 feet of the 100-year floodway for the San Diego River. Direct and indirect impacts are only anticipated to occur within currently developed areas.

Biological resources may be either directly or indirectly impacted by growth and development associated with the project. Furthermore, direct and indirect impacts may be either permanent or temporary in nature. These various types of impacts are defined per the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds guidance document (City of San Diego 2016).

> Direct: A direct impact is a physical change in the environment which is caused by and immediately related to the project. Direct impacts are caused by a project and occur at the same time and place as the project.
>
> Indirect: An indirect impact is a physical change in the environment which is not immediately related to the project, but which is caused indirectly by the project. If a direct impact in turn causes another physical change in the environment, then the secondary change is an indirect impact. An indirect physical change is to be considered only if that change is a reasonably foreseeable impact which may be caused by the project. A change which is speculative or unlikely to occur is not reasonably foreseeable.
>
> Permanent: All impacts that result in the irreversible removal or loss of biological resources are considered permanent.

Temporary: Any impact that will last for only a limited amount of time and is considered to have reversible effects on biological resources can be viewed as temporary. This includes all impacts related to construction activities.

The City's Biology Guidelines require that the impact discussion include an analysis of direct impacts, indirect impacts, and cumulative impacts (City of San Diego 2012). The significance of both direct and indirect impacts is determined based on the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds (City of San Diego 2016).

Permanent and temporary direct impacts from the project are anticipated to occur in areas that are already highly developed. Temporary indirect impacts would occur during construction of development associated with the project because these indirect impacts would cease when construction is complete. Permanent indirect impacts may occur as a result of the increased growth and activity within developed and/or redeveloped areas. The extent of indirect impacts varies by species and biological resource. Potential indirect impacts could include the following.

Noise: Elevated ambient noise levels that could result from development associated with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU's implementation (construction), could impact species that rely on sound to communicate (e.g., birds). Elevated ambient noise levels have potential to disturb species and/or cause direct habitat avoidance. The impact of noise on wildlife differs from species to species, and is dependent on the source of the noise (e.g., vehicle traffic versus blasting) and the decibel level, duration, and timing.

Changes in Hydrology: Changes in hydrology, runoff, and sedimentation resulting from the project could temporarily (i.e., during construction) have indirect impacts on species dependent on surface water species.

Exotic and Predator Species: Introduction of exotic plant and animal species to MHPA areas adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would be considered an indirect impact as such species have few natural predators or other ecological controls on their population sizes, and they often thrive in disturbed habitats. Exotic plant and wildlife species may aggressively outcompete native species.

Lighting: Artificial night lighting associated with the project could impact habitat value for some species, particularly for nocturnal species, through potential modification of predation rates, obscuring of lunar cycles, and/or causing direct habitat avoidance. Nighttime lighting could also disturb diurnal species roosting in adjacent habitat.

Fugitive Dust: Fugitive dust generated during development associated with implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU could adversely impact plants by coating the surfaces of the leaves and reducing the rates of metabolic processes, such as photosynthesis and respiration.

Unauthorized Access: Development associated with implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU could create or increase use of habitats that otherwise were not easily accessible to humans. Disturbance from human activities (i.e., trampling of species from recreational activity) and trash left by human activities can adversely impact species and degrade habitat.

5.13.3.1 Issue 1 Sensitive Species

Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP or other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

No sensitive terrestrial wildlife or sensitive plant species have potential to occur within the areas where development would occur within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The majority of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area occurs entirely within urban/developed land. There are no wetland communities within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Ornamental trees could be removed during development, which have the potential to support nesting avian species including common species protected under the MBTA. Therefore, direct impacts to special-status species would be limited to avian species protected under the MBTA that may nest in the ornamental trees present within developed areas. No listed avian species are expected to nest in the ornamental trees present within the developed area. Although the San Diego River is adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, development and growth will be located south of I-8 and species inhabiting the San Diego River north of I-8 would not be indirectly impacted by activities associated with the project. Indirect impacts associated with development and growth in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would not extend north of I-8.

Potentially occurring sensitive species would be conserved in accordance with ESL Regulations, the City's Biology Guidelines, and the provisions of the MSCP Subarea Plan. The MBTA, which is enforced by the USFWS, makes it unlawful "by any means or in any manner, to pursue, hunt, take, capture, [or] kill" any migratory bird or attempt such actions, except as permitted by regulation. Thus, there is an existing regulatory framework in place to prevent adverse impacts to migratory birds. Additionally, future discretionary development occurring within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area that has the potential to impact migratory birds would be required to conduct pre-construction surveys if construction occurs during the typical bird breeding season to determine the presence or absence of breeding birds and to ensure that no impacts occur to any nesting birds or their eggs, chicks, or nests. Thus, impacts to sensitive species as a result of the project would be less than significant.

5.13.3.2 Issue 2 Sensitive Habitats

Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact on any Tier I Habitats, Tier II Habitats, Tier IIIA Habitats, or Tier IIIB Habitats, as identified in the Biology Guidelines of the Land Development Manual, or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?

As detailed in Section 5.13.1 Existing Conditions, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is developed and does not support sensitive habitats that would be impacted by implementation of the project. Implementation of the project would impact disturbed land and urban/developed land, which are not considered sensitive vegetation communities. Although the San Diego River is adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, development and growth will be located south of I-8, and vegetation communities along the San Diego River, north of I-8, would not be indirectly impacted by

activities associated with the project. Thus, impacts to sensitive habitats as a result of the project would be less than significant.

5.13.3.3 Issue 3 Wetlands

Would the project result in a substantial adverse impact on wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, riparian, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

There are no wetland habitats in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Thus, implementation of the project would result in no significant direct impacts to wetland habitats including riparian scrub.

5.13.3.4 Issue 4 Wildlife Corridors and Nursery Sites

Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, including linkages identified in the MSCP Plan, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?


The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is entirely developed, and therefore, no direct impacts would occur to migratory species. The San Diego River, north of I-8, functions as a local and regional wildlife corridor; however, development and growth will be located south of I-8. Indirect impacts associated with development and growth in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would not extend north of I-8. Thus, impacts to wildlife corridors as a result of the project would be less than significant.

5.13.3.5 Issue 5 Multiple Species Conservation Program

Would the project result in a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, either within the MSCP plan area or in the surrounding region?

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would comply with the adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Conservation Community Plan (NCCP) and other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans. Direct impacts are confined entirely within urban/developed habitat and are not located within the MHPA, north of I-8, within the San Diego River (Figure 5.13-2).

Development adjacent to MHPA lands would be subject to the City's MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, which address indirect effects on the MHPA from adjacent development. These effects include those due to increased runoff, trampling, and removal of plant cover due to hiking, biking and other human activities, increased presence of toxins, increased nighttime light levels, redirection or blockage of wildlife movement, and increased levels of non-native and invasive plants. These indirect effects could reduce the quality of the MHPA.



Source: SANDAG 2014; City of San Diego 2017

2,000 1,000 0 2,000 Feet

Scale: 1:30,000 ; 1 inch = 2,500 feet

Figure 5.13-2
MHPA and Open Space Areas

Path: P:_6044\60440144_MidOld_CPU\900-CAD-GIS\920 GIS\922_Maps\CommunityPlan\Midway_Community_Plan_MHPA.mxd, 8/17/2017, paul.moreno

The MHPA is north of I-8; however, development and growth will be located south of I-8. Indirect impacts associated with development and growth in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would not extend north of I-8. In addition, future development proposals located adjacent to the MHPA would be required to address potential indirect impacts through compliance with the City's MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Projects adjacent to the MHPA would incorporate features into the project and/or permit conditions that demonstrate compliance with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Adherence to these guidelines would avoid any future significant indirect impacts.

The City's Land Use Adjacency Guidelines of the MSCP address requirements for grading and land development: drainage, toxic substances in runoff, lighting, barriers, invasive plant species, brush management, and noise. Furthermore, proposed policies in the Conservation Element of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would support existing protections for MHPA lands. Thus, implementation of the project would not result in a conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan or local policy protecting biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

5.13.4 Significance of Impacts

5.13.4.1 Sensitive Species

Implementation of the project would result in land use changes that would affect primarily developed areas. Thus, impacts to sensitive species would not be anticipated to occur. Therefore, based on the lack of sensitive species anticipated to occur in the developable areas of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area in addition to the regulatory framework in place that protects sensitive species, impacts to wildlife species would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.13.4.2 Sensitive Habitats

Implementation of the project would result in land use changes that would affect developed areas. Impacts to sensitive habitats would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.13.4.3 Wetlands

Implementation of the project would not result in direct impacts to wetlands (riparian scrub), as area where this habitat occurs are outside of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. No impacts to wetlands are expected; therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.13.4.4 Wildlife Corridors and Nursery Sites

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area does not include wildlife corridors and thus, no impact to wildlife corridors would occur. In addition, wildlife corridors adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would not be impacted. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

5.13.4.5 Multiple Species Conservation Program

The project would be consistent with the City's MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines and SDMC (Section 142.0740) requirements relative to lighting adjacent to the MHPA. Additionally, in complying with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines requirements, landscape plans for future projects would require that grading would not impact environmentally sensitive land, that potential runoff would not drain into MHPA land, that toxic materials used on a development do not impact adjacent sensitive land, that development includes barriers that would reduce predation by domestic animals, and that landscaping does not contain exotic plants/invasive species. In addition, the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines directs development so that any brush management activities are minimized within the MHPA, and contains requirements to reduce potential noise impacts to listed avian species. Compliance with the City's MHPA Land Adjacency Guidelines and adherence to the policies in the Conservation Element of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would reduce potential impacts of the project to less than significant. No mitigation is required.

5.13.5 Mitigation Framework

All impacts to biological resources would be less than significant; thus, no mitigation is required.

5.14 Paleontological Resources

The analysis presented in this section evaluates the potential for impacts to paleontological resources based on existing geologic formations that underlay the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Refer to Section 5.4, Geologic Conditions, for a discussion of the geologic formations that could be affected by the project (see Figure 2-6). The following analysis is based on a review of available literature, including the General Plan; the Paleontological Resource Assessment, Old Town San Diego and Midway-Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan Updates, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California [Paleontological Resource Assessment (2013)]; Kennedy and Tan maps; the City's Paleontological Guidelines; and the publication of Paleontological Resources, County of San Diego by Deméré and Walsh (1994). The Paleontological Resource Assessment is included in this PEIR as Appendix M.

5.14.1 Existing Conditions

The existing environmental setting and regulatory framework are summarized in Chapters 2.0 and 4.0, respectively. As described in the Chapter 2.0, Environmental Setting (Section 2.3.4, Geologic Conditions and 2.3.14, Paleontology), of this PEIR, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is underlain by the Mount Soledad, and Bay Point Formations, which are all assigned a high paleontological resource sensitivity. However, the majority of the project site is underlain by artificial fill, which has zero resource sensitivity. Refer to Section 2.3.14 for additional discussion of the existing setting for paleontological resources and sensitivity ratings.

5.14.2 Significance Determination Thresholds

The City of San Diego's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds provides guidance to determine potential significance to paleontological resources. Based on the City's thresholds, a significant impact related to paleontological resources would occur if the project would:

1. Result in development that requires:
    - Over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation in a high resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit.
    - Over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit.

The City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds includes a Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix that is included in Section 2.3.14 of this PEIR. Additionally, the significance thresholds provide the following additional guidance for determining significance:

- If there are sedimentary rocks such as those found in the coastal areas, they usually contain fossils.
- If there are granitic or volcanic rocks such as those found in the inland areas, they usually will not contain fossils.

5.14.3 Impact Analysis

Issue 1 Paleontological Resources

Would the project result in development that requires over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation in a high resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit or over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit?

Because human understanding of history is obtained, in part, through the discovery and analysis of paleontological resources, impacts of activities that excavate or grade geologic formations that could contain fossil resources would be significant. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is underlain by the Mount Soledad Formation and the Bay Point Formation, which are considered to be of high sensitivity for fossil resources; however, the vast majority of the proposed CPU area is underlain by artificial fill. Artificial fill materials are largely derived from earlier construction activities and do not contain any fossils of paleontological interest. Grading associated with future development projects implemented in accordance with the project that involve excavation into the underlying geological formations could expose these formations and associated fossil remains. These development projects could destroy paleontological resources if the fossil remains are not recovered and salvaged. In addition, future projects proposing shallow grading where formations are exposed and where fossil localities have already been identified would also result in a significant impact. While the majority of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is underlain by artificial fill with no potential to uncover paleontological resources, the Mount Soledad and Bay Point formations have high resource sensitivity where feasible could be uncovered during future construction-related activities. Thus, impacts resulting from future discretionary development into the high and moderate sensitivity formations would be potentially significant (**Impact 5.14-1**).

Build-out of future ministerial projects implemented in accordance with the project would likely result in a certain amount of disturbance to the native bedrock within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Since ministerial projects are not subject to a discretionary review process, there would be no mechanism to screen for grading quantities and geologic formation sensitivity and apply appropriate requirements for paleontological monitoring. Thus, impacts related to future ministerial development that would occur under the project would be potentially significant (**Impact 5.14-2**).

Impact 5.14-1: Grading activities associated with future discretionary projects that require grading in excess of 1,000 cubic yards, extending to a depth of 10 feet or greater into high sensitivity formations, could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.

Impact 5.14-2: Grading activities associated with future ministerial projects that require grading in excess of 1,000 cubic yards, extending to a depth of 10 feet or greater into high sensitivity formations, could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.

5.14.4 Significance of Impacts

Because of high sensitivity for paleontological resources within the Mount Soledad and Bay Point formations, grading into these formations could potentially destroy fossil resources. Therefore, implementation of future discretionary and ministerial projects within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area within these formations has the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.

5.14.5 Mitigation Framework

In order to reduce the potential adverse impact to paleontological resources associated with discretionary projects, the project would incorporate the mitigation measure identified in the General Plan PEIR addressing paleontological resource impacts.

The following mitigation measure would apply to any discretionary project that proposes subsurface disturbance within a high sensitivity formation. If no subsurface disturbance is planned, then paleontological resources would not be impacted and development of a project-specific paleontological monitoring and discovery treatment plan would not be necessary. The following mitigation measure would reduce the impact to below a level of significance.

PALEO 5.14-1 Paleontological Review and Monitoring

Prior to the approval of subsequent discretionary development projects implemented in accordance with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, the City shall determine the potential for impacts to paleontological resources within a high sensitivity formation based on review of the project application submitted and recommendations of a project-level analysis completed in accordance with the steps presented below. Future projects shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts on paleontological resources in accordance with the City's Paleontological Resources Guidelines and CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds. Monitoring for paleontological resources required during construction activities shall be implemented at the project level and shall provide mitigation for the loss of important fossil remains with future subsequent development projects that are subject to environmental review.

I. Prior to Project Approval

A. The environmental analyst shall complete a project-level analysis of potential impacts on paleontological resources. The analysis shall include a review of the applicable United States Geological Survey Quad maps to identify the underlying geologic formations, and shall determine if construction of a project would:

- Require over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation and/or a 10-foot, or greater, depth in a high resources potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit.
- Require over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation and/or 10-foot, or greater, depth in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit.
- Require construction within a known fossil location or fossil recovery site. Resource potential within a formation is based on the Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix.

B. If construction of a project would occur within a formation with a moderate to high resource potential, monitoring during construction would be required and any identified resources shall be recovered.

   - Monitoring is always required when grading on a fossil recovery site or a known fossil location.
   - Monitoring may also be needed at shallower depths if fossil resources are present or likely to be present after review of source materials or consultation with an expert in fossil resources (e.g., the San Diego Natural History Museum).
   - Monitoring may be required for shallow grading (<10 feet) when a site has previously been graded, and/or unweathered geologic deposits/formations/ rock units are present at the surface.
   - Monitoring is not required when grading documented artificial fill. When it has been determined that a future project has the potential to impact a geologic formation with a high or moderate fossil sensitivity rating, a Paleontological Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be implemented during construction grading activities.

5.14.6 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation

All future discretionary projects that would occur as a result of the project would be required to comply with **PALEO 5.14-1**. Implementation of mitigation measure **PALEO 5.14-1** would reduce paleontological impacts associated with future discretionary development to below a level of significance.

Future ministerial projects proposed in conformance with the project would also likely result in a certain amount of disturbance to the native bedrock within the study area. Since ministerial projects are not subject to a discretionary review process, there would be no mechanism to screen for grading quantities and geologic formation sensitivity and apply appropriate requirements for paleontological monitoring. Thus, impacts related to future ministerial development that would occur under the project would remain significant and unavoidable.

6

Chapter 6.0
Cumulative Impacts

6.1 Introduction

Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines cumulative impacts as "two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts." These individual effects may entail changes resulting from a single project or from a number of separate projects. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects occurring over a period of time.

Section 15130 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR discuss the cumulative impacts of a project when the project's incremental effect would potentially be cumulatively considerable. Cumulatively considerable, as defined in Section 15065(a)(3), means that the incremental effects of the individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects and the effects of probable future projects. Where a lead agency determines the project's incremental effect would not be cumulatively considerable, a brief description of the basis for such a conclusion must be included. In addition, the CEQA Guidelines allow for a project's contribution to be rendered less than cumulatively considerable with implementation of appropriate mitigation.

According to Section 15130(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of cumulative impacts "…need not provide as great detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness." Additionally, one of the following two possible approaches is required for considering cumulative effects:

- A list of past, present and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency; or

- A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or

> evaluated region- or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.

Pursuant to Section 15130(d), cumulative impact discussions may rely on previously approved land use documents such as general plans, specific plans, and local coastal plans, and may be incorporated by reference. In addition, no further cumulative impact analysis is required when a project is consistent with such plans, and the lead agency determines that the regional or area-wide cumulative impacts of the project have already been adequately addressed in a certified EIR for that plan.

Section 15130(e) also states that "If a cumulative impact was adequately addressed in a prior EIR for a community plan, zoning action, or general plan, and the project is consistent with that plan or action, then an EIR for such a project should not further analyze that cumulative impact, as provided in Section 15183(j)."

The cumulative impacts assessment in this section primarily relies on the cumulative impact determinations in the General Plan PEIR. The following issues were identified as cumulatively significant in the General Plan PEIR: agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, geologic conditions, health and safety, historical resources, hydrology, land use, mineral resources, noise, paleontological resources, population and housing, public services and facilities, public utilities, traffic, visual effects and neighborhood character, water quality, and global warming (GHGs). Consistent with Section 15130(e), where significance of cumulative impacts was previously identified for the General Plan PEIR, and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is consistent, those impacts do not need to be analyzed further. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would add incremental effects to the issues identified above; however, the effects associated with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU are also considered cumulatively significant. Based on the noted considerations, all of the issue areas identified as cumulatively significant in the General Plan PEIR are assessed below.

6.2 Cumulative Analysis Setting and Methodology

A broad examination of cumulative impacts involves considering the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU together with growth of the City and the region. Development would occur in accordance with the land use designations and development intensities identified in the Land Use and Community Planning Element of the General Plan. The land uses and the associated potential development designated in the General Plan correlate to regional growth estimates made by SANDAG. SANDAG estimates anticipated growth for the 18 cities and the unincorporated areas within San Diego County for the purpose of allocating growth to specific areas and identifying regional transportation infrastructure needed to support regional growth.

Section 5 of the PEIR for the General Plan discusses the cumulative impacts that result from its implementation and is, therefore, incorporated by reference. The analysis in the General Plan PEIR relied on the regional growth projections provided by the SANDAG 2030 Regional Growth Forecast Update (Regional Growth Forecast) estimates for employment, population, and housing for the period between 2004 and 2030. Cumulative impacts were analyzed in light of the significance thresholds presented in Sections 3.1 through 3.17 of the General Plan PEIR. The General Plan strategy anticipated the cumulative effects of growth and planned for it in a manner that would be balanced in its approach. The

focused growth strategy addresses future growth as a whole, and includes policies to avoid or reduce impacts on a cumulative basis.

