Morena Corridor Specific Plan

Final Program Environmental Impact Report

Project No. 582608
SCH No. 2016101021
July 17, 2019

The Morena Corridor Specific Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report (Final PEIR) dated February 1, 2019, includes changes that were made to the document since the public review Draft PEIR dated August 1, 2018. These changes are shown in ~~strikeout~~/underline format. Subsequent to distribution of the Final PEIR, additional edits were made to correct factual inaccuracies or typographical errors, or to provide clarifying information in the Final PEIR that are described in these errata, as indicated below in ~~strikeout~~/underline format.

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15088.5, the addition of new information that clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modification does not require recirculation as there are no new impacts and no new mitigation identified. An environmental document need only be recirculated when there is identification of new significant environmental impacts or with the addition of a new mitigation measure required to avoid a significant environmental impact. These corrections do not result in any new physical effects and do not affect the conclusions of the environmental analysis contained within the Final PEIR. Therefore, in accordance with CEQA Section 15088.5, recirculation of the Final PEIR is not required.

Corrections:

1. In the Certification Pages, on page 2 of 8, the second paragraph of the Environmental Determination is revised as follows:

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 proposed project could result in significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of Transportation and Circulation (Roadway Segments, Intersections, and Freeway Segments),

Noise (Vehicle Traffic Noise, Temporary Construction Noise, Construction-related Vibration), Air Quality (Conflicts with Air Quality Plans, Air Quality Standards), Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources (Historic Resources, Archaeological Resources, and Tribal Cultural Resources), ~~Paleontological Resources (Ministerial Projects),~~ and Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character (Scenic Vistas or Views, Neighborhood Character). All other impacts analyzed in this Draft PEIR were found to be less than or not significant.

2. In Table S-1, the intersection mitigation measures on page S-8 are revised as follows:

TRANS 6.2-6: Morena Boulevard and Jellett Street (Impact 6.2-6) – Signalize the intersection or restrict left turn movements from Jellett Street onto Morena Boulevard. Subject to the approval of the City Engineer, a roundabout may be utilized in-lieu of signalization. This improvement project is proposed as part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan.

TRANS 6.2-7: Morena Boulevard and Savannah Street (Impact 6.2-7) – Signalize the intersection or restrict left turn movements from Savannah Street onto Morena Boulevard. Subject to the approval of the City Engineer, a roundabout may be utilized in lieu of signalization. This improvement project is proposed as part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan.

3. In Table S-1, within the Mitigation column for the Transportation and Circulation issue area, the following statement is added:

TRANS 6.2-4 and TRANS 6.2-6 have been added to the Morena Corridor Specific Plan as SDR-10, and TRANS 6.2-7 has been added as SDR-7.

4. Paleontological Resources is removed from Table S-1.

5. Section 1.5, the Scope of this PEIR, is revised as follows:

The scope of this PEIR was determined by the City's CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds, comments received in response to the NOP, and comments received at the public scoping meeting. Through these scoping activities, the proposed project was determined to have the potential to result in significant environmental impacts to the following subject areas:

- Land Use
- Transportation and Circulation
- Noise
- Air Quality
- Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources
- ~~Paleontological Resources~~
- Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Energy
- Health and Safety
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Geologic Conditions
- Public Services and Facilities
- Public Utilities

6. Section 3.3.5, Supplemental Development Regulations, is revised as follows:

3.3.5 Supplemental Development Regulations

Future development within the Specific Plan area would be required to demonstrate consistency with the existing provisions of the City of San Diego (City) Municipal Code (SDMC). However, the Specific Plan includes the following supplemental development regulations that would modify the development regulations of the applicable base zones in the SDMC within specific districts in the Linda Vista Community Plan area portion of the Specific Plan area as shown on Figure 3-1.

Supplemental Development Regulation (SDR)-1 would apply within all districts in the Morena Corridor Specific Plan area and would require that no building permits be issued for projects that generate more than 1,000 Average Daily Trips (ADTs) unless existing streets and related public facilities are improved to accommodate traffic generated by the project to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.