Year 2035 is the relevant year for projected growth associated with the proposed Midway Pacific Highway CPU. Therefore, the cumulative analysis for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU PEIR relies on the San Diego Region growth projections for 2035 provided in SANDAG's 2050 Regional Growth Forecast adopted in October 2013. The 2035 estimates for population, housing, and employment are shown in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1
San Diego Region Growth Projections for Cumulative Analysis

Regional Growth Indicator	2035
Population	3,853,698
Housing Units	1,394,783
Jobs	1,769,938
Source: SANDAG Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast	

6.2.1 Plans and Programs Evaluated for Cumulative Impacts

The General Plan, City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan, City of San Diego LDC, City of San Diego CAP, San Diego International Airport ALUCP, and the RP were used to evaluate cumulative impacts. These documents are on file at the City of San Diego Planning Department, 1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower, San Diego, California 92101 and available online. A summary of the status of these plans is included in Table 6-2.

6.3 Assessment of Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope for the analysis of cumulative impacts is dependent on the nature of the issue and the project and varies depending upon the environmental issue being analyzed. Often, cumulative impacts are not limited by jurisdictional boundaries. For example, the project's contribution to localized impacts, such as those associated with traffic or noise, would affect the local neighborhood and traffic study area. Other topic areas, such as biological resources, historical resources, or water quality, could extend to areas beyond the local vicinity to include geographic areas that share similar conditions and the potential for similar adverse effects to these resources. Further, the impacts associated with regional topics, such as air quality and GHG emissions, could extend throughout the entire air basin. Table 6-3 shows the cumulative impact analysis geographic scope and applicable plans for each issue area evaluated in the PEIR.

Table 6-2 Planning Documents Used for Cumulative Analysis		
Planning Documents	Location	Status
City of San Diego General Plan	City of San Diego	Final EIR certified and plan adopted in March 2008.
City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan	City of San Diego	Final EIR certified and plan adopted in March 1997.
City of San Diego LDC	City of San Diego	Final EIR certified and plan adopted in 1999.
City of San Diego CAP	City of San Diego	Approved on December 15, 2015.
San Diego International Airport ALUCP	San Diego International Airport	Final EIR certified and plan adopted by the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Board of Directors in April 2014.
San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan	San Diego Region	Final EIR adopted by the SANDAG Board of Directors on October 9, 2015.
San Diego Water Quality Improvement Plans	City of San Diego	Final MND adopted May 29, 2015

Table 6-3 Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Cumulative Analysis Setting		
Issue Area	Geographic Scope	Applicable Plans
Land Use	Midway-Pacific Highway community and adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown)	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code, San Diego International Airport ALUCP, San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
Transportation/ Circulation	Intersections, roadway segments, and freeway segments and ramps as identified in the TIS prepared for the project (see Section 2.1, in the TIS, Appendix B).	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code, San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources	Midway-Pacific Highway community	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code
Geologic Conditions	Midway-Pacific Highway community and adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown)	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code
Noise	Midway-Pacific Highway community and adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown)	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code, San Diego International Airport ALUCP

Table 6-3 Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Cumulative Analysis Setting		
Issue Area	Geographic Scope	Applicable Plans
Health and Safety	Midway-Pacific Highway community and adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown)	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code
Hydrology/Water Quality	San Diego hydrologic unit and Pueblo San Diego hydrologic unit	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code, San Diego Water Quality Improvement Plans
Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character	Midway-Pacific Highway community and adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown)	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code
Air Quality and Odor	San Diego Air Basin	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code, City of San Diego Climate Action Plan
GHG	Global and San Diego Region	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code, City of San Diego Climate Action Plan
Public Services and Facilities	Midway-Pacific Highway community and adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown)	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code
Public Utilities	Midway-Pacific Highway community and adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown)	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code
Biological Resources	Midway-Pacific Highway community and adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown)	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code, City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan
Paleontological Resources	Southern California Region	City of San Diego General Plan, City of San Diego Land Development Code

6.3.1 Land Use

As discussed in Section 5.1, Land Use, of the ~~Draft~~ PEIR, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains nine elements providing community-specific goals and policies that are consistent with Citywide zoning classifications, development design guidelines, mobility guidelines, and programs in accordance with the goals of the General Plan and the implementing regulations of the City's LDC. Both the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU along with the adjacent community plan areas (Peninsula, Old Town, Uptown, and Downtown) would accommodate existing development as well as encourage development consistent with community goals and character.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU combined with adjacent community plan areas are consistent with and also implement the environmental goals or objectives of the SANDAG's RP. The proposed CPU and adjacent community plan areas are consistent with the City's MSCP and MHPA and Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Development implemented in accordance with the project and adjacent community plan areas would not result in conflicts with the City's ESL Regulations, which contains policies supporting the goals of these regulations. Any development within the proposed CPU area that would encroach into environmentally sensitive lands would be subject to review in accordance with the ESL Regulations (LDC Section 143.0101 et seq.). Future development in accordance with the proposed CPU would also be required to comply with the City's HRR to protect designated and eligible historical resources in the proposed CPU area. Future development projects within the AIA would be submitted to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority, acting as the ALUC, to ensure the consistency of future development with the ALUCP for the SDIA, until the ALUC determines that the updated community plan and development regulations are consistent with the ALUCP or the City Council takes action to overrule the ALUC. Based on the compatibility of the proposed CPU with the General Plan policy framework and other applicable land use plans and regulations, cumulative land use compatibility and cumulative impacts associated with the project would be less than significant.

6.3.2 Transportation and Circulation

Due to the nature of the project being an update to the adopted Community Plan with no specific development project being proposed at this time, the transportation and circulation analysis provided in Section 5.2 of this PEIR is cumulative in nature. Thus, as discussed in Section 5.2, impacts to roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, and freeway ramp meters under the proposed CPU would result in a significant cumulative impact. Please refer to Section 5.2 for mitigation and significance conclusions.

6.3.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

As stated in Section 5.3, impacts to historical and tribal cultural resources would be considered significant with the implementation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. While federal, state, and local regulations, as well as goals and policies developed by the City would reduce impacts to historical and tribal cultural resources, the additional development in the proposed CPU area could still result in significant impacts to historical and tribal cultural resources. Each individual future project has the potential to contribute to incremental historical and tribal cultural resources impacts. This, in conjunction with impacts resulting from surrounding community plan updates, could contribute to a significant cumulative impact to historical and tribal cultural resources. Please refer to Section 5.3 for mitigation and significance conclusions.

6.3.4 Geologic Conditions

Cumulative impacts related to geologic hazards within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and surrounding CPU areas such as Old Town, Uptown, Peninsula and Downtown would be less than significant with implementation of recommendations included in site-specific geotechnical investigations required under the CBC and SDMC, as discussed in the analysis. As discussed in Section 5.4 of this PEIR, geologic hazards occur from mapped faulting and site-specific soil or geologic conditions. Development of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU in combination with surrounding CPU areas

would not compound or worsen potential geologic hazards. Geologic hazard conditions are site-specific and do not compound or increase in combination with projected development elsewhere in the county. Thus, as each individual development would be required to comply with remedial measures identified in a site-specific geotechnical investigation, as required by the SDMC and CBC, cumulative impacts related to geologic hazards would be less than significant.

6.3.5 Noise

The analysis provided for noise is cumulative in nature because the analysis considers noise and vibration impacts associated with regional growth within and adjacent to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, and the traffic assumptions used in the analysis includes cumulative traffic associated with growth in neighboring communities (Old Town, Peninsula, Downtown, and Uptown CPU areas). Noise impacts associated with growth in neighboring CPU areas would be localized in nature. For example, construction of restaurants or commercial uses in Old Town or Peninsula would not affect residences in Midway with the exception of development that may occur at the boundary of the proposed CPU area. However, land uses within each CPU area would be subject to the same General Plan policies, noise ordinance requirements, and Title 24 standards discussed in this document that reduce noise impacts. Thus, cumulative noise impacts would be less than significant.

6.3.6 Health and Safety

As discussed in this PEIR, compliance with federal, state, regional, and local health and safety laws and regulations would address potential health and safety impacts. Potential health and safety impacts associated with wildfires, hazardous substances, emergency response and evacuation plans, and aircraft hazards would not combine to create cumulative impacts when viewed together with the potential growth that could occur within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and surrounding CPU areas (Old Town, Uptown, Peninsula, and Downtown). Wildfire impacts in these communities are limited to the canyon areas, which are localized and would not be exacerbated by cumulative development in adjacent communities. Additionally, future projects implemented in accordance with the proposed CPU are required to follow the City's Brush Management regulations and the City's Fire Code requirements. Similarly, potential hazards associated with hazardous material sites are site specific and would not combine with hazards in other community plan areas to create a cumulative impact. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in a cumulatively significant impact related to health and safety issues.

6.3.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

Future projects within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and surrounding areas, including projects within the San Diego and Pueblo San Diego hydrologic units, could have a cumulative impact on hydrology and water quality, including downstream problems with flooding, sizing of drainage facilities, erosion, and sedimentation. However, all future development within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and San Diego and Pueblo San Diego hydrologic units as a whole would be required to comply with all NPDES permit requirements, including the development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan if the disturbed area covers one acre or more, or a Water Quality Control Plan if the disturbed area is less than one acre. Future projects would also be required to follow the City's Storm

Water Standards Manual for drainage design and BMPs for treatment. Thus, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

6.3.8 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

Future growth within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and surrounding communities including Old Town, Uptown, Peninsula, and Downtown have the potential to cumulatively impact the visual environment through the design and location of future buildings. Changes in visual character and quality resulting from individual development projects within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and development within the Old Town, Uptown, Peninsula, and Downtown communities could contribute incrementally to cumulative impacts with regard to aesthetics. However, the cumulative visual impact would not result in a cumulatively significant impact since the adjacent CPU areas are already urbanized and include existing development of the type that would be further developed under the proposed CPU and the surrounding communities' land use plans.

Future development in accordance with the proposed CPU area and surrounding communities is likely to take place on infill sites in previously developed locations. The proposed CPU and surrounding communities' land use plans (Midway-Pacific Highway, Old Town, Uptown, Peninsula, and Downtown) contain policies to ensure that any new development is consistent with the existing character and protects public views. The proposed policies address consistency in setbacks, height and bulk, landscaping, design, historic character, and natural features such as canyons and hillsides. The proposed CPU and surrounding communities' land use plans contain policies to preserve, protect, and restore existing landforms. Compliance with the SDMC would ensure that cumulative light and glare impacts are avoided. Based on the existing urbanized character of the proposed CPU area and surrounding communities and implementation of existing regulations and policies in the proposed CPU and surrounding communities' land use plans, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

6.3.9 Air Quality and Odor

For purposes of Issue 1 in Section 5.9, the cumulative study area would be considered the SDAB. Since the analysis provided under Issue 1 is a discussion of consistency with the air quality plan for the SDAB (i.e., the RAQS), the analysis provided a cumulative analysis by nature since it considers consistency of the project with a regional air quality plan that relies on the land use plans of jurisdictions within the basin. As discussed in Section 5.9, the net change in emissions from implementation of the project compared to the build-out of the adopted Community Plan would generate air emissions that would not exceed the thresholds of significance. These thresholds are designed to identify those projects that would result in significant levels of air pollution and to assist the region in attaining the applicable NAAQS or CAAQS. Thus, the project would not result in an increase of emissions that would conflict with implementation of the air quality plan. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to conflicts with air quality plans would be less than significant.

As explained under Issue 2 in Section 5.9, the hypothetical intensive year of construction would not result in air emissions that would exceed the applicable thresholds. While unlikely to occur based on the fact that the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is largely built out and the proposed CPU is designed to guide development through 2035, future environmental review for these larger projects would allow for a site-specific analysis of construction level air quality emissions to ensure projects are

appropriately phased and timed to avoid such cumulative construction emissions. Thus, the impact related to construction emissions would be less than significant. After construction, the net increase in emissions over the adopted Community Plan would not result in the generation of criteria air pollutant emissions that exceed the applicable threshold of significance. Since the RAQS are established for the SDAB which is the cumulative study area for air quality emissions, build-out of the land uses within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would not have the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact. Therefore, cumulative operational emissions associated with build-out of the project would be less than significant.

The CO hot spot screening analysis identified two road segments in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The hot spot screening analysis indicated that the deterioration of LOS due to the implementation of the proposed CPU would not cause a potential impact to localized air quality. Since CO hot spots are a localized phenomenon, development within other community plans would not contribute to a cumulative CO hot spot impact. The San Diego APCD would require an emissions inventory and health risk assessment in accordance with AB 2588 prior to issuance of any permits to construct or operate a stationary emission source. These requirements would extend to land uses within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area in addition to land uses within the SDAB as a whole. Thus, existing regulations would ensure that cumulative impacts associated with stationary sources of toxic air emissions would be less than significant as build-out of the plan occurs.

Implementation of the project would not result in a significant cumulative odor impact because the project would develop land uses that are not associated with generation of substantial odors. Thus, cumulative odor impacts would be less than significant.

6.3.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The impact analysis discussed under Issue 1 in Section 5.10 is a cumulative analysis by its nature because GHG emissions are a cumulative issue caused by global GHG emissions and not an individual project. Cumulatively, there exists a significant impact related to GHG emissions at the global level. However, as discussed under Issue 1, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact from GHG emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable because implementation of the project would be consistent with the goals and strategy of the CAP and City of Villages strategy. As discussed under Issue 2 in Section 5.10, City policies, plans, and codes will be evaluated as needed to ensure that CAP GHG emissions reduction targets are met. If implementation of the project cumulatively with other CPUs would be inconsistent with the CAP or other plans/policies for the reduction of GHGs, the City could amend land use plans to reflect more aggressive strategies for GHG reduction and to ensure consistency with the adopted CAP. Thus, the contribution of the project to the existing cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, cumulative impacts related to GHGs would be less than significant

6.3.11 Public Services and Facilities

Some of the City's existing built areas have existing infrastructure deficiencies and would require capacity improvements to serve additional population. Therefore, it is anticipated that new or improved public services and facilities infrastructure would be required to meet the needs of the City's future growth occurring through infill and redevelopment as well as remaining on vacant and developable lands. However, as discussed in this section, implementation of the project does not include construction of any

specific public facilities or services. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies that would support improvements to public facilities and includes a proposed Impact Fee Study that would specify the DIF applicable to future development within the proposed CPU area.

The specific public facilities improvements that would be constructed in the cumulative area of Midway-Pacific Highway and adjacent community plan areas and the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known at this program level of analysis. Thus, cumulative impacts related to public facilities would be less than significant at the program level.

6.3.12 Public Utilities

a. Water Supply

The WSA prepared for the project concluded that the project would be consistent with the water demand assumptions included in the regional water resource planning documents of the SDCWA and the MWD. Furthermore, current and future water supplies, as well as the actions necessary to develop these supplies, have been identified in the water resources planning documents of the PUD, the SDCWA, and MWD to serve the projected demands of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, in addition to existing and planned future water demand of the City. Additionally, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU contains policies intended to ensure that no excessive water use takes place, encourage water conservation and reclamation, and ensure the continued operability of existing infrastructure. Thus, cumulative impacts related to water supply would be less than significant.

b. Utilities

The specific utilities improvements that would be constructed in the cumulative area of Midway-Pacific Highway and adjacent community plan areas and the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known at this program level of analysis. Thus, cumulative impacts related to utilities would be less than significant at the program level.

c. Solid Waste and Recycling

The project combined with future development of adjacent community plan areas would generate solid waste through demolition/ construction and ongoing operations that would increase the amount of solid waste generated within the region. Future projects within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and Citywide would be required to comply with City regulations regarding solid waste, including those intended to divert solid waste from the Miramar Landfill to preserve capacity. Compliance with the SDMC and consistency with the General Plan policies promoting waste diversion would serve to preserve solid waste capacity. Discretionary projects of 40,000 square feet or more generating more than 60 tons of waste would be required to develop and implement WMPs targeting 75 percent waste diversion. Therefore, cumulative solid waste impacts would be less than significant.

6.3.13 Biological Resources

Preservation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU region's biological resources has been addressed through the implementation of regional HCPs. Impacts to biological resources in the City of San Diego are managed through the adopted MSCP Subarea Plan, which is incorporated by reference in the General Plan.

Sensitive resources are located in MHPA or Open Space areas that are protected through respective designation and/or their location within the MHPA in addition to protections provided by the City's ESL Regulations. These areas are outside the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. The proposed Midway- Pacific Highway CPU and land use plans of surrounding communities incorporate policies related to the protection of biological resources focusing primarily on the land use plans' consistency with the City's ESL Regulations, the Biology Guidelines, and MSCP Subarea Plan Management Policies to protect the area's sensitive plants and animals.

Cumulative development that would occur within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would result in less than significant cumulative impacts to biological resources due to the developed nature of this community combined with the existing regulatory framework that would ensure that impacts to sensitive biological resources are avoided. Although each individual future project may contribute to incremental biological resource impacts, compliance with proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies, the MSCP Subarea Plan, ESL Regulations, and the Biology Guidelines would ensure that cumulative impacts from future development would be less than significant.

6.3.14 Paleontological Resources

Development allowed pursuant to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and development within surrounding communities could involve excavation of previously undeveloped areas, some of which may consist of unique paleontological resources with fossil-bearing potential. Potential cumulative impacts to paleontological resources were evaluated in the General Plan PEIR. The analysis concluded that there is potential for the cumulative loss of paleontological resources throughout the county, as the county continues to develop in response to projected population growth. Likewise, development of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area may result in the loss of unique paleontological resources or geologic formations with fossil-bearing potential. Certification of the General Plan PEIR included the adoption of mitigation measures that attempt to reduce significant project-level impacts from future development. However, there is only a mechanism to apply the mitigation framework to discretionary projects, not ministerial projects. Thus, within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area and surrounding communities, significant impacts to paleontological resources could occur associated with grading for ministerial projects. Similar to the General Plan PEIR, future ministerial projects within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area would result in significant cumulative impacts to paleontological resources (Impact 5.14-2).

This page intentionally left blank.

7

Chapter 7.0
Other Mandatory Discussion Areas

CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR contain discussion of impacts associated with growth inducement, effects found not to be significant, significant unavoidable environmental impacts, and significant irreversible environmental changes. Each of these discussion areas is addressed in the sections below.

7.1 Growth Inducement

This PEIR must examine the potential growth-inducing impacts of the project. More specifically, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires that an EIR:

> Discuss ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are projects which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community services facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

According to the City's Significance Determination Thresholds, growth inducement "is usually associated with those projects that foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, which may result in the construction of major new infrastructure facilities. Also, a change in land use policy or projects that provide economic stimulus, such as industrial or commercial uses, may induce growth. Accelerated growth may further strain existing community facilities or encourage activities that could significantly affect the surrounding environment." In addition, the Thresholds state that "the analysis must avoid speculation and focus on probable growth patterns or projects."

The General Plan PEIR (2008a) notes that "population in San Diego will grow whether or not the Draft General Plan is adopted…" and although a number of the General Plan policies are in place to

"…encourage business, education, employment and workforce development…preserve and protect valuable employment land, especially prime industrial land, from conversion to other uses…and facilitate expansion and new growth of high quality employment opportunities in the City." The General Plan incorporates the previously adopted City of Villages strategy, which notes that a "village" is a place where residential, commercial, employment, and civic uses are present and integrated, and are characterized by compact mixed-use areas that are pedestrian-friendly and linked to the regional transit system (City of San Diego 2008b). Based on Government Code Section 65300, the General Plan serves as a comprehensive, long-term plan for physical development of the City and, by definition, is intended to manage and address future growth in the City. Implementation of the City of Villages strategy relies on the future designation and development of village sites through comprehensive community plan updates.

The project serves as a comprehensive long-term plan for the physical development of the proposed CPU area, and is intended to manage and address future growth of the community through 2035. There is a current estimate of 4,600 residents in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. Under the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan, the City estimates that the forecasted population would be 11,775 in year 2035; under the proposed CPU, by the year 2035, this population is projected to be 27,070 residents.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU incorporates the City of Villages strategy by creating individual districts and villages with distinct characteristics throughout the proposed CPU area. Specific policies and guidelines for each village or district are laid out in Section 2.4 of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and draw upon the character and strengths of the proposed CPU area setting, commercial centers, transit corridors, institutions, and employment centers. The districts and villages include: Channel District, Camino Del Rio District, Rosecrans District, Cauby District, Lytton District, Kurtz District, Sports Arena Community Village, Kemper Neighborhood Village, Dutch Flats Urban Village, and the Hancock Transit Corridor. The community and neighborhood villages are planned to be vibrant pedestrian- and transit-oriented neighborhoods with enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connectivity that reflect the types of public spaces, structures, public art, connections, and land uses that will support the specific vision for each village. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policy directs housing growth to areas suitable for infill and new development with a focus on integrating residential uses into the planned mixed-use villages in the community.

The project is intended to provide guidance on orderly growth and redevelopment in accordance with smart growth principles. Through the placement of higher density residential development in areas in and around transit and commercial corridors, the proposed CPU would foster a mixed-use urban environment that supports transit and pedestrian activity. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would designate land uses to accommodate residential and non-residential growth, although additional housing units and non-residential space would not be built without demand. Other potential environmental impacts associated with population growth in the proposed CPU area (e.g., transportation/traffic, air quality, noise, GHG emissions) are addressed in the relevant sections of this PEIR.

Based on the forecasted population for the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan stated above, the population in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area will grow whether or not the project is adopted. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU promotes infill residential, commercial, and office development in proximity to transit services and residential uses, and encourages the use of local and state programs to incentivize business retention and expansion. Additional policies

are intended to facilitate economic well-being of locally owned and operated businesses and create ample job opportunities for residents in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area. These policies serve to facilitate expansion and new growth of high-quality employment opportunities with bicycle or pedestrian access to transit. Therefore, the project would provide comprehensive planning for the management of population growth, necessary economic expansion to support development efforts, and allow an appropriate balance of managed population, housing, and economic growth to accommodate community development while maintaining related community and environmental standards.

7.2 Effects Found not to be Significant

CEQA Guidelines Section 15128 requires that an EIR contain a brief statement disclosing the reasons why various possible significant effects of a project were found not to be significant and therefore would not be discussed in detail in the EIR. The impacts associated with the following environmental issue areas were found to not be significant as a result of the project: Agricultural Resources, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, and Energy.

7.2.1 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

Based on the farmland maps prepared by the California Department of Conservation (2014), the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is not identified as containing Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The proposed CPU area is designated entirely as urban and built-up land. Therefore, there would be no impact to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

Agricultural Zoning/Williamson Act

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is not zoned for agriculture and there are no lands under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, no impact is identified for this issue area.

Forest, Timberland, Timberland Production Zone

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located within an urbanized area. There are no existing forestlands, timberlands, or timberland for Timberland Production Zone either within the proposed CPU area or in the immediate vicinity that would conflict with existing zoning or the proposed rezoning. Therefore, no impact is identified for this issue area.

Loss of Forest Land

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is located within an urbanized area. There are no existing forestlands either within the proposed CPU area or in the immediate vicinity (USDA 2016). Implementation of the project would not result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact is identified for this issue area.

Natural Conversion of Farmland or Forest

The proposed CPU area is located within an urbanized area; there are no existing forestland uses either on-site or in the immediate vicinity. Implementation of the project would not involve any other changes that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use (i.e., increase in population) or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact is identified for this issue area.

7.2.2 Mineral Resources

According to the California Department of Conservation (CDC), Division of Mines and Geology, the area of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU is designated as the following Mineral Land Classification:

MRZ-1: Areas where adequate geologic information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood for their presence exists (CDC 1996).

According to the California Geological Survey Open File Report 96-04, areas mapped as Mineral Resource Zone 1, 2, 3, and 4 (MRZ-1 through MRZ-4) have been mapped for the City of San Diego. MRZ-1 areas are locations in San Diego County that have been identified as having no significant mineral deposits. Areas mapped in MRZ-2 are considered to have extractable aggregate deposits. Areas mapped in MRZ-3 contain mineral deposits that may qualify as mineral resources. MRZ-4 areas are those where geologic information does not rule out either the presence or absence of mineral resources. Based on a review of referenced data, the proposed CPU area is in an urban area where the potential for loss of mineral deposits due to further development is considered low.

The proposed CPU area is located entirely within a developed urban area and does not require the acquisition of additional land. There are no identified mineral resources that would be affected or “lost” as a result of implementation of the project. Thus, the project would not result in a loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on any local or general plan. Therefore, no impact to mineral resources would occur.

7.2.3 Population and Housing

While population projections for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area indicate that population will increase over time, the population growth would not introduce an impact. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would serve as a comprehensive, long-term plan for the physical development of the Midway-Pacific Highway community and is intended to manage and address future growth in the community to support transit use and multi-modal mobility. The project would not displace people or existing housing, as the project would designate planned land uses and zoning that would accommodate future development within the proposed CPU area. Therefore, no impact to population and housing would occur.

7.2.4 Energy

Section 15126.4 (a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR shall describe feasible measures, which could minimize significant adverse impacts, including, where relevant, the inefficient and

unnecessary consumption of energy. CEQA Guidelines, Appendix F, Energy Conservation, provides guidance for EIRs regarding potential energy impacts of projects, with particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing the inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy. The Resources Agency amended Appendix F to make it clear that an energy analysis is mandatory. However, the Resources Agency also clarified that the energy analysis is limited to effects that are applicable to the project (Resources Agency 2009). Furthermore, Appendix F is not described as a threshold for determining the significance of impacts. Appendix F merely seeks inclusion of information in the EIR to the extent relative and applicable to the project.

Because the proposed action is the adoption of a proposed community plan update and associated discretionary regulatory actions and does not specifically address any particular development project(s), impacts to energy resources are addressed generally, based on projected future development of the project. Implementation of the project has the potential to result in impacts to energy supply due to development that is anticipated to occur in response to projected population growth. Depending on the types of future uses, impacts would need to be addressed in detail at the time specific projects are proposed. At a minimum, future projects implemented in accordance with the project would be required to meet the mandatory energy standards of the current California energy code (Title 24 Building Energy Standards of the California Public Resources Code).

Energy resources would be consumed during construction of future development. Energy also would be consumed to provide operational lighting, heating, cooling, and transportation for future development.

Construction-Related Energy Consumption

Grading and construction activities consume energy through the operation of heavy off-road equipment, trucks, and worker traffic. At the program-level, it is too speculative to quantify total construction-related energy consumption of future development, either in total or by fuel type. The majority of energy to be used in conjunction with construction activities would be supplied by SDG&E.

In compliance with the City's Significance Determination Thresholds for solid waste, future discretionary projects of 40,000 square feet or more exceeding 60 tons of solid waste would be required to develop waste management plans and comply with the AB 341 target of at least 75 percent waste reduction, including construction waste. Even though exact details of the projects implemented in accordance with the project are not known at this time, there are no conditions in the proposed CPU area that would require non-standard equipment or construction practices that would increase fuel-energy consumption above typical rates. Therefore, development pursuant to the project would not result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or other forms of energy during the construction of future projects.

Long-Term Operation-Related Energy Consumption

Long-term operational energy use associated with the project includes fuel consumption of vehicles, electricity and natural gas consumption by residents and commercial operations, and energy consumption related to obtaining water. However, the use of these resources would still be used daily as essential energy sources and utilities regardless of implementation of the project. As such, although long-term operational energy use would result from future development, such changes would not be considered

significant in comparison to the energy use of other cities in the region. The project would not result in any unusual characteristics that would result in excessive long-term operational building energy demand.

At a minimum, development under the project would be required to meet the mandatory energy standards of the current California Energy Code (Title 24 Building Energy Standards of the California Public Resources Code). Some efficiencies associated with the Energy Standards under Title 24 include the building heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) mechanical system, water heating system, and lighting system. Additionally, rebate and incentive programs that promote the installation and use of energy-efficient plug-in appliances and lighting would be available, but not covered under Title 24. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Conservation and Urban Design elements also contain a number of sustainable development policies that focus on designing new development to have a climate adaptive, energy efficient, and environmentally sustainable building and site design and to incorporate on-site renewable energy generation where feasible.

Policies in the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would further address energy consumption. Specifically, proposed Mobility, Conservation, and Urban Design Element policies would reduce local dependence on automobile transportation by improving the street network to create a walkable block pattern, improving pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and encouraging pedestrian-oriented development; support transit use and transit infrastructure improvements; adhere to standardized measures outlined in the City's CAP, and encourage street light retrofits and outdoor lighting that are energy efficient.

Although these policies would decrease the overall per capita energy use in the proposed CPU area, they would not ensure that energy supplies would be available when needed. Future projects would be subject to review for measures that would further reduce energy consumption in conformance to existing regulations. Furthermore, the City's CAP, adopted by City Council in December 2015, includes 2020 and 2035 targets that are on the trajectory for meeting the 2050 GHG reduction goals established by EO S-3-05. Future projects would be reviewed for consistency with the CAP and applicable implementation measures.

Future operational energy use related to roadways would consist of the transportation fuels consumed to transport area residents, workers, and visitors. The total estimated daily vehicle trips are estimated to be 313,558 for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, as detailed in the traffic impact analysis prepared for the proposed CPU (Chen Ryan 2017). The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU Mobility Element also contains policies that would reduce vehicle miles travelled and associated fuel consumption. These include policies to improve the pedestrian environment and neighborhood walkability, improve bicycle infrastructure and facilities, encourage implementation of transportation demand management strategies, and parking management policies that support installation of electric vehicle charging stations and measures to reduce parking demand.

In conclusion, development under the project would result in increased energy use, in the form of new buildings and transportation. Residential and non-residential developments use electricity, natural gas, and petroleum products for power, lighting, and heating, and vehicles use both oil and gas. Use of these types of energy for new development would result in the overall increased use of nonrenewable energy resources. This represents an irreversible environmental change.

7.3 Unavoidable Significant Environmental Impacts

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b), any significant unavoidable impacts of a project, including those impacts that can be mitigated, but not reduced to below a level of significance despite the applicant's willingness to implement all feasible mitigation measures, must be identified in the PEIR. For the project, impacts related to transportation and circulation (cumulative impacts to roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, and freeway ramps), noise (ambient noise, vehicle noise impacts, and construction-related vibration), historical resources (historical, tribal cultural, and archaeological resources), and paleontological resources (future ministerial development) would remain significant and unavoidable impacts (refer to Chapter 5.0, Environmental Analysis, of this PEIR, Sections 5.1 through 5.14, for further detail). All other significant impacts identified in Chapter 5.0 of this PEIR can be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the mitigation framework identified, as well as through compliance with General Plan and proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies.

7.4 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires an evaluation of significant irreversible environmental changes which would occur should the project be implemented. Irreversible changes typically fall into one of three categories:

- Primary impacts such as the use of nonrenewable resources (i.e., biological habitat, agricultural land, mineral deposits, water bodies, energy resources and cultural resources);
- Primary and secondary impacts such as highway improvements which provide access to previously inaccessible areas; and
- Environmental accidents potentially associated with future development under the project.

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that current consumption of such resources is justified.

Implementation of the project would not result in significant irreversible impacts to agricultural land, biological habitat, energy resources, cultural resources, mineral deposits, or water bodies. Although sensitive biological resources are identified adjacent to the proposed CPU area (in the San Diego River, north of the proposed CPU area) (see Section 2.3.13), direct and indirect impacts can be offset through strict compliance with CPU policies, regulatory compliance (MSCP and ESL Regulations of the LDC). Similarly, future development pursuant to the project could impact important historical, tribal cultural, or archaeological resources given the presence of known and potential historical and archaeological resources within the Midway-Pacific Highway community. Potential impacts to historical, tribal cultural, or archaeological resources can be mitigated through strict adherence to proposed CPU policies and regulatory compliance (LDC Historical Resource Regulations), and implementation of the mitigation framework further detailed in Section 5.3 of this PEIR. Impacts to historical, tribal cultural, and archaeological resources would, however, remain significant and unavoidable. As evaluated in Section 7.2, Effects Not Found to be Significant, of this PEIR, implementation of the project would not result in significant irreversible impacts to agricultural and forestry or mineral resources. Finally, no water bodies

are present within the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area, and no downstream receiving waters would be impacted by the proposed CPU.

The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area is almost completely built out and is accessible via regional transportation facilities (e.g., I-5 and I-8, State Route 163). No new freeways or roadways are proposed that would provide access to currently inaccessible areas. Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in a significant irreversible commitment with regard to unplanned land use.

Construction of development implemented in accordance with the project would require the irreversible consumption of natural resources and energy. Natural resource consumption would include lumber and other forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, steel, copper, other metals, and water. Building materials, while perhaps recyclable in part at some long-term future date, would for practical purposes be considered permanently consumed. Energy derived from nonrenewable sources, such as fossil fuels, would be consumed during construction and as a result of operational lighting, heating, cooling, and equipment and transportation uses. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU includes policies aimed at improving energy efficiency, reducing water use, minimizing impacts on other natural resources, and encouraging renewable energy generation. For example, the mixed-use villages concept would reduce dependence on fossil fuel energy sources by integrating housing units in close proximity to supportive non-residential land uses and transit corridors. These policies would serve to reduce irreversible water, energy, and building materials consumption associated with construction, occupation, and operation. Energy consumption was discussed in greater detail in Section 7.2.4 above.

With respect to environmental accidents potentially associated with the project, and as further discussed in Section 5.6 of this PEIR, potential impacts related to hazardous materials and associated health hazards from implementation of the project would be avoided or reduced to below a level of significance through mandatory conformance with applicable regulatory/industry standards and codes. The proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU area contains a minimal amount of undeveloped land along the San Diego River. Due to the community's location and its developed nature, there is little to no risk for wildfires. Further, development pursuant to the project would be subject to applicable state and City regulatory requirements related to fire hazards and prevention. Accidents related to flood hazards would not be significant because all development would be subject to drainage and floodplain regulations in the SDMC, and would be required to adhere to the City's Drainage Design Manual and Storm Water Standards Manual.

8

Chapter 8.0
Alternatives

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR compare the effects of a "reasonable range of alternatives" to the effects of a project. The CEQA Guidelines further specify that the alternatives selected should attain most of the basic project objectives, and avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant effects of the project. The "range of alternatives" is governed by the "rule of reason," which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit an informed and reasoned choice by the lead agency, and to foster meaningful public participation (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[f]). CEQA generally defines "feasible" to mean an alternative that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, while also taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors.

As discussed in Sections 5.1 through 5.14 and Chapter 6.0, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to: land use, transportation and circulation (alternative transportation), geologic conditions, health and safety, hydrology/water quality, visual effects/neighborhood character, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, public services and facilities, public utilities, and biological resources. Also, as discussed in Section 5.1 through 5.14 and Chapter 6.0, the project would result in significant and unavoidable environmental impacts related to transportation and circulation (traffic circulation); noise; historical and tribal cultural resources; and paleontological resources. In developing the alternatives to be addressed in this chapter, consideration was given regarding their ability to meet the basic objectives of the project and the potential to eliminate or substantially reduce significant environmental impacts (as identified in Sections 5.1 through 5.14 and Chapter 6.0 of the PEIR.

The following specific objectives for the project support the underlying purpose of the project, assisted the City as lead agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in this PEIR, and will ultimately aid the lead agency in preparing findings and overriding considerations, if necessary. The following primary goals, recommendations, and objectives of the proposed CPU are to:

- Establish multiple-use villages and districts within the community;
- Enhance community identity and visual character through land use and urban design;

- Create a complete mobility system that promotes access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit, including within existing superblocks;
- Create a Bay-to-Bay pedestrian and bicycle linkage;
- Identify park and recreation facilities to serve the community;
- Provide housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit;
- Maintain employment uses including industrial, business park, and commercial office uses to support the City's economy;
- Improve localized water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design; and
- Identify future alternative uses for government-owned land in the community.

The alternatives addressed in this PEIR were selected in consideration of one or more of the following factors:

- The extent to which the alternative would feasibly accomplish most or all of the basic objectives of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU;
- The extent to which the alternative would avoid or substantially lessen any of the identified significant environmental impacts of the project;
- The feasibility of the alternative, taking into account site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, and consistency with other applicable plans and regulatory limitations;
- The appropriateness of the alternative in contributing to a "reasonable range" of alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice; and
- The requirement of the CEQA Guidelines to consider a "no project" alternative; and to identify an "environmentally superior" alternative in addition to the no project alternative (Section 15126.6[e]).

Based on the criteria described above, this PEIR considers the following project alternatives:

- No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan)
- Alternative 1
- Alternative 2

General descriptions of the characteristics of each of these alternatives, along with a discussion of their ability to reduce significant environmental impacts associated with the project are provided in the following subsections. Table 8-1, Comparison of Future Land Uses, provides a comparison of the future land uses under the No Project Alternative, Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and the Project, and Table 8-2, Matrix Comparison of Project Alternatives and Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, provides a side-by-side comparison of the potential impacts of the alternatives to the impacts of the project.

Table 8-1
Comparison of Future Land Uses

Land Use	No Project Alternative			Alternative 1			Alternative 2			Project		
	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area
Residential												
Single-Family Residential	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0
Multi-Family Residential	114.0	3,054	0	107.6	2,666	0	125.4	4,285	0	125.4	4,285	0
Total	114.0	3,055	0	107.6	2,666	0	125.4	4,285	0	125.4	4,285	0
Commercial and Office												
Office Commercial	42.3	126	1,270,139	88.5	1,520	1,364,636	89.1	1,550	1,775,489	113.7	3,025	1,915,423
Retail Commercial	234.3	1,860	2,975,759	210.7	1,664	2,565,465	192.4	4,275	2,273,500	189.1	4,275	2,227,328
Visitor Commercial	16.9	0	520,756	16.7	0	505,750	16.7	0	505,750	16.7	0	505,750
Stadium/Arena	0	0	0	0[1]	0	0[1]	0[1]	0	0[1]	0[1]	0	0[1]
Parking (Airport-Related or Other Stand-Alone)	22.5	0	0	22.5	0	0	9.8	0	0	9.8	0	0
Total	316.0	1,986	4,766,654	338.4	3,184	4,435,851	308.0	5,825	4,554,739	329.3	7,300	4,648,501
Industrial												
Total	93.4	0	2,759,640	53.0	0	1,806,608	65.5	0	4,124,035	44.1	0	2,288,259
Institutional and Educational												
Education	10.9	0	186,873	17.1	0	186,873	17.1	0	186,873	17.1	0	186,873
Institutional	28.5	0	754,733	27.7	0	733,213	27.7	0	733,213	27.7	0	733,213
Total	39.4	0	941,606	44.8	0	920,086	44.8	0	920,086	44.8	0	920,086
Military												
Total	447.1[2] ~~46.4~~	0	2,234,370	447.1	0	2,234,370	447.1	0	2,234,370	447.1	0	2,234,370
Transportation and Utilities												
Transportation	311.6	0	0	302.9	0	0	302.9	0	0	302.9	0	0
Utilities	2.5	0	0	2.5	0	0	2.5	0	0	2.5	0	0
Total	314.1	0	0	305.4	0	0	305.4	0	0	305.4	0	0
Parks												
Total	0	0	0	27.8[32]	0	0	27.8[32]	0	0	27.8[32]	0	0
Vacant												
Total	0.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00	0	0
Grand Totals	1,324	5,040	10,702,270	1,324	5,850	9,396,915	1,324	10,110	11,833,230	1,324	11,585	10,091,215
Estimated Future Population	11,775			13,670			23,630			27,070		

[1] Proposed CPU (Project), Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 would permit Stadium/Arena use (San Diego Sports Arena) to remain or be replaced with other uses. For the purposes of CEQA analysis, the most intense land use possible with application of the proposed land use designation (replacement of Stadium/Arena use with mixed-use development) has been assumed.

[2] This average includes MCRD, which is not within the area of the 1991 Community Plan but has been included for comparison purposes with the proposed CPU.

[32] In addition to total shown, planned parks in the proposed CPU, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 include a 1.5 acre joint use facility at Dewey Elementary School, and 0.55 acres just north of the proposed CPU area along the San Diego River Park Pathway within Mission Bay Park. Total proposed park space is 29.86 acres.