Within the Tecolote Village District and Morena Station District, SDR-2 through SDR-8 would apply. SDR-2 sets maximum building heights, SDR-3 requires primary building entrances front a public street, and SDR-4 requires noncontiguous sidewalks. SDR-5 disallows new drive-throughs, and SDR-6 outlines the calculation of residential density and floor area. SDR-7 requires installation of a traffic signal, restriction of left turn movements from Savannah Street onto Morena Boulevard, or proof no improvements are necessary, at the intersection of Morena Boulevard and Savannah Street prior to the issuance of any building permits in the Tecolote Village District and Morena Station District.

Finally, SDR-8 addresses the roadway extensions identified in the Morena Station District. SDR-8 prohibits new structures within the future roadway extension while allowing landscaping, parking facilities, or driveways prior to construction of the roadway extension. ~~the following development regulations would apply:~~

- ~~SDR-1, Structure Height. Maximum structure height shall be limited to 45 feet. Architectural projections may exceed this limit by 5 feet.~~
- ~~SDR-2, Building Entrances. Primary entrances shall front a public street.~~
- ~~SDR-3, Drive-Throughs. Commercial uses with a drive-through are not permitted. Properties with existing drive-through restaurants permitted on or before January 1, 2018 are exempt from this regulation and may be maintained or relocated on the same property.~~

- ~~SDR-4, Calculation of Residential Density. The calculation for residential density shall be based on gross site area including any dedication of right-of-way on any site where new public streets, parks, or linear parks are planned or will be constructed.~~

Within the Design District and Employment District, SDR-9 would apply, which sets a maximum structure height for the district. ~~the following development regulation would apply~~:

- ~~SDR-5. Structure Height. Maximum structure height shall be limited to 45 feet. Architectural projections may exceed this limit by 5 feet.~~

Within the Clairemont District, SDR-10 would apply which requires installation of traffic signals, restriction of left turn movements from Jellett Street onto Morena Boulevard or proof no improvements are necessary, at the intersection of Morena Boulevard and Jellett Street and the intersection of Clairemont Drive and East Mission Bay Drive prior to the issuance of any building permits in the Clairemont District.

Within the Tecolote Village District, SDR-11 would apply, which outlines what development is allowable through a Planned Development Permit. ~~the following development regulation would apply:~~

- ~~SDR-6. Within the Tecolote Village District as shown on Figure 8-2, allow the following through a Planned Development Permit for proposed mixed-use development:~~
  - ~~a. A maximum residential density of 109 acres per gross acre~~
  - ~~b. Maximum floor area ratio of 5.0.~~

Within the Morena Station District, SDR-12 would apply, which outlines what development is allowable through a Planned Development Permit.~~the following development regulation would apply:~~

- ~~SDR-7. Within the Morena Station District as shown on Figure 8-2, allow the following through a Planned Development Permit for proposed mixed-use development:~~
  - ~~a. A maximum residential density of 73 dwelling units per gross acre~~
  - ~~b. Maximum floor area ratio of 4.5.~~

7. Section 6.2.5, Mitigation Framework, is revised as follows:

6.2.5 Mitigation Framework

6.2.5.1 Traffic Circulation

A number of transportation impacts would result from implementation of the Specific Plan. This section identifies ~~mitigation measures~~ improvements that have been incorporated into the Specific Plan that ~~could reduce~~ would ensure that these impacts ~~to~~ would be less than significant. ~~; however,~~ Mitigation measures have also been ~~number of the mitigation measures~~ identified in this section that are not proposed for implementation as they would conflict with the overall mobility goals of the Specific Plan and affect the ability to implement multi-modal improvements identified in the Specific Plan.

a. Roadway Segments

While the following roadway segment mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts, none of the measures are proposed as part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan and associated discretionary actions.

TRANS 6.2-1: Clairemont Drive from I-5 NB Ramps to Denver Street (Impact 6.2-1): Widen this roadway to a 6-Lane Prime Arterial.

TRANS 6.2-2: Denver Street from Clairemont Drive to Ingulf Street (Impact 6.2-2): Restripe this roadway to a 2-Lane Collector with two-way left-turn lane.