Table 8-2 Matrix Comparison of Project Alternatives and Proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU				
Environmental Issue Area	Project	No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan)	Alternative 1	Alternative 2
Land Use	LS	LS (>)	LS (>)	LS (>)
Transportation and Circulation	SU - Traffic Circulation LS - Alternative Transportation	SU (<) Traffic Circulation LS (>) Alternative Transportation	SU (<) Traffic Circulation LS (=) Alternative Transportation	SU (=) Traffic Circulation LS (=) Alternative Transportation
Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources	SU	SU (=)	SU (=)	SU (=)
Geologic Conditions	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Noise	SU	SU (=)	SU (=)	SU (=)
Health and Safety	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Hydrology/Water Quality	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Visual Effects/ Neighborhood Character	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Air Quality	LS	LS (=)	LS (<)	LS (>)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LS	LS (>)	LS (>)	LS (>)
Public Services and Facilities	LS	LS (=)	LS (<)	LS (<)
Public Utilities	LS	LS (=)	LS (<)	LS (<)
Biological Resources	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Paleontological Resources	SU	SU (=)	SU (=)	SU (=)
Notes: SU = Significant and Unavoidable (for the issue that results in the impact); LS = Less than Significant = Impacts the same/similar to the Project; < Impact less than the Project; > Impacts greater than the Project.				

8.1 No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan)

8.1.1 Description

Under the No Project Alternative, the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan and Local Coastal Program would continue to guide development. Adopted in 1991, the current Community Plan identifies issues that are the most important to be addressed in the community plan through land use designations, policies, and Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone supplemental development regulations. Issues identified in the adopted Community Plan are listed in Table 8-3.

The No Project Alternative would consist of the adopted Community Plan land use designations as they apply today (see Figure 8-1), including all amendments to the Community Plan from its original adoption in 1991 to the most recent amendment in 2010, and continued applicability of the current Community Plan

Implementation Overlay Zone. Table 8-4 describes the history of amendments to the Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan that are considered part of the No Project Alternative.

Table 8-3 Issues Identified in the Adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan	
Commercial	The community contains a wide variety of commercial retail activities which attract a large number of residents from surrounding communities.
	Some commercial areas within this community exhibit symptoms of disorganization and economic decline.
	This community contains a concentration of adult entertainment uses, which exhibit excessive signage and contribute to the occurrence of crime (i.e., prostitution) in the area.
	Many commercial areas developed under the provisions of the Midway Planned District exhibit a general lack of adequate parking, setbacks and landscaping.
Industrial	The Plant 19 and adjacent storage yard have redevelopment potential as an industrial park or a major institutional use which would need extensive transportation improvements and design control.
	Industrial areas of this community exhibit symptoms of physical and economic decline.
	Redevelopment and rehabilitation in much of the industrial area has been hampered by poor access, odd-sized lots and an alternating pattern of commercial and industrial land uses.
	Access to major transportation routes is needed for the retention of light industrial uses.
	Rooftops and open storage areas are unscreened.
	Commercial activities have preempted the industrial use areas.
Bay-to-Bay Canal	Development of a canal linking San Diego Bay to Mission Bay via the San Diego River would provide an opportunity for a renewed vitality and upscale image for the Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor community.
	An alternative to the Bay-to-Bay canal is the development of a linear park or waterway without connections to San Diego Bay or Mission Bay in the Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor community planning area.
	The canal would be an amenity that would provide opportunities for recreation, outdoor dining, entertainment, and an enhanced living and working environment.
	Development of the canal presents challenges for automobile circulation.
	Development of the canal is likely to be a long-term effort, and implementation will occur in phases.
Institutional	Because of their size and integral role in the community, institutional uses can have either a very significant positive or adverse effect on the neighborhoods in which they are located.
	The institutional designation may not be appropriate if existing uses of institutionally designated sites relocate outside of the community.
	Institutional uses tend to have a significant impact on traffic within the community.
Residential	Most of the existing single-family units in this community are in need of repair and/or are inappropriately located within commercial and industrial areas.
	The community is subject to significant noise levels which, in some areas, exceed the 65 CNEL threshold for residential use as recommended by the


Table 8-3 Issues Identified in the Adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan	
	General Plan, thereby limiting new locations and increased intensities for residential development. However, as quieter aircraft are phased in, additional areas become suitable for residential development because proper noise attenuation becomes more economically feasible.
	Most residential open space, park and recreational opportunities exist outside of the community.
Urban Design	Urban design guidelines are needed to improve the visual character of the community.
	Many commercial projects in this community are physically and visually isolated from the surrounding neighborhood by poor circulation, landscaping and site design.
	Excessive signage and utility lines present a cluttered community image.
	Landscaping along the public right-of-way is minimal or nonexistent.
	The community lacks pedestrian-oriented amenities such as benches at bus stops, definitive pathways, safe lighting and pedestrian-oriented landscaping.
Transportation and Circulation	Circulation within the community is often congested and confusing.
	Traffic which passes through the community contributes significantly to the congestion of streets in the community.
	Vehicular congestion is expected to increase as traffic volumes rise.
	On- and off-street parking and loading facilities are inadequate in certain areas.
	Excessive curb cuts along major streets have contributed significantly to traffic flow problems, and along industrial streets have removed the opportunity for on-street parking
	Auto/pedestrian conflicts are apparent throughout the community.
	Lack of sidewalk continuity, as well as physical obstructions, hamper pedestrian and handicap access throughout the community.
Community Facilities	The community lacks open space and public park and recreation areas.
Environmental	Airport noise affects the quality of experience for both the residential and business populations.
	Street noise is prevalent along major commercial boulevards and intersections.
	Most of the community has been identified as having a relatively high risk of liquefaction.
	The area may contain significant historic, architectural, and/or archaeological resources which have not yet been identified.
Local Coastal Program	The portion of this community which lies within the Coastal Zone is located immediately adjacent to the Lindbergh Field runway and is directly beneath the airport glide path.
	Traffic impacts associated with the Marine Corps Recruit Depot and other areas within the jurisdiction of the Port District may impact the Coastal Zone area of the community.
	The Centre City/Pacific Highway Corridor Local Coastal Program requires protection of major public view corridors, improved sign control, and improved landscaping and design where the existing zoning does not address these goals.

Table 8-4
Amendments to the 1991 Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan

Amendment	Date Adopted by City Council	Resolution Number
Allow commercial office uses at the Midway Continuing Education Center if the center should relocate.	December 6, 1994	R-285099
Added Bay-to-Bay/Canal Influence Area and Multiple Use Plan Elements outside of Coastal Zone.	May 4, 1998	R-290045
Add Bay-to-Bay/Canal Influence Area and Multiple Use Plan Elements with Coastal Commission revisions.	January 19, 1999	R-291202
Stella 0.89-acre land use designation amended from light industrial to very-high residential.	March 21, 2006	R-301318
Mission Brewery Villas: 3.12-acre land use designation amended from Transportation-Related Commercial to Multiple Use and amendments to the Pedestrian Circulation and Community Facilities figures.	July 12, 2010	R-805973

The adopted community plan land use designations are intended to transform areas from their industrial, retail, and storage-based emphasis to water-oriented retail, entertainment, office, and residential uses as construction of a planned Bay-to-Bay Connection is undertaken. The Bay-to-Bay Connection would develop a canal linking San Diego and Mission Bays through the community to improve the image of the community and stimulate revitalization and development. Mixed-use development is encouraged in selected areas to promote redevelopment and revitalization of the area. In Midway-Pacific Highway, the areas between Sports Arena Boulevard and the Peninsula Community west of Rosecrans Street, and areas just east of Rosecrans Street and south of Sports Arena Boulevard, are identified for community commercial use, and the industrial uses northwest of Camino del Rio West are preserved. Along the Pacific Highway corridor, industrial uses are maintained north of Sassafras Street but planned to transition to airport-related uses and commercial services south of Sassafras Street. Residential uses are concentrated within the Midway portion of the community on the Sports Arena site, City-owned properties are located adjacent to the Sports Arena site, and federal property is maintained north of Barnett Avenue. Institutional uses throughout the community are expected to remain, but alternate land use designations are identified should the institutional uses cease.

Figure 8-1 shows the No Project Alternative (adopted Community Plan) land use map. Areas of land use transition from the existing conditions, as identified in the adopted Community Plan Figure 10, include areas along the planned Bay-to-Bay Connection, between Sports Arena Boulevard and Midway Drive, the industrial areas northwest of Kurtz Street and south of Washington Street, and the SPAWAR campus. In contrast, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would generally facilitate an increase in the mix of land uses in identified villages located along transit corridors. Table 8-5 presents a comparison of development under the No Project Alternative and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU including acreage by generalized land use, dwelling units, floor area, and projected household population in 2035.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP; Kennedy and Tan, 2008

0 1,600 3,200 Feet

Figure 8-1
No Project Alternative: Adopted Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Land Use

Table 8-5
Comparison of the No Project Alternative and the Project

No Project Alternative				Project			
Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area	Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area
Residential				**Residential**			
Single-Family Residential	0.00	0	0	Single-Family Residential	0.00	0	0
Multi-Family Residential	114.0	3,054	0	Multi-Family Residential	125.4	4,285	0
Total	114.0	3,055	0	Total	125.4	4,285	0
Commercial and Office				**Commercial and Office**			
Office Commercial	42.3	126	1,270,139	Office Commercial	113.7	3,025	1,915,423
Retail Commercial	234.3	1,860	2,975,759	Retail Commercial	189.1	4,275	2,227,328
Visitor Commercial	16.9	0	520,756	Visitor Commercial	16.7	0	505,750
Stadium/Arena	0	0	0	Stadium/Arena	0[1]	0	0[1]
Parking (Airport-Related or Other Stand-Alone)	22.5	0	0	Parking (Airport-Related or Other Stand-Alone)	9.8	0	0
Total	316.0	1,986	4,766,654	Total	329.3	7,300	4,648,501
Industrial				**Industrial**			
Total	93.4	0	2,759,640	Total	44.1	0	2,288,259
Institutional and Educational				**Institutional and Educational**			
Education	10.9	0	186,873	Education	17.1	0	186,873
Institutional	28.5	0	754,733	Institutional	27.7	0	733,213
Total	39.4	0	941,606	Total	44.8	0	920,086
Military				**Military**			
Total	447.1[2] ~~46.4~~	0	2,234,370	Total	447.1	0	2,234,370
Transportation and Utilities				**Transportation and Utilities**			
Transportation	311.6	0	0	Transportation	307.4	0	0
Utilities	2.5	0	0	Utilities	2.5	0	0
Total	314.1	0	0	Total	309.9	0	0
Parks				**Parks**			
Total	6.5[3] ~~2~~	0	0	Total	27.8[4] ~~3~~	0	0
Vacant				**Vacant**			
Total	0.0	0	0	Total	0.0	0	0
Grand Totals	1,324	5,040	10,702,270	**Grand Totals**	1,324	11,585	10,091,215
Estimated Future Population	11,775			Estimated Future Population	27,070		

[1] Proposed CPU (Project) would permit Stadium/Arena use (San Diego Sports Arena) to remain or be replaced with other uses. For the purposes of CEQA analysis, the most intense land use possible with application of the proposed land use designation (replacement of Stadium/Arena use with mixed-use development) has been assumed.

[2] This average includes MCRD, which is not within the area of the 1991 Community Plan but has been included for comparison purposes with the proposed CPU.

[3] ~~2~~ The Parks total for the build-out of the No Project Alternative is based on the policy in the 1991 Community Plan to "Establish a five-acre joint-use park site adjacent to the Dewey Elementary School, establish a two-acre park with a recreation building and a mini-park in the community…." Because the land surrounding Dewey Elementary School has been built out since the adoption of the 1991 Community Plan, a size of 1.5 acres for the proposed joint-use park is assumed based on joint-use park feasibility analysis completed for the proposed project. For the mini-park, a size of 3 acres is assumed based on the General Plan's definition of a mini-park as 1 to 3 acres in size.

[4] ~~3~~ In addition to total shown, planned parks in the project include a 1.5 acre joint use facility at Dewey Elementary School, and 0.55 acres just north of the proposed CPU area along the San Diego River Park Pathway within Mission Bay Park. Total proposed park space is 29.86 acres.

With the No Project Alternative, the current Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zone (CPIOZ) would continue to be in effect in two areas of the community: the first, a CPIOZ-Type B, along the planned route of the Bay-to-Bay Connection to facilitate the dedication of the necessary right-of-way and comprehensive review of overmall site design to implement the supplemental development regulations in the adopted Community Plan; and the second, also a CPIOZ-Type B, applicable to areas east of I-5 south of Sassafras Street to ensure maintenance of view corridors to San Diego Bay, incorporation of pedestrian-oriented features, and landscaping of visible parking structures.

With the project, the two existing uses of CPIOZ in the community would be discontinued, and three new applications of the CPIOZ would be implemented in geographically specific areas as described in the Project Description, Chapter 3, and shown in Figure 3-4 of this PEIR. The Sports Arena Community Village CPIOZ (Type B) would require preparation of a comprehensive specific plan or master plan for the City-owned parcels within the Sports Arena Community Village, consistent with the policies identified within the proposed CPU, prior to significant new development within the village, and allow density and/or intensity to be calculated based on site area before dedication of the right-of-way for planned streets or area for planned linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies. The Sports Arena Boulevard Streetscape CPIOZ (Type A) would require the implementation streetscape improvements related to the planned Bay-to-Bay mobility and parks connection along Sports Arena Boulevard near Rosecrans Street to provide visual continuity between planned linear parks in the Sports Arena Community Village and Dutch Flats Urban Village. The Dutch Flats Urban Village CPIOZ (Type A) would reserve land for the future implementation of planned linear parks as new development is proposed, and allow density and/or intensity to be calculated based on site area before dedication of the right-of-way for planned streets or area for planned linear parks, parks, and other park equivalencies. The Sports Arena Community Village CPIOZ would also ensure that the City-owned Sports Arena site would be developed in accordance with the proposed CPU in a comprehensive and orderly manner, compared to the No Project Alternative where the Sports Arena site and surrounding area have the potential to be redeveloped piecemeal. The Sports Arena Boulevard Streetscape and Dutch Flats Urban Village CPIOZs would ensure the development of the proposed Bay-to-Bay mobility and linear parks connection proposed to replace the Bay-to-Bay canal concept in the No Project Alternative. The Sports Arena Community Village CPIOZ (Type B) and Dutch Flats Urban Village CPIOZ (Type A) would also include supplemental regulations prohibiting fireplaces in new residential development.

The proposed CPU would also revise the existing CO-3-1 and CO-3-2 zones to rename them CO-3-2 and CO-3-3 respectively; and implement a new Commercial-Office zone (CO-3-1) which would allow for research and development and office uses with a pedestrian orientation and supporting commercial and residential uses. Thus, the proposed CPU aims to create mixed business park/residential developments which is consistent with the City of Villages strategy and the General Plan's identification of the Midway-Pacific Highway community as a subregional employment center. The new CO-3-1 zone would also limit retail commercial development to reduce the possibility for the proliferation of auto-oriented region-serving commercial uses, which will assist in implementing the City of Villages strategy. It would also implement a new pedestrian-oriented CN-1-6 zone that would allow an increase in residential density (0-54 du/acre) above what is permitted by current Neighborhood Commercial land use designations and zones in the community (0-29 du/acre).

8.1.2 Analysis of No Project Alternative

a. Land Use

The No Project (adopted Community Plan) Alternative would retain the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan land use map. Land use impacts under this alternative would be slightly greater than the anticipated impacts of the project because it would not contain the proposed CPU policies and land use changes intended to improve compatibility with and implement the General Plan and the City of Villages strategy.

The adopted Community Plan intended to revitalize the community by maintaining and increasing residential, multiple use, industrial land uses, as well as pedestrian and recreational amenities, and decreasing auto-oriented, strip commercial development and excessive signage, similar to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. While retail centers within the community have made aesthetic improvements, opportunities for mixed-use development in the Midway area have not been realized and the predominant auto-oriented urban form and lack of pedestrian amenities, parks, and public spaces has remained. While the No Project Alternative incorporates similar overall goals as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, the No Project Alternative would not implement the measures included in the project to meet the project objectives of establishing multiple use villages and districts within the community; enhancing community identity and visual character through land use and urban design; providing housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit; and identifying park and recreation facilities to serve the community. While both the No Project Alternative and the proposed CPU would support the project objective to maintain employment uses including industrial, business park, and commercial office uses, the No Project Alternative land use plan focuses on maintaining industrial areas whereas the proposed CPU focuses on commercial office and business park uses. In terms of total acres and square feet of commercial and industrial uses, the No Project Alternative meets the objective to maintaining employment uses to a greater degree than the proposed CPU.

The adopted Community Plan's land use designations establishes a Multiple Use area along the proposed Bay-to-Bay canal alignment and allows for mixed use development in many commercial areas, it does not establish multiple use villages and districts within the community to the same extent as the proposed CPU. The proposed CPU distinguishes the community's neighborhoods by identifying four mixed-use villages and providing land use designations within most districts that allow for mixed use development. Also, the identification of villages and districts in the proposed CPU supports the project objective of enhancing community identity and visual character through land use and urban design.

While the No Project Alternative would allow for residential development on the City-owned Sports Arena site, in Multiple Use-designated areas along the Bay-to-Bay canal alignment, and in commercial-designated areas along Sports Arena Boulevard and Rosecrans Street, the No Project Alternative only provides for residential development on a few parcels near the Washington Street Trolley Station. Under the adopted Community Plan, the community's estimated residential capacity is 5,040 dwelling units (see Table 8-4). The proposed CPU increases the opportunities for mixed-use and residential development in proximity to transit services, and for housing overall. Specifically, the proposed CPU proposes to transition the Dutch Flats Urban Village, the Camino del Rio District and the Kurtz District, which are near the Old Town Transit Center, into areas with a mix of commercial, office, and residential uses, and to transition the Hancock Transit Corridor adjacent to the Washington Street Trolley Station into a transit-

oriented mixed-use village. Residential densities throughout the community are also increased in the proposed CPU above the No Project Alternative. Per estimates, as shown in Table 8-4, the proposed CPU would have a residential capacity of 11,585 dwelling units; an increase of 6,545 dwelling units over the No Project Alternative.

Regarding parks, the No Project Alternative recommends the development of the 200-foot-wide Bay-to-Bay canal alignment as a greenbelt system/park linkage until such time as the canal is constructed; and includes a policy that the canal area should be developed as a linear park or waterway if plans for the bay-to-bay water link are not approved. Within the "canal influence area" to either side of the planned canal, the adopted Community Plan calls for development of uses including a mix of passive, park-like amenities, walking and bicycling paths, and hotel, retail, and other uses. Other than the Bay-to-Bay connection, the adopted Community Plan identifies one proposed joint use park site at Dewey Elementary School and calls on new residential development to provide additional private recreational facilities. The Bay-to-Bay canal concept has been determined to be infeasible due to cost and environmental effects (see Bay-to-Bay Feasibility Study, October 2003); thus, the No Project Alternative's strategy to increase parks and recreational facilities is outdated and would not provide relevant policy direction to the same degree as the project.

The proposed CPU promotes park development by incorporating a strategy for creating a parks system in the community utilizing a combination of neighborhood parks and park equivalencies, including linear parks that will complement the proposed Bay-to-Bay multi-use urban path; and identifying eight park opportunity sites on public and private property in addition to the planned Dewey Elementary School joint use park facility. Although the adopted Community Plan would not conflict with adopted land use plans, policies, or ordinances, and would result in a less than significant land use impact overall, the No Project Alternative would be less compatible than the project when viewed in relation to applicable land use plans and policies. Thus, the land use impacts of the No Project Alternative would be less than significant and slightly greater than the project.