TRANS 6.2-3: Morena Boulevard south of Linda Vista Road (Impact 6.3-3): Widen this roadway to a 6-Lane Prime Arterial.

b. Intersections

~~While the following intersection mitigation measures would reduce potentially significant impacts, only measures TRANS 6.2-4, TRANS 6.2-6 and TRANS 6.2-7 are proposed as part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan and associated discretionary actions.~~ During the course of environmental review, three intersection improvements were identified as feasible improvements that would reduce impacts to a less than significant level and have since therefore been incorporated into the Specific Plan as Supplemental Development Regulations (SDRs). These improvements were identified as:

TRANS 6.2-4: E. Mission Bay Drive and Clairemont Drive (Impact 6.2-4) – Signalize the intersection and restripe the northbound approach to include a dedicated right-turn lane. Subject to the approval of the City Engineer, a roundabout may be utilized in-lieu of signalization. This intersection is located outside the boundaries of the Specific Plan area; however, this improvement project is proposed as part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan.

~~**TRANS 6.2-5:** Denver Street and Clairemont Drive (Impact 6.2-5) – Widen the northbound approach to accommodate an additional northbound left-turn lane and widen the southbound approach to include an exclusive right-turn lane. This improvement project is not part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan.~~

TRANS 6.2-6: Morena Boulevard and Jellett Street (Impact 6.2-6) – Signalize the intersection or restrict left turn movements from Jellett Street onto Morena Boulevard. Subject to the approval of the City Engineer, a roundabout may be utilized in-lieu of signalization. This improvement project is proposed as part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan.

TRANS 6.2-7: Morena Boulevard and Savannah Street (Impact 6.2-7) – Signalize the intersection or restrict left turn movements from Savannah Street onto Morena Boulevard. Subject to the approval of the City Engineer, a roundabout may be utilized in lieu of signalization. This improvement project is proposed as part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan.

TRANS 6.2-4 and TRANS 6.2-6 have been added to the Morena Corridor Specific Plan as SDR-10, and TRANS 6.2-7 has been added as SDR-7. The SDRs are as follows:

SDR-7: Transportation Improvements. No building permits shall be issued in the Tecolote Village and Morena Station Districts for any development project until a traffic signal has been installed at the intersection of Morena Boulevard & Savannah Street or left turn movements have been restricted from Savannah Street onto Morena Boulevard, unless the warrants for a traffic signal are not met as determined by the City Engineer in accordance with Council Policy 200-06.

SDR-10: Transportation Improvements. No building permits shall be issued in the Clairemont District for any development project until the following transportation improvements are installed, unless the warrants for the traffic signals are not met as determined by the City Engineer in accordance with Council Policy 200-06:

- Installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Morena Boulevard & Jellett Street, or restriction of left turn movements from Jellett Street onto Morena Boulevard; and
- Installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of at the Clairemont Drive and E. Mission Bay Drive.

While the following mitigation measure would reduce potentially significant impacts, TRANS 6.2-5 is not included as part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan and associated discretionary actions.

TRANS 6.2-5: Denver Street and Clairemont Drive (Impact 6.2-5) – Widen the northbound approach to accommodate an additional northbound left-turn lane and widen the southbound approach to include an exclusive right-turn lane. This improvement project is not part of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan.

c. Freeway Segments

Freeway improvements are not within the authority of the City. The improvements identified in SANDAG's Regional Plan 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. 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. The following are the freeway mainline improvements identified in the SANDAG Regional Plan:

TRANS 6.2-8: I-5 NB and SB from Grand Avenue/Garnet Avenue to Old Town Avenue (Impact 6.2-8): The SANDAG San Diego Forward 2050 Revenue Constrained Network includes operational improvements and the construction of managed lanes along this segment. These improvements are anticipated to be implemented by the year 2050.

TRANS 6.2-9: I-8 EB from Morena Boulevard and Hotel Circle (Impact 6.2-9): The SANDAG San Diego Forward 2050 Revenue Constrained Network includes operational improvements

along this segment. These improvements are anticipated to be implemented by the year 2050.

d. Ramp Meters

TRANS 6.2-10: The City of San Diego shall coordinate with Caltrans to address ramp capacity at impacted on-ramp locations. Improvements could include additional lanes, interchange reconfigurations, Transportation Demand Management (TDM), etc.; 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 proposed project 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 (Impacts 6.2-10 and 6.2-11).