In summary, the No Project Alternative also meets the following project objectives to a lesser degree than the proposed CPU: establish multiple-use villages and districts within the community, enhance community identity and visual character through land use and urban design, identify park and recreation facilities to serve the community, provide housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit, and identify future alternative uses for government-owned land in the community. The No Project Alternative meets the following project objective to a greater degree than the proposed CPU: maintain employment uses including industrial, business park, and commercial office uses to support the City's economy.

b. Transportation and Circulation

The No Project (adopted Community Plan) Alternative would retain the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan's Circulation and Bay-to-Bay Connection Elements. The adopted Circulation Element includes recommendations to improve vehicular circulation while promoting access for public transit, pedestrian, and bicyclists, similar to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. With regard to vehicular circulation, the Circulation Element recommends physical and operational improvements to the community's circulation system and improvements to freeway access. Recommended physical improvements are listed in Table 8-6, and include the construction of grade separation (tunnels or flyover) at the Camino del Rio West/Rosecrans Street/Sports Arena Boulevard intersection, which is not a recommendation of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU.

Table 8-6 No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan) Planned Circulation Improvements	
Improvement	Carried Forward in Proposed CPU?
New Streets and Street Extensions	
Barnett Avenue – Extension from Pacific Highway to Old Town Avenue	No
Kemper Street – Extension from Sports Arena Boulevard to Kurtz Street	Yes
Cauby Street – Extension from current end to Midway Drive	No
Street A – New street connecting Midway Drive to Barnett Avenue	No
Street B – New street connecting Street A to Kurtz Street	Yes, with modified extent from Midway Drive to Kurtz Street
Street C – New street connecting Kurtz Street to Hancock Street	No
Street Widenings	
Rosecrans Street – Widen to eight lanes between Camino del Rio West and Lytton Street	No
Barnett Avenue – Widen to six lanes between Midway Drive and Pacific Highway	Yes
Sports Arena Boulevard – Widen to four-lane collector street between Rosecrans Street and Pacific Highway	No
Kurtz Street – Widen to four-lane collector street between Rosecrans Street and Pacific Highway	No
Intersection Improvements	
Camino del Rio West/Rosecrans Street/Sports Arena Boulevard – Provide grade separation of Camino del Rio West, or Sports Arena Boulevard and Midway Drive, via tunnel or flyover to separate regional traffic from local traffic	No
Midway Drive and Rosecrans Street – Add eastbound through lane on Midway Drive and add southbound right-turn lane, northbound through lane, and northbound right-turn lane on Rosecrans Street	Yes, with modification to northbound Rosecrans Street lane configuration
Sports Arena Boulevard/West Point Loma Boulevard/Midway Drive – Add southbound to eastbound left-turn lane on Sports Arena Boulevard, and add two northbound through lanes and one northbound left-turn lane to Midway Drive, as well as pedestrian crossing improvements	No
Rosecrans Street and Lytton Street – Add one southbound through lane on Rosecrans Street, and one westbound through lane on Lytton Street	Rosecrans Street configuration – No Lytton Street configuration - Yes

Table 8-6 No Project Alternative (Adopted Community Plan) Planned Circulation Improvements	
Improvement	Carried Forward in Proposed CPU?
Freeway Interchange Improvements	
I-5/I-8 Interchange – Provide missing eastbound-to-northbound and southbound-to-westbound connectors ~~eastbound-to-southbound and southbound-to-westbound connectors~~	No~~Yes~~
Kurtz Street and I-8 – New interchange	No

With regard to bicycle access, the adopted Community Plan proposes the removal of architectural barriers which inhibit bicycle access, installation of a bicycle access ramp along Pacific Highway at Witherby Street, and the following bicycle facilities and locations:

Class I (Bike Path) Facilities:

- Along the Bay-to-Bay canal alignment

Class II (Bike Lane) Facilities:

- Sports Arena Boulevard
- Midway Drive
- Rosecrans Street
- Pacific Highway
- Lytton Street/Barnett Avenue
- Kurtz Street, between Kemper Street extension and new Street B
- New Street A
- New Street B
- Washington Street

Class III (Bike Route) Facilities:

- Kemper Street south of Sports Arena Boulevard
- Kettner Boulevard
- Laurel Street

With regard to pedestrian access, the adopted Community Plan proposes the following improvements:

- Establish an interconnecting system of sidewalks throughout the community
- Provide a crosswalk across Kettner Boulevard to link the I-5 pedestrian overpass at Palm Street to Palm Street
- Improve pedestrian access at the intersections of Camino del Rio West/Rosecrans Street/Sports Arena Boulevard and Midway Drive/West Point Loma Boulevard/Sports Arena Boulevard by retrofitting traffic signals for on-demand pedestrian crossing with shutdown of right turn vehicular movement through the intersection at the time of crossing

- Provide an enhanced pedestrian area along Lytton Street across from the Naval Training Center [Liberty Station] to link the Naval Training Center and Marine Corps Recruit Depot to Rosecrans Street and the central Midway area
- Provide walkways along the Bay-to-Bay canal alignment

Several of the circulation improvements and recommendations listed above rely on or relate to the implementation of the Bay-to-Bay canal concept, which has now been determined to be infeasible.

The transportation and circulation improvements that are included in the proposed CPU are described in Sections 3.4 and 5.2 of this PEIR, and include the implementation of a system of multi-use urban paths that can accommodate both pedestrians and bicyclists (including a Bay-to-Bay urban path); implementation of a cycle track along Pacific Highway; provision of pedestrian walkways in key locations to supplement sidewalk connections; and new street and street extension recommendations that incorporate some of the new streets included in the adopted Community Plan as well as additional recommended new streets. The proposed CPU's transportation and circulation improvements focus on providing mobility facilities that support walking and bicycling and that connect to transit and to recreational opportunities within the community and in adjacent communities. Regarding consistency with applicable plans and policies related to alternative transportation, the No Project Alternative would not include the proposed CPU policies that support increasing multi-modal opportunities within the proposed CPU area consistent with SANDAG's RP, the General Plan, and the City's CAP as all have been created or updated since the current Community Plan was adopted. Thus, while the No Project Alternative would not result in significant impacts related to conflicts with plans and policies addressing alternative transportation, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the level of consistency with these applicable plans and policies that the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU would achieve. Thus, impacts related to alternative transportation would be less than significant and slightly greater with the No Project Alternative compared to the project.

Both the No Project Alternative and the project would help meet the project objectives to create a complete mobility system that promotes access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit, including within existing superblocks and to create a Bay-to-Bay pedestrian and bicycle linkage. However, the proposed CPU would meet these objectives to a greater degree because the proposed CPU focuses bicycle and pedestrian improvements on those that provide connections to transit; provides a greater number of separated or protected (Class I and Class IV) bicycle facilities than the No Project Alternative; and provides enhanced pedestrian facilities in the form of multi-use paths along the primary street corridors in the community. The proposed CPU also provides more up-to-date and relevant direction on the creation of a Bay-to-Bay pedestrian and bicycle connection separate from the Bay-to-Bay canal concept.

With regard to vehicle transportation demand, the No Project Alternative would generate less vehicular trips than the project as it allows for fewer residential units than the project. While impacts to individual roadways and intersections would be lesser under the No Project Alternative than the project, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

c. Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

The No Project Alternative would retain the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan land use map and policies. While the No Project Alternative would not include the same policies as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU to support the Historic Preservation Element, future development

implemented in accordance with the No Project Alternative or the proposed CPU would be required to comply with all applicable City, federal, state, and local regulations regarding the protection of historical and tribal cultural resources, as described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources. However, because implementation of preservation measures at the project-level cannot be guaranteed, impacts to historical and tribal cultural resources would be significant and unavoidable at the program level under the No Project Alternative, similar to the project.

As with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, future development under the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to archaeological resources. Implementation of future projects under this alternative would require adherence to all applicable guidelines further described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources. The extent of impacts to archaeological resources resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, because the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same and only the land use designations would change. As with the project, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in similar impacts related to archaeological resources at the program level that would be significant and unavoidable, despite adherence to the existing regulatory framework.

d. Geologic Conditions

Geologic impacts from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be similar to those of the project. Potential impacts related to seismic and geologic hazards, or to the instability of geological units and soils would be avoided or reduced to less than significant through adherence to existing state and local regulations, including the California Building Code, the SDMC, and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act. Where required, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to identify and evaluate seismic hazards and formulate mitigation measures prior to permitting most developments designed for human occupancy. Similarly, project-level compliance with City-mandated grading requirements, and, compliance with applicable state regulations would ensure that future grading and construction activities would avoid significant soil erosion impacts. These requirements would apply equally to both the No Project Alternative and the project. Thus, geologic impacts from the No Project Alternative would be less than significant and similar to the project.

e. Noise

The No Project Alternative would retain the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan. Noise impacts under this alternative would be similar to the anticipated impacts of the project because, like the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, it would permit development that would be subject to ambient noise increases and traffic noise as the planning area is built out. The No Project Alternative would result in lower development potential, average daily trips, and traffic noise compared to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. While the No Project Alternative does not contain the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policy changes intended to improve compatibility with and implement the General Plan policies, future development implemented under both the No Project Alternative and the project would be required to comply with applicable City and state noise regulations including Title 24 building code requirements. The noise impacts of the No Project Alternative would be similar to the project and both would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to ambient noise increases, traffic noise exposure, and construction-related vibration impacts.

f. Health and Safety

Impacts under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the potential impacts under the project. Future development under the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in exposure to hazardous materials, wastes, or emissions, airport hazards, and fire hazards. As the No Project Alternative would result in a lower population growth than the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, there would be fewer people exposed to these potential hazards. However, land uses under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the land uses under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. In fact, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU promotes a transition from heavy commercial and light industrial land uses to mixed commercial residential, which has the potential to decrease exposure to hazards. Federal, state and local regulations that serve to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level would also reduce impacts for development under the No Project Alternative. Overall, health and safety impacts from the No Project Alternative would be less than significant and similar to those anticipated under the project.

g. Hydrology/Water Quality

Impacts under the No Project Alternative would be similar to the potential impacts under the project. Future development under the No Project Alternative would be less likely to result in the redevelopment of existing, developed commercial and industrial sites when compared to the project. Future development under both the No Project Alternative and the project would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations relative to runoff and water quality at the project level. Thus, hydrology and water quality impacts of the No Project Alternative would be less than significant and similar to the project. However, since the No Project Alternative does not contain the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies and recommended storm water improvements in the public right-of-way intended to improve storm water management and encourage the implementation of LID measures like the project, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objective to improve localized water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design to the same extent as the project.

h. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

Potential impacts to visual effects and neighborhood character under the No Project Alternative would be similar to those anticipated under the project, as the adopted Community Plan aims to upgrade and physically enhance commercial, residential, and industrial areas, and encourage pedestrian-oriented development. The No Project Alternative also includes the Bay-to-Bay connection policies regarding development of a canal, recreation amenities, and canal-oriented development; however, as the canal concept has been determined to be infeasible, the possibility of achieving implementation of the canal-associated recreational spaces and canal-oriented development is reduced. While the No Project Alternative includes policies to improve community character generally and reduce potential neighborhood character impacts, the proposed CPU provides policies that are intended to further improve neighborhood character, through measures including: the creation of villages and districts to highlight and foster the diverse character areas within the community; the creation of green streets, linear gateways and gateway nodes to highlight key community corridors and entry points; the creation of an interconnected parks system. The No Project Alternative would also not benefit from the CPIOZ included under the proposed CPU, which would require preparation of a comprehensive specific plan for the Sports Arena Community Village, require streetscape enhancements along Sports Arena Boulevard near Rosecrans Street to provide visual continuity between planned linear parks, and reserve land for linear

parks as new development occurs, all of which have the potential to reduce neighborhood character impacts through cohesive and planned development.

As the adopted Community Plan provides policies to upgrade and enhance commercial, residential and industrial, visual effects and neighborhood character impacts of the No Project Alternative would be less than significant and similar to the project. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the project objectives to establish multiple-use villages and districts within the community and enhance community identity and visual character through land use and urban design to the same extent as the project.

i. Air Quality and Odors

The No Project Alternative would retain the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan. Air Quality impacts under this alternative would be similar to the anticipated impacts of the project. For the adopted Community Plan, emissions from mobile sources (vehicle trips associated with residents, workers, and visitors to the area) constitute the majority of the operational emissions, representing 42~~65~~ percent of the total NOx emissions, 83~~75~~ percent of the total CO emissions, and 81~~91~~ percent of the total PM10 emissions. The adopted Community Plan would generate less than one percent fewer vehicle miles traveled than the proposed CPU. Thus, like the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, the No Project Alternative would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan nor would it result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because the land uses under existing community plan would be consistent with the RAQS. Like the project, the No Project Alternative would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and the residents would not be impacted by any existing odor sources. Thus, air quality and odor impacts from the No Project Alternative would be less than significant and similar to the project.

j. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The No Project Alternative would retain the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan land uses. In 2035, operation of the No Project Alternative would result in ~~86,038~~184,811 MT CO_2e per year, approximately ~~1,494~~21,707 MT CO_2e less than the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. The adopted Community Plan intended to develop residential land uses, pedestrian amenities, and parks and decrease auto-oriented, similar to the proposed CPU. However, while the No Project Alternative incorporates similar overall land use and multi-modal mobility goals as the proposed CPU, it would not provide the land use plan focused around transit-oriented village development and enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connections that are included in the proposed CPU. Also, the proposed CPU provides policies in the Urban Design and Conservation Elements to ensure that new development is energy- and water-efficient and supports implementation of the CAP, which are not included in the No Project Alternative. Thus, the No Project Alternative would not adopt land uses and policies to implement the City of Villages strategy and be consistent with the CAP to the same level as the proposed CPU would. While the No Project Alternative would not result in significant impacts related to conflicts with plans and policies addressing GHGs, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the level of consistency with the CAP that the proposed CPU would achieve. Thus, impacts related to GHGs from the No Project Alternative would be slightly greater than the project, but still less than significant.

k. Public Services and Facilities

The No Project Alternative would retain the adopted Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan. Impacts to public services and facilities under this alternative would be less than the anticipated impacts associated with the project because the anticipated population under the proposed CPU in 2035 is more than double the anticipated population under the No Project Alternative in 2035.

For police and fire protection services, as population growth occurs, there will be a need for new or expanded services and facilities. Thus, the No Project Alternative could result in the demand for new or altered police and fire protection services. However, no construction of such facilities is included in the No Project Alternative or the proposed CPU. For schools, under both the No Project Alternative and the proposed CPU, future additional housing units suggested in the No Project Alternative and the proposed CPU would likely impact district schools. However, the school district would be responsible for potential expansion of development of new facilities. Thus, for the No Project Alternative, physical public facilities and services impacts would be less than significant and similar to the project.

However, in the case of both the No Project Alternative and the proposed CPU, there would be the need to build new parks and recreational facilities to serve the future population, and a deficit in planned population-based parks and park equivalencies. In the adopted Community Plan, planned parks and recreation facilities are a five-acre joint-use park site adjacent to Dewey Elementary School, a two-acre park with a recreation building, and a mini-park (defined in the General Plan as being one to three acres in size). The adopted Community Plan also states that the Bay-to-Bay Connection will serve as a park linkage, although it is unclear from the description of the canal corridor and canal influence area what acreage of future park space would result from the canal's implementation. Because the land surrounding Dewey Elementary School has been built out since the adoption of the 1991 Community Plan, a size of 1.5 acres for the proposed joint-use park is assumed based on joint-use park feasibility analysis as part of the proposed CPU. Therefore, conservatively, the total planned park space under the adopted Community Plan would be 6.5 acres. The forecast future population under the adopted Community Plan is 11,775 persons, for which, under General Plan standards, a total of 32.97 acres of park space would be required. The proposed CPU identifies a total of 29.86 acres of parks and park equivalencies to serve future residents, and a park deficit of 45.94 acres based on forecast future population.

Therefore, the No Project Alternative would not implement the project objective to identify park and recreation facilities to serve the community to the same degree as the proposed CPU.

l. Public Utilities

The No Project Alternative would retain the existing Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan. Although the proposed CPU would have a higher anticipated population than the No Project Alternative (see Table 8-4), implementation of the No Project Alternative would have less than significant and similar environmental impacts related to storm water, sewer, water distribution, communications systems, and solid waste and recycling as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. However, the adopted Community Plan provides few policies related to public utilities, while the proposed CPU provides additional policy guidance on water conservation in new development and landscaping; implementation of storm water best management practices in public and private development and infrastructure projects, and recycling and composting. Therefore, the proposed CPU would meet the project objective to improve

localized water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design to a slightly greater extent than the No Project Alternative.

m. Biological Resources

Under the No Project Alternative, the Midway-Pacific Highway community would remain a highly urbanized area with little open space or naturally occurring biological resources. Implementation of the No Project Alternative would require to adherence to all applicable federal, state, and local regulations regarding the protection of biological resources, as for all subsequent development project submittals under the project. While the proposed CPU contains policies to continue to implement the City's ESL Regulations and MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines as well as implement park improvements adjacent to the San Diego River consistent with the San Diego River Park which are not included in the adopted Community Plan, impacts to biological resources resulting from the No Project Alternative would be less than significant and similar to the project.


n. Paleontological Resources

As with the project, future development under the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to paleontological resources. Implementation of future projects under this alternative would require adherence to all applicable guidelines further described in Section 5.14, Paleontological Resources. The extent of impacts to paleontological resources resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be similar to those identified for the proposed CPU, because the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same and only the land use designation would differ. As with the proposed CPU, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in potentially significant impacts related to paleontological resources at the program level because adherence to the mitigation framework cannot be guaranteed for ministerial projects that only require a grading permit. Thus, impacts to paleontological resources from the No Project Alternative would be significant and unavoidable and similar to the project.

8.2 Alternative 1

8.2.1 Description

Alternative 1 incorporates the land uses proposed in the November 2013 Draft Community Plan which, compared to the adopted Community Plan (No Project Alternative), would redistribute planned residential units into mixed-use villages located close to transit. This would include locating Community Commercial – Residential Permitted, Business Park – Residential Permitted, and Mixed Commercial Residential land uses in the Sports Arena Community Village along Sports Arena Boulevard; in the Kemper Neighborhood Village near Midway Drive; in the Dutch Flats Urban Village near the intersection of Barnett Avenue and Pacific Highway; and in the Hancock Transit Corridor between Pacific Highway and Interstate 5 northwest of Washington Street. The planned land uses under Alternative 1 would be forecasted to result in a small increase in the number of dwelling units in the community compared to the No Project Alternative. Additionally, as shown in Table 8-7, the number of dwelling units and non-residential development potential would be less than the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. The total projected population under Alternative 1 would be 13,400 persons less than under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. Figure 8-2 shows land use designations under Alternative 1.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP; Kennedy and Tan, 2008

0 1,600 3,200 Feet

Figure 8-2
Alternative 1 Land Use

Table 8-7
Comparison of Alternative 1 and the Project

Alternative 1				Project			
Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area	Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area
Residential				**Residential**			
Single-Family Residential	0	0	0	Single-Family Residential	0	0	0
Multi-Family Residential	107.6	2,666	0	Multi-Family Residential	125.4	4,285	0
Total	107.6	2,666	0	Total	125.4	4,285	0
Commercial and Office				**Commercial and Office**			
Office Commercial	88.5	1,520	1,364,636	Office Commercial	113.7	3,025	1,915,423
Retail Commercial	210.7	1,664	2,565,465	Retail Commercial	189.1	4,275	2,227,328
Visitor Commercial	16.7	0	505,750	Visitor Commercial	16.7	0	505,750
Stadium/Arena	0[1]	0	0[1]	Stadium/Arena	0[1]	0	0[1]
Parking (Airport-Related or Other Stand-Alone)	22.5	0	0	Parking (Airport-Related or Other Stand-Alone)	9.8	0	0
Total	338.4	3,184	4,435,851	Total	329.3	7,300	4,648,501
Industrial				**Industrial**			
Total	53.0	0	1,806,608	Total	44.1	0	2,288,259
Institutional and Educational				**Institutional and Educational**			
Education	17.1	0	186,873	Education	17.1	0	186,873
Institutional	27.7	0	733,213	Institutional	27.7	0	733,213
Total	44.8	0	920,086	Total	44.8	0	920,086
Military				**Military**			
Total	447.1	0	2,234,370	Total	447.1	0	2.234.370
Transportation and Utilities				**Transportation and Utilities**			
Transportation	302.9	0	0	Transportation	302.9	0	0
Utilities	2.5	0	0	Utilities	2.5	0	0
Total	305.4	0	0	Total	305.4	0	0
Parks				**Parks**			
Total	27.8[2]	0	0	Total	27.8[2]	0	0
Vacant				**Vacant**			
Total	0	0	0	Total	0	0	0
Grand Totals	1,324	5,850	9,396,915	**Grand Totals**	1,324	11,585	10,091,215
Estimated Future Population	13,670			Estimated Future Population	27,070		

[1] Proposed CPU and Alternative 1 would permit Stadium/Arena use (San Diego Sports Arena) to remain or be replaced with other uses. For the purposes of this CEQA analysis, the most intense land use possible with application of the proposed land use designation (replacement of Stadium/Arena use with mixed-use development) has been assumed. Appendix N provides a summary of the proposed CPU with Sports Arena and Alternative 1 with Sports Arena scenarios.
[2] In addition to total shown, planned parks in the project and Alternative 1 include a 1.5 acre joint use facility at Dewey Elementary School, and 0.55 acres just north of the proposed CPU area along the San Diego River Park Pathway within Mission Bay Park. Total proposed park space for the project and Alternative 1 is 29.86 acres.