6.2.5.2 Alternative Transportation

As no significant impact to alternative transportation would occur, no mitigation is required.

6.2.6 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation

6.2.6.1 Traffic Circulation

While implementation of the improvements identified above would reduce impacts to less than significant at many of the intersections and roadway segments, only ~~mitigation measures~~ intersection improvements TRANS 6.2-4, TRANS 6.2-6, and TRANS 6.2-7 are included within the proposed Morena Corridor Specific Plan as SDR-7 and SDR-10. ~~and Impact Fee Study (IFS). There is no funding mechanism for the remaining measures not included within the IFS.~~ Additionally, implementation of the roadway segment and intersection measures not included within the Specific Plan ~~proposed IFS~~ would be inconsistent with the mobility goals of the proposed Morena Corridor Specific Plan, ~~and~~ the General Plan, and the City's Climate Action Plan.

~~Due to the programmatic nature of the proposed project and associated discretionary actions, there is uncertainty as to the specific phasing of development including actual design and specific location of future projects.~~ The ultimate design of identified ~~mitigation~~ improvements represents the design required to reduce potential impacts at build-out of the Specific Plan area, and the effectiveness at the project-level is not known at this time. Future discretionary development projects and other future implementing actions 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 the majority of the impacted intersections and roadway segments would remain significant and unavoidable.

Likewise, impacts to Caltrans facilities (freeway segments and metered on-ramps, Impacts 6.2-8 through 6.2-11) 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.

After implementation of ~~mitigation measures~~ intersection improvements identified as TRANS 6.2-4, TRANS 6.2-6, and TRANS 6.2-7, which have been included in the Specific Plan as SDR-7 and SDR-10, the potentially significant impacts to the following intersections would be reduced to less than significant:

- Impact 6.2-4: Intersection #1: E. Mission Bay Drive & Clairemont Drive
- Impact 6.2-6: Intersection #8: Morena Boulevard & Jellett Street
- Impact 6.2-7: Intersection #14: Morena Boulevard & Savannah Street

All of the remaining transportation/circulation impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

6.2.6.2 Alternative Transportation

As no significant impact to alternative transportation would occur, no mitigation is required and impacts would be less than significant.

8. The Impact Analysis in Section 6.6, Paleontological Resources, is revised as follows:

Issue 1 Paleontological Resources

Would implementation or the proposed 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, which are nonrenewable resources, impacts of activities that excavate or grade geologic formations that could contain fossil resources would be significant. The Specific Plan area is underlain by the following geologic formations which have high paleontological resource sensitivity: Unnamed Marine Terrace Deposits, Ardath Shale, Scripps Formation, and the San Diego Formation. The westernmost portion of the Specific Plan area along the existing railroad corridor and south of Napa Street around the Morena/Linda Vista Trolley Station are underlain by artificial fill materials largely derived from earlier construction activities with no potential for paleontological resources.

Future development projects implemented under the proposed Specific Plan that would 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 could also result in a

significant impact. While much of the Specific Plan area is underlain by artificial fill with no potential to uncover paleontological resources, the above-mentioned formations have high resource sensitivity where fossils could be uncovered during future construction-related activities. Buildout of future projects would likely result in a certain amount of disturbance to the native bedrock within the Specific Plan area. Pursuant to SDMC Section 142.0151, all future development is required to screen for grading quantities and geologic formation sensitivity and apply appropriate requirements for paleontological monitoring. Implementation of the General Grading Guidelines for Paleontological Resources, as required by the San Diego Municipal Code, would ensure that impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

~~Grading associated with future development projects implemented in accordance with the Specific Plan that involve excavation into underlying geological formations could expose these formations and associated fossil remains. Disturbance of these geologic formations during grading activities for future development could destroy paleontological resources if the fossil remains are not recovered and salvaged. In addition, future projects proposing shallow grading where sensitive formations may be exposed would also result in a significant impact. Thus, impacts resulting from future discretionary construction-related activities into high sensitivity formations would be potentially significant (Impact 6.6-1).~~