As with the project, Alternative 1 would allow for the San Diego Sports Arena to be retained, rehabilitated or reconstructed, or replaced with other land uses. Similar to the analysis within this PEIR and as discussed in Section 3.6.1.1, for the purposes of more conservative transportation, noise, and air quality analyses, the more intensive land use assumptions (replacing the Sports Arena with other land uses) are used in the analysis of Alternative 1 impacts. However, the adoption of this alternative would not preclude an arena use on the Sports Arena site. A future specific plan or master plan for the City-owned parcels in the Sports Arena Community Village would be required under either option, and could require additional analysis if the proposed development exceeds the amount of development analyzed in this PEIR.

8.2.2 Analysis of Alternative 1

a. Land Use

Alternative 1 would include the land use map and policies in the November 2013 Draft Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan, which redistribute planned residential units from the adopted Community Plan to mixed-use villages located close to transit. The November 2013 Draft Community Plan land uses intended to develop residential land uses within the proposed mixed-use villages and districts in close proximity to transit, as with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. The primary characteristics of the November 2013 Draft Community Plan land uses when compared to the proposed CPU land uses are: the designation of the Camino del Rio District for Urban Industrial and Heavy Commercial land uses; the designation of the Kettner District for Heavy Commercial uses; the application of Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited and Heavy Commercial land uses in portions of the Channel and Kurtz Districts; and lower permitted residential densities within the Hancock Transit Corridor village and portions of the Lytton and Cauby Districts. To summarize, Alternative 1 incorporates the same overall goals and policies as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, but would result in more land for industrial uses (53.0 acres vs. 44.1 acres in the proposed CPU), and fewer residential units (5,850 vs. 11,585 for the proposed CPU).

Land use impacts under Alternative 1 would be greater than the anticipated impacts of the project because Alternative 1 would implement the General Plan's City of Villages strategy to a lesser degree than the proposed CPU. Implementation of Heavy Commercial and Urban Industrial land uses in the Camino del Rio, Channel, and Kurtz Districts under Alternative 1, as compared to Mixed Commercial Residential land uses and increasing residential densities in the Hancock Transit Corridor as under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, would implement General Plan Policy LU-A.1(d) (Revitalize transit corridors through the application of plan designations and zoning that permits a higher intensity of mixed use development) to a lesser degree than the proposed CPU. Also, despite identifying more land for industrial uses, Alternative 1 would result in fewer acres and square feet of industrial and office commercial uses combined than under the proposed CPU (based on future land use assumptions). Therefore, Alternative 1 would implement General Plan Policy LU-A.1(b) (Encourage further intensification of employment uses throughout Subregional Employment Districts) to a lesser degree than the proposed CPU.

Although Alternative 1 would not conflict with adopted land use plans, policies, or ordinances, and would result in a less than significant land use impact overall, this alternative would be less compatible than the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU with applicable land use plans and policies. In summary, Alternative 1 would implement the project objectives to establish multiple-use villages and districts within the community, to enhance community identity and visual character through land use and urban design, to identify park and recreation facilities to serve the community, and to identify future alternative uses for government-owned land in the community to the same degree as the project as the urban design policies, incorporation of mixed-use villages and district, identification of parks, and integration of MCRD into the proposed CPU boundary would occur under both Alternative 1 and the project. Alternative 1 would also implement the project objectives to provide housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit and to maintain employment uses including industrial, business park, and commercial office uses to support the City's economy although to a lesser degree than the project as there are fewer residential units and fewer acres and square feet of industrial and office commercial uses. Thus, land use impacts of Alternative 1 would be less than significant and slightly greater than the project.

b. Transportation and Circulation

Alternative 1 would generate less vehicular trips than the project as it allows for less residential units and less non-residential development than the proposed CPU. The TIS for Alternative 1 (May 2017) produced by Chen Ryan Associates (included as Appendix B of this PEIR), summarizes the results of the traffic evaluation based on the land use plan proposed by this alternative.

Similar to the proposed CPU, Alternative 1 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to roadways, intersections, freeway segments, and freeway ramp meters. However, Alternative 1 would result in three less impacted roadway segments than the proposed CPU (four roadway segments would be significantly impacted under Alternative 1 whereas seven roadways would be significantly impacted under the proposed CPU). The number of significantly impacted intersections, freeway segments, and freeway ramps would be the same as the proposed CPU. Therefore, Alternative 1 impacts to roadway and freeway facilities would be significant and unavoidable, but slightly less than the project.

Regarding consistency with applicable plans and policies related to alternative transportation, Alternative 1 would include the same planned mobility improvements and same Mobility and Conservation Policies as in the proposed CPU policies, including those that support increasing multi-modal opportunities within the proposed CPU area consistent with SANDAG's RP, the General Plan, and the City's CAP. Therefore, Alternative 1 would implement the project objectives to create a complete mobility system that promotes access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit and to create a Bay-to-Bay pedestrian and bicycle linkage to the same degree as the project. Thus, similar to the proposed CPU, Alternative 1 would not result in significant impacts related to conflicts with plans and policies addressing alternative transportation. Thus, impacts related to alternative transportation would be less than significant and similar to the project.

c. Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

Like the project, Alternative 1 would identify potential historic properties and associated policies supporting protection of potential historic properties, and the SDMC provides for the regulation and protection of designated and potential historical resources. The mitigation framework combined with the proposed CPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of historical resources would reduce the program-level impact related to historical resources of the built environment. However, even with implementation of the mitigation framework, the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at this program level of analysis. Therefore, as with the project, where increases in density are proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning, potential impacts to individual historic buildings, structures, objects, or sites would be significant and unavoidable.

As with the proposed CPU, Alternative 1 would allow the retention of a sports arena/entertainment use on the existing San Diego Sports Arena site either in the existing, potentially historic San Diego Sports Arena or in a new structure, or allow the sports arena use to be replaced by other land uses. Any new development that would redevelop or demolish the existing San Diego Sports Arena would require a separate environmental review to identify potential impacts associated with historical resources. Therefore, potential impacts to historical resources from implementation of Alternative 1 would be significant and unavoidable and similar to the project.

As with the project, future development under Alternative 1 has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to tribal cultural and archaeological resources. Implementation of future projects under this alternative would require adherence to all applicable guidelines described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources. The extent of impacts to tribal cultural and archaeological resources resulting from implementation of this alternative would be similar to those identified for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, as there is limited undeveloped land in the community. However, similar to the proposed CPU, while existing regulations, the SDMC, and proposed CPU policies would provide for the regulation and protection of tribal cultural and archaeological resources and human remains, it is impossible to ensure the successful preservation of all tribal cultural and archaeological resources. As with the project, implementation of Alternative 1 would result in similar impacts related to tribal cultural and archaeological resources at the program level that would be significant and unavoidable.

d. Geologic Conditions

Geologic impacts from implementation of Alternative 1 would be similar to those of the project. Potential impacts related to seismic and geologic hazards, or to the instability of geological units and soils would be avoided or reduced to less than significant through adherence to existing state and local regulations, including the CBC, the SDMC and other standards. Where required, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to identify and evaluate seismic hazards and formulate mitigation measures prior to permitting most developments designed for human occupancy. Similarly, project-level compliance with City-mandated grading requirements, and, compliance with applicable state and/or federal regulations would ensure that future grading and construction activities would avoid significant soil erosion impacts. These requirements would apply equally to both Alternative 1 and the project. Thus, impacts to geologic conditions under Alternative 1 would be less than significant and similar to the project.

e. Noise

Noise impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to the anticipated impacts of the project because, like the proposed CPU, Alternative 1 would permit development that would be subject to ambient noise increases and traffic noise as the planning area is further developed. Alternative 1 would result in lower development potential and average daily trips; therefore, there would be no increase in traffic noise compared to the project. Alternative 1 contains the same policy changes as the proposed CPU that are intended to improve compatibility with and implement the General Plan Noise Element policies, and future development implemented under both Alternative 1 and the project would be required to comply with applicable City and state noise regulations including Title 24 building code requirements. Therefore, the noise impacts of Alternative 1 would be similar to the project, and both would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to ambient noise increases, traffic noise exposure, and construction-related vibration impacts.

f. Health and Safety

Impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to the potential impacts under the project. Future development under Alternative 1 has the potential to result in exposure to hazardous materials, wastes, emissions, airport hazards, and fire hazards. As the alternative would result in lower population growth than the proposed CPU, there would be fewer people exposed to these potential hazards. However, land

uses under Alternative 1 would be similar to the land uses under the proposed CPU. Federal, state and local regulations that serve to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level would also reduce impacts for development under Alternative 1. Overall, health and safety impacts from Alternative 1 would be less than significant and similar to those anticipated under the project.

g. Hydrology/Water Quality

The land use pattern and distribution for Alternative 1 is generally the same as for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU; however, there is likely to be less impervious pavement with the redevelopment of land from heavy commercial and light industrial land uses to mixed use (in the Camino del Rio, Channel, and Kurtz Districts) under the proposed CPU than under Alternative 1. However, future development under both Alternative 1 and the project would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations relative to runoff and water quality at the project level. Thus impacts to hydrology and water quality under Alternative 1 would be less than significant and similar to the project. Alternative 1 would implement the project objective of improving localized water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design to the same degree as the project.

h. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

Potential impacts to visual effects and neighborhood character under Alternative 1 would be similar to those anticipated under project. As both Alternative 1 and the proposed CPU would include the same land use and urban design policies, they would generally produce similar bulk and scale development. Therefore, the overall impact of Alternative 1 to the visual and neighborhood character in the community would be less than significant and similar to the project. Alternative 1 would implement the project objective of enhancing community identity and visual character to the same degree as the project.

i. Air Quality

As explained in Chapters 4 and 5, area and mobile sources generate the majority of daily operational emissions. Emissions from mobile sources associated with operation of the proposed CPU are approximately ~~60~~ 32 percent of the total NOx, ~~69~~ 78 percent of the total CO, and ~~89~~ 73 percent of the total PM10 daily emissions. Emissions from area sources associated with operation of the proposed CPU are approximately 57 percent of the total NOx, 18 percent of the total CO, and 23 percent of the total PM10 daily emissions. Alternative 1 would generate approximately 8 percent fewer vehicle miles traveled than the proposed CPU, and thus is anticipated to result in approximately 8 percent less mobile source emissions than the proposed CPU. Alternative 1 would also include the development of fewer multi-family residential dwelling units, thus would result in fewer area source emissions. Like the proposed CPU, Alternative 1 would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan nor would it result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because the emissions would be consistent with assumptions and emissions forecasts used in the development of the RAQS. Alternative 1 would generate fewer vehicle miles traveled, and therefore, is anticipated to generate fewer operational emissions than the proposed CPU. Like the proposed CPU, Alternative 1 would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and the residents would not be impacted by any existing odor sources. Thus, Alternative 1 air quality impacts would be less than significant and slightly less than the project.

j. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than significant and slightly greater than the project. Alternative 1 would incorporate similar overall goals as the proposed CPU, such as locating residential land uses closer to transit and incorporating residential uses within mixed commercial and business park land uses to be consistent with the General Plan's City of Villages and CAP strategies. However, the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU allows for more residential density, residential units, and office commercial and industrial square footage within proximity to transit than Alternative 1. While Alternative 1 would not conflict with CAP strategies and the General Plan's City of Villages strategy, it would achieve the associated strategies and policies to a lesser extent than the proposed CPU. Thus, although Alternative 1 would not conflict with adopted plans or policies designed to reduce GHGs, and would result in a less than significant GHG impact overall, this alternative would be less compatible than the project with applicable GHG reduction plans and policies.

k. Public Services and Facilities

Impacts to public services and facilities under Alternative 1 would be less than the anticipated impacts associated with the project because the anticipated population of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU in 2035 (27,070) is approximately double the anticipated population of Alternative 1 in 2035 (13,670). For police and fire protection services, as population growth occurs (current population is 4,670), there will be a need for new or expanded services. While Alternative 1 could result in less demand for new or altered police and fire protection services than the proposed CPU, no construction of such facilities are included in Alternative 1 or the proposed CPU. For schools, under both Alternative 1 and the proposed CPU, future additional housing units suggested in Alternative 1 and the proposed CPU would likely impact district schools. However, the school district would be responsible for potential expansion of development of new facilities. Thus, for Alternative 1, public facilities and services impacts would be less than significant and less than the project.

In the case of both Alternative 1 and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, there would be a deficit in planned population-based parks based on General Plan standards. Total proposed park space for the project and Alternative 1 is 29.86 acres.~~The population-based parks deficit for both Alternative and the proposed CPU would be 45.94 acres.~~ As with the proposed CPU, implementation of Alternative 1 would provide policy support for increasing the acreage of population-based parks and recreational facilities in the proposed CPU area, but does not propose design and construction of new facilities, so no impacts can be analyzed. As with the proposed CPU, individual park projects under Alternative 1 could require a project-level analysis at the time they are proposed, based on the details of the parks and the existing conditions at the time such projects are pursued. As such, implementation of Alternative 1 would result in a less than significant impact associated with the construction of new facilities.~~As the parks deficit would be the same for both Alternative 1 and the project, Alternative 1 and the project would implement the project objective of identifying park and recreation facilities to serve the community to the same degree.~~

l. Public Utilities

Similar to public services and facilities, impacts to public utilities related to storm water, sewer, water distribution, communications systems, and solid waste and recycling under Alternative 1 would be less than significant and less than the anticipated impacts of the project, as the anticipated population under

Alternative 1 would be less than the project. However, Alternative 1 and the project would implement the project objective of improving water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design to the same degree as the same policies would be implemented.

m. Biological Resources

Like the project, Alternative 1 would result in land uses changes that would affect primarily developed areas, and therefore, would result in similar impacts to biological resources as those anticipated under the proposed CPU. Implementation of Alternative 1 would also require adherence to all applicable federal, state, and local regulations regarding the protection of biological resources, as for all subsequent development project submittals under the proposed CPU. Therefore, impacts to biological resources under Alternative 1 would be less than significant and similar to those identified for the project.

n. Paleontological Resources

As with the project, future development under Alternative 1 has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to paleontological resources. Implementation of future projects under this alternative would require adherence to all applicable guidelines further described in Section 5.14, Paleontological Resources. The extent of impacts to paleontological resources resulting from implementation of Alternative 1 would be similar to those identified for the proposed CPU, because the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same and only the land use designation would differ. As with the proposed CPU, implementation of Alternative 1 would result in potentially significant impacts related to paleontological resources at the program level because adherence to the mitigation framework cannot be guaranteed for ministerial projects that only require a grading permit. Thus, the impacts of Alternative 1 to paleontological resources would be significant and unavoidable and similar to the project.

8.3 Alternative 2

8.3.1 Description

Alternative 2 would increase planned residential density in the Sports Arena Community Village and Hancock Transit Corridor, as well as portions of the Rosecrans, Cauby, Camino del Rio, Kurtz, Lytton, and Kettner Districts compared to the No Project Alternative (adopted Community Plan) and Alternative 1, but would not increase planned residential density as much as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. Alternative 2 would also increase non-residential intensity in the Camino Del Rio and Kettner districts compared to the adopted Community Plan, Alternative 1, and the proposed CPU.

As with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and Alternative 1, this alternative would allow for the San Diego Sports Arena to be retained, rehabilitated or reconstructed, or replaced with other land uses. Similar to the analysis of the project and Alternative 1 in this PEIR, for the purposes of more conservative transportation, noise, and air quality analyses, the more intensive land use assumptions (replacing the Sports Arena with other land uses) are used in the analysis of Alternative 2 impacts. However, the adoption of this alternative would not preclude an arena use on the Sports Arena site. As with the proposed CPU and Alternative 1, a future specific plan or master plan for the City-owned parcels in the

Sports Arena Community Village would be required and additional environmental analysis could be required if the proposed development exceeded the amount of development analyzed in this PEIR.


Table 8-8 presents a summary comparison of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU and Alternative 2 for residential capacity and reasonably anticipated non-residential development. The total projected population under Alternative 2 would be 3,440 persons less than under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. Figure 8-3 shows land use designations under Alternative 2.

Table 8-8
Comparison of Alternative 2 and the Project

Alternative 2				Project			
Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area	Land Use	Acres	Dwelling Units	Floor Area
Residential				**Residential**			
Single-Family Residential	0.0	0	0	Single-Family Residential	0	0	0
Multi-Family Residential	125.4	4,285	0	Multi-Family Residential	125.4	4,285	0
Total	125.4	4,285	0	Total	125.4	4,285	0
Commercial and Office				**Commercial and Office**			
Office Commercial	89.1	1,550	1,775,489	Office Commercial	113.7	3,025	1,915,423
Retail Commercial	192.4	4,275	2,273,500	Retail Commercial	189.1	4,275	2,227,328
Visitor Commercial	16.7	0	505,750	Visitor Commercial	16.7	0	505,750
Stadium/Arena	0[1]	0	0[1]	Stadium/Arena	0[1]	0	0[1]
Parking (Airport-Related and Other Stand-Alone)	9.8	0	0	Parking (Airport-Related and Other Stand-Alone)	9.8	0	0
Total	308.0	5,825	4,554,739	Total	329.3	7,300	4,648,501
Industrial				**Industrial**			
Total	65.5	0	4,124,035	Total	44.1	0	2,288,259
Institutional and Educational				**Institutional and Educational**			
Education	17.1	0	186,873	Education	17.1	0	186,873
Institutional	27.7	0	733,213	Institutional	27.7	0	733,213
Total	44.8	0	920,086	Total	44.8	0	920,086
Military				**Military**			
Total	447.1	0	2,234,370	Total	447.1	0	2.234.370
Transportation and Utilities				**Transportation and Utilities**			
Transportation	302.9	0	0	Transportation	302.9	0	0
Utilities	2.5	0	0	Utilities	2.5	0	0
Total	305.4	0	0	Total	305.4	0	0
Parks				**Parks**			
Total	27.8	0	0	Total	27.8	0	0
Vacant				**Vacant**			
Total	0.00	0	0	Total	0	0	0
Grand Totals	1,324	10,110	11,833,230	**Grand Totals**	1,324	11,585	10,091,215
Estimated Future Population	23,630			Estimated Future Population	27,070		

[1] Proposed CPU (Project) and Alternative 2 would permit Stadium/Arena use (San Diego Sports Arena) to remain or be replaced with other uses. For the purposes of this CEQA analysis, the most intense land use possible with application of the proposed land use designation (replacement of Stadium/Arena use with mixed-use development) has been assumed. Appendix N provides a summary of the proposed CPU with Sports Arena and Alternative 2 with Sports Arena scenarios.

[2] In addition to total shown, planned parks in the project and Alternative 2 include a 1.5 acre joint use facility at Dewey Elementary School, and 0.55 acres just north of the proposed CPU area along the San Diego River Park Pathway within Mission Bay Park. Total proposed park space for the project and Alternative 2 is 29.86 acres.



Source: City of San Diego; SDIA - ALUCP; Kennedy and Tan, 2008

0 1,600 3,200 Feet

Figure 8-3
Alternative 2 Land Use

8.3.2 Analysis of Alternative 2

a. Land Use

Compared to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 would increase non-residential intensity in the Camino del Rio District west of Camino del Rio West; change the predominant land use designation in the Kettner District from Heavy Commercial to Urban Industrial with a higher non-residential intensity; increase permitted residential density in portions of the Rosecrans, Cauby, and Lytton Districts; and apply Mixed Commercial Residential land use designations with high residential densities in portions of the Camino del Rio, Kurtz, and Kettner Districts and the Hancock Transit Corridor. Compared to the proposed CPU, land uses under Alternative 2 would be substantially the same except that Alternative 2 includes Urban Industrial, Heavy Commercial, and Community Commercial – Residential Prohibited land uses in portions of the Camino del Rio and Channel Districts.

Increased permitted residential density in portions of the Rosecrans, Camino Del Rio, Kurtz, Cauby, Lytton, and Kettner districts and in the Hancock Transit Corridor would allow for more residential units to be built in proximity to transit stations and routes than under the No Project Alternative and Alternative 1, and fewer than under the project. The change in the predominant land use designation in the Kettner District from Heavy Commercial to Urban Industrial would maintain additional industrial land in the community and increased non-residential intensity in industrial-designated areas would allow for additional employment in proximity to transit stops and routes, when compared to Alternative 1 and the project. Alternative 2 is similar to the No Project Alternative regarding the Kettner District as the existing land use designations district are predominantly industrial and transportation-related commercial; however, Alternative 2 would allow a greater intensity of industrial use in this area.

Although Alternative 2 would not conflict with adopted land use plans, policies, or ordinances, and would result in a less than significant land use impact overall, the alternative would be less compatible than the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU when viewed in relation to applicable land use plans and policies with regard to the City of Villages strategy (specifically, regarding providing housing in proximity to transit). Thus, the land use impacts of Alternative 2 would be less than significant and slightly greater than the project.

While Alternative 2 would achieve similar overall land use goals and project objectives as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, Alternative 2 would meet the project objective to maintain employment uses including industrial, business park, and commercial office uses to support the City's economy to a greater degree than the proposed CPU. However, Alternative 2 would not implement the project objective to provide housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit to the same degree as the proposed CPU. Alternative 2 would also not implement the project objective to enhance community identity and visual character through land use and urban design to the same degree as the project, because it would maintain larger areas of industrial land which currently exhibit a less attractive visual character and less pedestrian activity throughout the day than commercial and mixed use areas in the community. Alternative 2 would implement the project objectives to establish multiple-use villages and districts within the community, to identify park and recreation facilities to serve the community, and to identify future alternative uses for government-owned land in the community to the same degree as the project as the incorporation of mixed-use villages and district, identification of park area, and integration of MCRD into the proposed CPU boundary would occur to the same degree under both Alternative 2 and the project.

b. Transportation and Circulation

Alternative 2 would generate more vehicular trips than the project as it allows for increased non-residential development compared to the proposed CPU. The TIS, dated May 2017 and produced by Chen Ryan Associates (included as Appendix B of this PEIR), summarizes the results of the traffic evaluation to reflect densities proposed by this alternative.

Like the project, Alternative 2 would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to roadways, intersections and freeway segments and ramp meters. Although there would be a greater number of vehicular trips than the proposed CPU, Alternative 2 would result in the same number of significantly impacted roadways, intersections, and freeway segments and ramp meters as the proposed CPU. Compared to the proposed CPU, impacts to roadway and freeway facilities would be significant and unavoidable, similar to the project.

Regarding consistency with applicable plans and policies related to alternative transportation, Alternative 2 would include the same pedestrian and bicycle facilities and improvements and Mobility and Conservation Element policies as the proposed CPU, which supports increased use of alternative transportation within the proposed CPU area consistent with SANDAG's RP, the General Plan, and the City's CAP. Thus, similar to the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, Alternative 2 would not result in significant impacts related to conflicts with plans and policies addressing alternative transportation. Therefore, impacts related to alternative transportation would be less than significant and similar to the project. As such, Alternative 2 would implement the project objectives to create a complete mobility system that promotes access for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit and to create a Bay-to-Bay pedestrian and bicycle linkage to the same degree as the project.

c. Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

Like the project, Alternative 2 would identify potential historic properties and associated policies supporting protection of potential historic properties, and the SDMC provides for the regulation and protection of designated and potential historical resources. The mitigation framework combined with the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU policies promoting the identification and preservation of historical resources, which would also be a component of Alternative 2, would reduce the program-level impact related to historical resources of the built environment. However, even with implementation of the mitigation framework, the degree of future impacts and applicability, feasibility, and success of future mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at this program level of analysis. Therefore, as with the project, where increases in density are proposed beyond the adopted Community Plan and current zoning, potential impacts to individual historic buildings, structures, objects, or sites under Alternative 2 would be considered significant and unavoidable.

As with the proposed CPU, Alternative 2 would allow the retention of a sports arena/entertainment use on the existing San Diego Sports Arena site either in the existing, potentially historic San Diego Sports Arena or in a new structure, or allow the sports arena use to be replaced by other land uses. Any new development that would redevelop or demolish the existing San Diego Sports Arena would require a separate environmental review to identify potential impacts associated with historical resources. Therefore, potential impacts to historical resources from implementation of Alternative 2 would be significant and unavoidable and similar to the project.

As with the proposed CPU, future development under Alternative 2 has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to tribal cultural and archaeological resources. Implementation of future projects under this alternative would require adherence to all applicable guidelines further described in Section 5.3, Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources. The extent of impacts to tribal cultural and archaeological resources resulting from implementation of this alternative would be similar to those identified for the proposed CPU as there is limited undeveloped land in the community. However, similar to the proposed CPU, while existing regulations, the SDMC, and proposed CPU policies would provide for the regulation and protection of tribal cultural and archaeological resources and human remains, it is impossible to ensure the successful preservation of all tribal cultural and archaeological resources. As with the project, implementation of Alternative 2 would result in similar impacts related to tribal cultural and archaeological resources at the program level and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

d. Geologic Conditions

Geologic impacts from implementation of Alternative 2 would be similar to those of the project. Potential impacts related to seismic and geologic hazards, or to the instability of geological units and soils would be avoided or reduced to less than significant through adherence to existing state and local regulations, including the CBC, the SDMC, and the Seismic Hazards Mapping Act. Where required, site-specific geotechnical investigations would be conducted to identify and evaluate seismic hazards and formulate mitigation measures prior to permitting most developments designed for human occupancy. Similarly, project-level compliance with City-mandated grading requirements, and, compliance with applicable state and/or federal regulations would ensure that future grading and construction activities would avoid significant soil erosion impacts. These requirements would apply equally to both Alternative 2 and the project. Thus, impacts to geologic conditions under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the project.

e. Noise

Noise impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the anticipated impacts of the project because, like the proposed CPU, it would permit development that would be subject to ambient noise increases and traffic noise as the planning area is further developed. Although Alternative 2 would result in greater non-residential development potential and average daily trips, the increase in traffic noise would not likely be perceptible compared to the project. Alternative 2 contains the same policy changes as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU intended to improve compatibility with and implement the General Plan Noise Element policies, and future development implemented under both Alternative 2 and the project would be required to comply with applicable City and state noise regulations including Title 24 building code requirements. Therefore, the noise impacts of Alternative 2 would be similar to the project and both would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to ambient noise increases, traffic noise exposure, and construction-related vibration impacts.

f. Health and Safety

Impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the potential impacts under the project. Future development under Alternative 2 has the potential to result in exposure to hazardous materials, wastes, emissions, airport hazards, and fire hazards. As the alternative would result in a lower population growth than the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, there would be fewer people exposed to these potential

hazards. However, land uses under Alternative 2 would be similar to the land uses under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU. Federal, state and local regulations that serve to reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level would also reduce impacts for development under Alternative 2. Overall, impacts to health and safety under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to those anticipated under the project.

g. Hydrology/Water Quality

The land use pattern and distribution for Alternative 2 is generally the same as for the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU; however, there is likely to be less impervious pavement with the redevelopment of land in the western half of the Camino del Rio District from industrial and heavy commercial to mixed use under the proposed CPU than under Alternative 2. However, future development under both Alternative 2 and the project would be required to comply with existing federal, state, and local regulations relative to runoff and water quality at the project level. Thus impacts to hydrology and water quality under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to the project. Alternative 2 would implement the project objective of improving localized water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design to the same degree as the project.

h. Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character

Potential impacts to visual effects and neighborhood character under Alternative 2 would be similar to those anticipated under the project. As both Alternative 2 and the proposed CPU would include the same land use and urban design policies, they would generally produce similar bulk and scale development as the proposed CPU land uses. Therefore, the overall impact in the community would be less than significant and similar to the project. Alternative 2 would not implement the project objective to enhance community identity and visual character through land use and urban design to the same degree as the project, because it would maintain larger areas of industrial land which currently exhibit a less attractive visual character and less pedestrian activity throughout the day than commercial and mixed use areas in the community.

i. Air Quality

Air quality impacts under Alternative 2 would be slightly more than the anticipated impacts of the project due to increased non-residential development and higher vehicle miles traveled than the proposed CPU. Alternative 2 would generate approximately five percent more vehicle miles traveled associated with trips for the increased non-residential development than the proposed CPU. As mobile source emissions make up approximately ~~60~~ 32 percent of the total NOx, ~~69~~ 78 percent of the total CO, and ~~89~~ 73 percent of the total PM10 daily emissions associated with the proposed CPU, it is anticipated that the five percent increase in vehicle miles traveled associated with Alternative 2 would generate slightly higher daily operational emissions than the proposed CPU. Like the proposed CPU, Alternative 2 would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan nor would it result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation because the emissions would be consistent with assumptions and emissions forecasts used in the development of the RAQS. Like the proposed CPU, Alternative 2 would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and the residents would not be impacted by any existing odor sources. Thus, Alternative 2 air quality impacts would be less than significant and slightly greater than the project.

j. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

GHG impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and slightly greater than the anticipated impacts of the project due to increased non-residential development and higher vehicle miles traveled than the proposed CPU. As discussed previously, Alternative 2 would generate approximately five percent more vehicle miles traveled associated with trips for the increased non-residential development than the proposed CPU. While Alternative 2 incorporates similar overall goals and policies as the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU regarding consistency of future development with the City of Villages and CAP strategies and the same proposed multi-modal mobility improvements, Alternative 2 would not implement the change from heavy commercial and urban industrial land uses to mixed commercial residential and business park – residential permitted land uses within the Camino del Rio and Channel districts that is found in the proposed CPU and which allows the proposed CPU to meet the project objective to provide housing and commercial uses in proximity to transit to a greater degree. The increased non-residential development in the Camino del Rio and Channel Districts under Alternative 2 would decrease opportunities for additional residential in proximity to transit, thereby increasing vehicle miles traveled. Thus, Alternative 2 would also not support the City of San Diego in achieving the GHG emissions reduction targets of the CAP and City of Villages strategy to the same degree as the project. Thus, Alternative 2 would be less compatible than the proposed CPU when viewed in relation to plans and policies intended to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, the GHG impacts of Alternative 2 would be less than significant and slightly greater than project.

k. Public Services and Facilities

Impacts to public services and facilities under Alternative 2 would be less than the anticipated impacts associated with the project because than the anticipated population under Alternative 2 (23,630) in 2035 is less than the anticipated population under the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU (27,070) in 2035. For police and fire protection services, as population growth occurs (current population is 4,670), there will be a need for new or expanded services. Thus, Alternative 2 could result in the demand for new or altered police and fire protection services. However, no construction of such facilities are included in Alternative 2 or the proposed CPU. For schools, under both Alternative 2 and the proposed CPU, future additional housing units suggested in Alternative 2 and the proposed CPU would likely impact district schools. However, the school district would be responsible for potential expansion of development of new facilities. Thus, for Alternative 2, public facilities and services impacts would be less than significant and less than the project.

In the case of both Alternative 2 and the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, there would be a deficit in population-based parks based on General Plan standards. Total proposed park space for the project and Alternative 2 is 29.86 acres. ~~The population-based parks deficit for both Alternative 2 and the proposed CPU would be 45.94 acres.~~ As with the proposed CPU, implementation of Alternative 2 would provide policy support for increasing the acreage of population-based parks and recreational facilities in the proposed CPU area but does not propose design and construction of new facilities, so no impacts can be identified. As with the proposed CPU, individual park projects under Alternative 2 could require a project-level analysis at the time they are proposed, based on the details of the parks and the existing conditions at the time such projects are pursued. As such, implementation of Alternative 2 would result in a less than significant impact associated with the construction of new facilities. ~~As the parks deficit would~~

~~be the same for both Alternative 2 and the project, Alternative 2 and the project would implement the project objective of identifying park and recreation facilities to serve the community to the same degree.~~

l. Public Utilities

Similar to public services and facilities, impacts to public utilities related to storm water, sewer, water distribution, communications systems, and solid waste and recycling under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and less than the project as the anticipated population under Alternative 2 would be less than the project. Alternative 2 and the project would implement the project objective of improving water quality and conveyance through facility improvements and design to the same degree as the same policies would be implemented.

m. Biological Resources

Like the project, Alternative 2 would result in land uses changes that would affect primarily developed areas and therefore would result in similar impacts to biological resources as those anticipated under the proposed CPU. Implementation of Alternative 2 would also require adherence to all applicable federal, state, and local regulations regarding the protection of biological resources, as for all subsequent development project submittals under the proposed CPU. Therefore, impacts to biological resources under Alternative 2 would be less than significant and similar to those identified for the project.

n. Paleontological Resources

As with the project, future development under Alternative 2 has the potential to result in significant direct and/or indirect impacts to paleontological resources. Implementation of future projects under this alternative would require adherence to all applicable guidelines further described in Section 5.14, Paleontological Resources. The extent of impacts to paleontological resources resulting from implementation of Alternative 2 would be similar to those identified for the proposed CPU, because the extent and areas of disturbance by development would be generally the same and only the land use designation would change. As with the proposed CPU, implementation of Alternative 2 would result in potentially significant impacts related to paleontological resources at the program level because adherence to the mitigation framework cannot be guaranteed for ministerial projects that only require a grading permit. Thus impacts to paleontological resources under Alternative 2 would be significant and unavoidable and similar to the project.

8.4 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives analyzed in an EIR. The guidelines also require that if the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, then another environmentally superior alternative must be identified.

Based on a comparison of the alternatives' overall environmental impacts and their compatibility with the proposed CPU's goals and objectives, Alternative 1 is the environmentally superior alternative for this PEIR. While Alternative 1 would not be able to reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed Midway-Pacific Highway CPU, it would slightly reduce impacts related to traffic circulation. At

the same time, Alternative 1 would not achieve consistency with the General Plan's City of Villages strategy to the same extent as the proposed CPU because it would provide a land use plan that provides moderate rather than higher residential densities along major transit corridors. Alternative 1 would be consistent with General Plan Policy LU-A.2, which calls for the identification of sites suitable for mixed-use village development that will complement the existing community fabric or help achieve desired community character; and with General Plan Policy UD-A.10, which calls for the design or retrofit of streets to improve walkability, bicycling, and transit integration; to strengthen connectivity; and to enhance community identity. However, consistency with General Plan Policy LU-A.1(d) (Revitalize transit corridors through the application of plan designations and zoning that permits a higher intensity of mixed use development) would not be achieved to the same extent as the proposed CPU because the density of future development under Alternative 1 would be lower along most transit corridors in the proposed CPU area. Alternative 1 would also achieve consistency with the City's CAP to a lesser degree than the proposed CPU since the land use plan would not take advantage of capacity for higher residential densities along major transit corridors to the same extent as the project.

This page intentionally left blank.

9

Chapter 9.0
References Cited

Chapter 1.0 Introduction

San Diego, City of

1991 Midway/Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan, as amended.

2007 Program Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan.

2008a General Plan. March.

2008b City of San Diego Municipal Code.

2013 Housing Element FY2013-FY2020.

2015 Climate Action Plan. Available at https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/final_july_2016_cap.pdf. Accessed June 2017.

Chapter 2.0 Environmental Setting

Beier, P., and R. F. Noss

1998 Do Habitat Corridors Provide Connectivity? Conservation Biology 12:1241-1252.

Beier, P., D. R. Majka, and W. D. Spencer

2008 Forks in the Road: Choices in Procedures for Designing Wildland Linkages. Conservation Biology 22:836–851.

California Air Resources Board (CARB)

2007 California 1990 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Level and 2020 Emissions Limit. November 16.

2014 Proposed First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan: Building on the Framework. February.

2017 Air Quality Data Statistics. Available at http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/welcome.html. Accessed June 2017.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFW)
2017 California Natural Diversity Database. Biogeographic Data Branch.

California Energy Commission
2014 Integrated Energy Policy Report 2014 IEPR Update.

California Native Plant Society (CNPS)
2017 Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Available at http://www.rareplants.cnps.org [accessed 02 May 2017].

CalRecycle
2009 Strategic Directives. Available at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/AboutUs/StrategicPlan/2009/SD06.htm.
2017 Solid Waste Information System. Available at http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
2013 Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. Division of Environmental Analysis. September 2013.

Citygate
2017 Fire Service Standards of Response Cover Review for the City of San Diego Fire Rescue Department Volume 2 of 3. February 22. Available online at: https://www.sandiego.gov/fire/about/citygate. Accessed August 8, 2017.

Crooks, K. R., and M. Sanjayan
2006 Evolution and Systematics 37: 317–342. Connectivity Conservation (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Galvin Preservation Associates Inc. (GPA)
2017 City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area Historic Resources Survey Report: Historic Context & Reconnaissance Survey. February.

Holland
1986 *Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California*. State of California, The Resources Agency.

Kennedy, M. P.
1975 Geology of the San Diego metropolitan area, California (Section A, Western San Diego metropolitan area- Del Mar, La Jolla, and Point Loma 7.5 minute quadrangles): California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 200A.

Kennedy, M. P., and S.S. Tan
2008 Geology of the San Diego 30'x60' Quadrangle, California, CGS Regional Geologic Map No. 3.

Lidicker, W. Z., Jr., and J. A. Peterson
1999 Responses of Small Mammals to Habitat Edges. In Landscape Ecology of Small Mammals. G. W. Barrett and J. D. Peles, eds. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Lightner, J.
2011 San Diego County Native Plants. San Diego Flora, San Diego, California.

Ninyo & Moore
2012 Hazardous Materials Technical Study for the City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Community Plan Updates San Diego, California. April 10.

Osborne, K. H. (Osborne Biological Consulting) and ICF International
2014 An Entomological Investigation of the Coronado Beach Naval Base, San Diego County, California. 201. Unpublished report submitted to Coronado Beach Naval Base and Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest, San Diego, California.

Penrod, K., R. Hunter, and M. Merrifield
2001 Missing Linkages: Restoring Connectivity to the California Landscape.

Project Clean Water
2016 San Diego River Watershed Management Area (WMA). Available at http://www.project cleanwater.org/san-diego-river-wma/

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
2016 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9). May 17.

Rockwell, T.
2011 Seismic Hazard to the San Diego-Tijuana Region, Presentation to the 63rd Annual (2011) Meeting, Earthquake Engineering Research Institute-EERI, February 10, 2011.

Rockwell, T.K., M. Murbach, D. Murbach, K. Rockwell, and E. Haaker
2012 Paleoseismic assessment of the late Holocene rupture history of the Rose Canyon fault zone in San Diego: Southern California Edison, San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Seismic Source Characterization Research Project.

Rosenberg, D. K., B. R. Noon, and E. C. Meslow
1997 Biological Corridors: Form, Function, and Efficacy. BioScience 47:677–687.

San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD)
2015a Annual Air Quality Monitoring Network Plan 2015. Available at http://www.sdapcd.org/ content/dam/sdc/apcd/monitoring/2015_Network_Plan.pdf. Accessed September 2017.
2015b 5-Year Air Quality Monitoring Network Assessment 2015. Available at http://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdc/apcd/monitoring/2015_Network_Assessment.pdf. Accessed September 2017.

2016 Annual Air Quality Monitoring Network Plan 2016. Available at http://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdc/apcd/monitoring/2016_Network_Plan.pdf. Accessed September 2017.

San Diego, City of

1991 Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan.

2000 Historical Resources Guidelines and Associated Appendices (2009-2012)

2008 General Plan. March.

2012 San Diego Municipal Code, Land Development Manual, Biology Guidelines. Amended April 23, 2012.

2013 Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Barrio Logan Community Plan Update; Project No. 240982. May 2.

2015 City of San Diego General Plan, Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element, Updated June 29, 2015.

2017a Draft Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan. April.

2017b Police Services – Western Division. Available at https://www.sandiego.gov/police/services/divisions/western.

2017c About the Library Internet Site. Available at: https://www.sandiego.gov/public-library/about-the-library/projects/missionhills. Accessed March 29, 2017.

San Diego, County of

2015 SanGIS-SANDAG Regional Data Warehouse. SanGIS and SANDAG authoritative regional GIS data. Available at http://www.sangis.org/download/index.html.

Schweiger, E. W., J. E. Diffendorfer, R. D. Holt, R. Pierotti, and M. S. Gaines

2000 The Interaction of Habitat Fragmentation, Plant, and Small Mammal Succession in an Old Field. Ecological Monographs 70:383–400.

Singleton, D., T. K. Rockwell, D. Murbach, M. Murbach, J. Maloney, E. Marquez, L Weidman, Y. Levy, and S. Rugg

2017 Timing of late Holocene earthquakes on the Rose Canyon fault at Old Town, San Diego, CA: Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs, v. 49, no. 4, doi: 10.1130/abs/2017CD-292564

Unitt, Phillip

2004 San Diego County Bird Atlas. San Diego Natural History Museum & Ibis Publishing Company, San Diego. 645 pp.

Western Bat Working Group (WBWG)

2017 Western Bat Species. Website http://wbwg.org/western-bat-species/ [accessed 02 May 2017].

Wilson Geosciences, Inc.

2012 Seismic and Geologic Technical Background Report for the City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Community Plan Updates, and Environmental Impact Report, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California. April.

Chapter 3.0 Project Description

San Diego, City of

1991 Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan.

2017 Draft Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Update. April.

Chapter 4.0 Regulatory Framework

California Air Resources Board (CARB)

2000 Risk Reduction Plan to Reduce Particulate Matter Emissions from Diesel-fueled Engines and Vehicles. Available at: https://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/documents/rrpFinal.pdf, accessed July 12, 2017.

2014 First Update to the Climate Change Scoping Plan. Building on the Framework Pursuant to AB 32 – The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. May 2014.

2015 California Air Quality Data Statistics. California Air Resources Board Internet Site. http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/welcome.html. Accessed July 12, 2017.

2017b Area Designation Maps/State and National. Available at http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/desig.htm. Accessed June 2017.

San Diego, City of

1998 Land Development Code - Historical Resources Regulations

2000 Land Development Manual - Historical Resources Guidelines and Associated Appendices (2009-2012)

2012 Land Development Manual - Biological Resources Guidelines

2013 City of San Diego Bicycle Master Plan. Prepared by Alta Planning and Design. December.

2015 City of San Diego General Plan Amendments. Adopted by City Council June 29, 2015.

2016 City of San Diego Recycling Ordinance. https://www.sandiego.gov/environmental-services/recycling/ro. Accessed on July 12, 2017.

2017 Land Development Code – Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulation

San Diego, County of

1992 1991/1992 Regional Air Quality Strategies. Air Pollution Control District. June.

2016 San Diego County Hazardous Materials Division. http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/deh/hazmat.html. Accessed on July 12, 2017.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

2014 San Diego International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Prepared by Ricondo & Associates, Inc. Adopted April 3, 2014.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)

2010 Regulatory Announcement “EPA and NHTSA Finalize Historic National Program to Reduce Greenhouse Gases and Improve Fuel Economy for Cars and Trucks.” April.

2012 Regulatory Announcement “EPA and NHTSA Set Standards to Reduce Greenhouse Gases and Improve Fuel Economy for Model Years 2017-2025 Cars and Light Trucks.” August.

Chapter 5.0 Environmental Analysis

5.1 Land Use

San Diego, City of
2008 General Plan. March.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority
2014 San Diego International Airport Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. April 3. Available at: http://www.san.org/Portals/0/Documents/Land%20Use%20Compatibility/SDIA/SDIA%20ALUCP%20Ch%201-6%20(May%202014).pdf. Accessed March 29, 2017.

San Diego Unified Port District
2017 Port Master Plan. August. Available at: https://www.portofsandiego.org/document/environment/land-use-planning/4729-port-master-plan-1/file.html. Accessed March 19, 2018.

5.2 Transportation and Circulation

San Diego, City of
1998 Traffic Impact Study Manual. July
2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department.

San Diego Regional Traffic Standards Task Force
2000 SANTEC/ITE Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies in the San Diego Region. March.

Transportation Research Board
2000 Highway Capacity Manual, Chapter 16 and 17.

5.3 Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources

AECOM
2015 Community Plan Update for Community of Midway – Prehistoric Cultural Resources, City of San Diego, California. January.

Galvin Preservation Associates Inc.
2017 City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway Community Plan Area Historic Resources Survey Report: Historic Context & Reconnaissance Survey. February.

San Diego, City of
2000 Historical Resources Guidelines and Associated Appendices (2012)
2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department

5.4 Geologic Conditions

Wilson Geosciences Inc.

2012 Seismic and Geologic Technical Background Report for the City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Community Plan Updates, and Environmental Impact Report, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California. April.

San Diego, City of

2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department

5.5 Noise

AECOM

2017 Noise Technical Report for the Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Community Plan Updates, July 2017.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)

2013 Transportation and Construction Vibration Guidance Manual. Division of Environmental Analysis. September 2013.

Chen Ryan Associates, Inc.

2017 Midway-Pacific Highway & Old Town Mobility Element Updates: Transportation Impact Study. May 2017.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

2006 Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment FTA-VA-90-1003-06. Office of Planning and Environment. May 2006.

RECON

2016 Noise Analysis for the Uptown, North Park, and Golden Hill Community Plan Updates. May 24, 2016.

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

2014 Mid-Coast Corridor Transit Project Noise and Vibration Impacts Technical Report. August 2014.

San Diego, City of

2012 San Diego Municipal Code, Noise Abatement and Control.

2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

2014 San Diego International Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Prepared by Ricondo & Associates, Inc. Adopted April 3, 2014.

San Diego Regional Traffic Standards Task Force
2000 SANTEC/ITE Guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies in the San Diego Region. March.

5.6 Health and Safety

CAL FIRE
2009 Fire Hazard Zone Maps. Available at http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_sandiego.

Ninyo & Moore
2012 Hazardous Materials Technical Study for the City of San Diego Midway-Pacific Highway and Old Town Community Plan Updates San Diego, California. April 10.

San Diego, City of
2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department

San Diego, County of
2014 Emergency Operations Plan. September.

5.7 Hydrology/Water Quality

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region
2016 Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. May. Available at: http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/docs/update082812/Chpt_1_2012.pdf. Accessed March 27, 2017.

San Diego, City of
2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department

5.9 Air Quality

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
2017 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines. Available at http://www.baaqmd.gov/~/media/files/planning-and-research/ceqa/ceqa_guidelines_may2017-pdf.pdf?la=en. Accessed June 2017.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA)
2016 California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1. Available at http://caleemod.com/. Accessed June 2017.

California Air Resources Board (CARB)
2005 *Air Quality and Land Use Handbook: A Community Health Perspective*. Available at http://www.arb.ca.gov/ch/landuse.htm. Accessed June 2017.
2016 Ambient Air Quality Standards. Available at http://www.arb.ca.gov/research/aaqs/caaqs/caaqs.htm. Accessed June 2017.

2017a Air Quality Data Statistics. Available at http://www.arb.ca.gov/adam/welcome. html. Accessed June 2017.

2017b Area Designation Maps/State and National. Available at http://www.arb.ca.gov/ desig/desig.htm. Accessed June 2017.

Chen Ryan

2017 Transportation Impact Study. Midway-Pacific Highway & Old Town Mobility Element Updates. May.

Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA)

2015 Hot Spots Guidance Manual. Available at http://www.oehha.org/air/hot_spots/ hotspots2015.html. Accessed March 2015.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD)

2016 CEQA Guide to Air Quality Assessment: Program-Level Analysis of General Plans and Area Plans. Accessed June 2017.

San Diego, City of

2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department.

San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD)

1998 Rule 20.2. New Source Review. Available at http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/ dam/sdc/apcd/PDF/Rules_and_Regulations/Permits/APCD_R20-2.pdf. Accessed June 2017.

2015a Annual Air Quality Monitoring Network Plan 2015. Available at http://www.sdapcd.org/ content/dam/sdc/apcd/monitoring/2015_Network_Plan.pdf. Accessed September 2017.

2015b 5-Year Air Quality Monitoring Network Assessment 2015. Available at http://www. sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdc/apcd/monitoring/2015_Network_Assessment.pdf. Accessed September 2017.

2016a Annual Air Quality Monitoring Network Plan 2016. Available at http://www.sdapcd.org/ content/dam/sdc/apcd/monitoring/2016_Network_Plan.pdf. Accessed September 2017.

2016b Regional Air Quality Strategy Revision. Available at http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/ content/dam/sdc/apcd/PDF/Air%20Quality%20Planning/2016%20RAQS.pdf. Accessed June 2017.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)

2007 Six Common Pollutants, Particulate Matter. Available at https://www.epa.gov/criteria-air-pollutants. Accessed June 2017.

Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC).

2017 Available: https://wrcc.dri.edu/Climate/summaries.php. Accessed June 2017.

5.10 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

American Water Works Association Research Foundation

2000 Commercial and Institutional End Uses of Water. Available at http://www.waterrf.org/PublicReportLibrary/RFR90806_2000_241B.pdf. Accessed August 8, 2017.

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA)

2016 California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2016.3.1. Appendix E Technical Source Documentation. Available at http://caleemod.com/. Accessed June 2017.

California Air Resources Board (CARB)

2008 Local Government Operations Protocol: Chapter 10 – Wastewater Treatment Facilities and EPA's Inventory of US Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks Available at https://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/protocols/localgov/archive/final_lgo_protocol_2008-09-25.pdf Accessed June 2017.

Chen Ryan

2017 Transportation Impact Study. San Diego, CA. May.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)

2007 *Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC. Geneva, Switzerland. February.

Pacific Institute

2003 *Waste Note, Want Not: The Potential for Urban Water Conservation in California.* November. Available at: http://pacinst.org/publication/waste-not-want-not/. Accessed August 8, 2017.

San Diego, City of

2016a California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department.

2016b Climate Action Plan. Available at https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/final_july_2016_cap.pdf. Accessed June 2017.

University of San Diego

2014 GHG Emissions Inventory for the San Diego Region. Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC) at University of San Diego. April.

5.11 Public Services and Facilities

Citygate

2017 Fire Service Standards of Response Cover Review for the City of San Diego Fire Rescue Department Volume 2 of 3. February 22. Available online at: https://www.sandiego.gov/fire/about/citygate. Accessed August 8, 2017.

City of San Diego
2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department.

5.12 Public Utilities

California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC)
2012 Renewables Portfolio Standard Quarterly Report, 1st and 2nd Quarter.
2016 Biennial RPS Program Update: In Compliance with Public Utilities Code Section 913.6. January.

San Diego, City of
2008a General Plan. March.
2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department
2017a Water Supply Assessment for Old Town San Diego. July.
2017b Environmental Services, Miramar Landfill. Available online at: https://www.sandiego.gov/environmental-services/miramar. Accessed on May 8, 2017.

5.13 Biological Resources

Beier, P., and R. F. Noss
1998 Do Habitat Corridors Provide Connectivity? Conservation Biology 12:1241–1252.

Beier, P., D. R. Majka, and W. D. Spencer
2008 Forks in the Road: Choices in Procedures for Designing Wildland Linkages. Conservation Biology 22:836–851.

California Department of Fish and Game (CDFW)
2017 California Natural Diversity Database. Biogeographic Data Branch.

California Native Plant Society, Rare Plant Program
2017 Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (online edition, v8-03 0.39). Website http://www.rareplants.cnps.org [accessed 02 May 2017].

Crooks, K. R., and M. Sanjayan
2006 Evolution and Systematics 37: 317–342. Connectivity Conservation (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Holland, R. F.
1986 Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. Prepared for California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Lidicker, W. Z., Jr., and J. A. Peterson
1999 Responses of Small Mammals to Habitat Edges. In Landscape Ecology of Small Mammals. G. W. Barrett and J. D. Peles, eds. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Lightner, J.
2011 San Diego County Native Plants. San Diego Flora, San Diego, California.

Oberbauer, Thomas, Meghan Kelly, and Jeremy Buegge
March 2008 Draft Vegetation Communities of San Diego County. Based on "Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California," Robert F. Holland, Ph.D., October 1986.

Osborne, K. H. (Osborne Biological Consulting) and ICF International
2014 An Entomological Investigation of the Coronado Beach Naval Base, San Diego County, California. 201. Unpublished report submitted to Coronado Beach Naval Base and Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest, San Diego, California.

Penrod, K., R. Hunter, and M. Merrifield
2001 Missing Linkages: Restoring Connectivity to the California Landscape.

Rosenberg, D. K., B. R. Noon, and E. C. Meslow
1997 Biological Corridors: Form, Function, and Efficacy. BioScience 47:677–687.

San Diego, City of
2012 San Diego Municipal Code, Land Development Code, Biology Guidelines. Amended April 23, 2012.
2013 San Diego River Park Master Plan. https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/sdrp_master_plan_full.pdf
2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department

San Diego, County of
1998 Final Multiple Species Conservation Program.
2015 SanGIS-SANDAG Regional Data Warehouse. SanGIS and SANDAG authoritative regional GIS data. Available at http://www.sangis.org/download/index.html.

Schweiger, E. W., J. E. Diffendorfer, R. D. Holt, R. Pierotti, and M. S. Gaines
2000 The Interaction of Habitat Fragmentation, Plant, and Small Mammal Succession in an Old Field. Ecological Monographs 70:383–400.

Unitt, Phillip
2004 San Diego County Bird Atlas. San Diego Natural History Museum & Ibis Publishing Company, San Diego. 645 pp.

Western Bat Working Group (WBWG)
2017 Western Bat Species. Website http://wbwg.org/western-bat-species/ [accessed 02 May 2017].

5.14 Paleontological Resources

San Diego Natural History Museum

2013 Paleontological Resource Assessment of Old Town San Diego and Midway-Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan Updates. October 14.

Deméré, T., and S. Walsh

1994 Paleontological Resources- County of San Diego. August.

San Diego, City of

2002 Paleontology Guidelines. July.

2016 California Environmental Quality Act Significance Determination Thresholds. Planning Department

Chapter 6 Cumulative Impacts

San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG)

2013 Series 13 Regional Growth Forecast. October. Available at: http://www.sandag.org/uploads/projectid/projectid_503_19239.pdf, accessed July 18, 2017.

Chapter 7 Other Mandatory Discussion Area

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (CDC)

1996 Open File Report 96-04. Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, Russell V. Miller. http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/index.html?map=mlc. Accessed on April 10, 2017.

2016 San Diego County Important Farmland 2014. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/Pages/SanDiego.aspx. Accessed on April 7, 2017.

California Natural Resources Agency

2009 California Environmental Quality Act, Appendix F – Energy Conservation. Revised 2009.

Chen Ryan Associates, Inc.

2017 Midway-Pacific Highway & Old Town Mobility Element Updates: Transportation Impact Study. May.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)

2017 Forest Service – Standard Map Products. https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/maps/standard-map.php. Accessed on April 7, 2017.

This page intentionally left blank.

10

Chapter 10.0
Individuals and Agencies Consulted

City of San Diego, Public Utilities Department

- Shelby Gilmartin, Assistant Engineer-Civil

San Diego Police Department

- Paul Connelly, Captain, Western Division

San Diego Unified School District, Instructional Facilities Planning Department

- Sarah Hudson, Demographer

This page intentionally left blank.

11

Chapter 11.0
Certification

This PEIR has been completed by the City of San Diego's Planning Department and is based on independent analysis and determinations made pursuant to the SDMC Section 128.0103. The following individuals contributed to the fieldwork and/or preparation of this report.

City of San Diego

Planning Department

- Alyssa Muto, Deputy Director, Environment and Policy Analysis Division
- Laura Black, AICP, Deputy Director, Long-Range Planning Division
- Tait Galloway, Program Manager
- Vickie White, Senior Planner
- Elizabeth Ocampo-Vivero, Senior Planner
- Myra Herrmann, Senior Environmental Planner
- Samir Hajjiri, PE, DCE, Senior Traffic Engineer
- Susan Morrison, AICP, Associate Environmental Planner
- Christine Mercado, Associate Traffic Engineer
- Meghan Cedeno, PE, Assistant Traffic Engineer
- Rebecca Malone, AICP, Senior Environmental Planner
- Alexander Frost, Senior Planner
- Kelley Stanco, Senior Historic Resources Planner
- Craig Hooker, Park Designer
- Robin Shifflet, Program Manager
- Kristen Forburger, Senior MSCP Planner
- Benjamin Hafertepe, Associate Management Analyst, Facilities Financing
- Angela Abeyta, Supervising Management Analyst, Facilities Financing

Development Services Department

- Jim Quinn, Senior Engineering Geologist, Geology
- Tamara Adams, Associate Engineer-Civil, Engineering
- Bill Prinz, Program Manager, Local Enforcement
- Mehdi Rastakhiz, Associate Engineer-Civil, Public Utilities

Environmental Services Department

- Lisa Wood, Senior Planner

Transportation and Storm Water Department

- Mark G. Stephens, AICP, Associate Planner

Police Department

- James Keck, Police Lieutenant

San Diego Fire-Rescue Department

- Larry Trame, Assistant Fire Marshal

PEIR Preparers

AECOM

- Yara Fisher, Principal Planner
- Bill Graham, Principal Planner
- Erin Murphey, Environmental Analyst
- Meghan Haggblade, Environmental Analyst
- Michael Anguiano, Biologist
- Chris Kaiser, Noise Specialist
- Sheila Madrak, Biologist
- Peter Augello, GIS
- Dan Brady, Graphics

Technical Appendices Preparers

Transportation Impact Study & Mobility Report – Chen Ryan

- Stephen C. Cook, PE, Principal
- Phuong H. Nguyen, Engineer
- Rona B. Quiambao, Engineer
- Andrew Prescott, Transportation Planner
- Aleksandar Jovanovic, GIS/Graphics

- Timmy Quach, Intern

Historic Resources Reconnaissance Survey: Historic Context & Survey Report – Galvin Preservation Associates Inc.

- Teresa Grimes, Principal Architectural Historian
- Nicole Collum, Architectural Historian
- Jennifer Krintz, Architectural Historian
- Elysha Dory, Architectural Historian

Prehistoric Cultural Resources Report – AECOM

- Rebecca Apple, MA, RPA
- Stacey Jordon-Connor, Ph.D., RPA
- Cheryl Bowden-Renna, Archaeologist
- Stephanie Jow, Archaeologist
- Andrew York, RPA

Seismic and Geologic Technical Background Report – Wilson Geosciences, Inc.

- Kenneth Wilson, Principal Geologist

Update of Seismic and Geologic Technical Background Report – AECOM

- Michael E. Hatch, Principal Engineering Geologist
- Kelly Giesing, Geotechnical Engineer

Noise Report – AECOM

- Mark Storm, INCE Bd. Cert., Principal Engineer, Acoustics and Noise Control
- Chris Kaiser, INCE, Senior Environmental Noise Specialist

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Technical Reports – AECOM

- Jason Paukovits, Air Quality Specialist
- Paola Pena, Air Quality Specialist

Hazardous Materials Technical Study – Ninyo & Moore

- Adrian Olivares, Senior Staff Environmental Scientist
- Stephan A. Beck, Manager, Environmental Sciences Division

Paleontological Resource Assessment – Department of PaleoServices, San Diego Natural History Museum

- Shelly L. Donohue, M.S. Paleontological Report Writer
- Thomas A. Deméré, Ph.D., Director

This page intentionally left blank.