~~Buildout of future ministerial projects implemented in accordance with the Specific Plan would likely result in a certain amount of disturbance to the native bedrock within the Specific Plan 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 within the Specific Plan area would be potentially significant (Impact 6.6-2).~~

~~**Impact 6.6-1:** 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, or grading in excess of 2,000 cubic yards, extending to a depth of 10 feet or greater, into moderate sensitivity formations could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.~~

~~**Impact 6.6-2:** 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 or grading in excess of 2,000 cubic yards, extending to a depth of 10 feet or greater, into moderate sensitivity formations could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.~~

Cumulative Analysis

Development allowed pursuant to the Specific Plan combined with development within the surrounding community and within the City could involve excavation of previously undisturbed geologic formations, some of which may contain 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 within the Specific Plan 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. As mentioned above, pursuant to SDMC Section 142.0151, all future development is required to screen for grading quantities and geologic formation sensitivity and apply appropriate requirements for paleontological monitoring. Implementation of the General Grading Guidelines for Paleontological Resources, as required by the San Diego Municipal Code, would ensure that cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant. ~~However, there is only a mechanism to apply the mitigation framework to discretionary projects, not ministerial projects. Thus, within the Specific Plan area and the remainder of the City, significant impacts to paleontological resources could occur associated with grading for ministerial projects. Similar to the General Plan PEIR, buildout of ministerial projects within the Specific Plan area would result in a significant cumulative impact to paleontological resources (Impact 6.6-2).~~

6.6.4 Significance of Impacts

SDMC Section 142.0151 requires all future development to screen for grading quantities and geologic formation sensitivity and apply appropriate requirements for paleontological monitoring. Implementation of the General Grading Guidelines for Paleontological Resources, as required by the San Diego Municipal Code, would ensure that direct and cumulative impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

~~Because of the high sensitivity for paleontological resources within the Unnamed Marine Terrace Deposits, Ardath Shale, Scripps Formation, and the San Diego Formation, grading into these formations could potentially destroy fossil resources. Therefore, implementation of future discretionary and ministerial projects within the Specific Plan area that are located on these formations has the potential to result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.~~

6.6.5 Mitigation Framework

Impacts related to paleontological resources would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.

~~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 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 Impact 6.6-1 to a less than significant level.~~

~~PALEO 6.6-1 Paleontological Review and Monitoring~~

~~Prior to the approval of subsequent discretionary development projects implemented in accordance with the Morena Corridor Specific Plan, 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 Report Program shall be implemented during construction grading activities.~~

~~6.6.6 Significance of Impacts after Mitigation~~

~~All future discretionary projects that would occur as a result of the proposed project would be required to comply with mitigation measure PALEO 6.6-1. Implementation of mitigation measure PALEO 6.6-1 would reduce paleontological impacts associated with future discretionary development to below a level of significance.~~

~~Future ministerial projects proposed in conformance with the proposed project would also likely result in a certain amount of disturbance to the native bedrock within the project 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, direct and cumulative impacts related to future ministerial development that would occur with development of the proposed project (Impact6.6-2) would remain significant and unavoidable.~~

9. The second paragraph on page 8-2 is revised as follows:

The proposed project serves as a comprehensive long-term plan for the physical development of the Specific Plan area, and is intended to manage and address future growth within the Specific Plan area. The current population within the Specific Plan area is estimated to be 2,659 residents and 10,155 employees. Under the adopted Clairemont Mesa and Linda Vista community plans, build-out within the Specific Plan area is estimated to result in a population of approximately 3,930 residents and 10,922 employees. With the proposed project, the population would increase within the ~~Linda Vista Community~~ Specific Plan area to an estimated ~~14,000~~ 18,737 residents and ~~4,181~~ 12,873 employees at full build-out.

10. The first paragraph on page 9-1 is revised as follows:

In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (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 Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). For the proposed Morena Corridor Specific Plan and associated discretionary actions (collectively referred to as the "Specific Plan;" or the "proposed project"), impacts to Transportation and Circulation, Noise, Air Quality, Historic and Tribal Cultural Resources, ~~Paleontological Resources,~~ and Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character would remain significant and unavoidable. All other significant impacts identified in Sections 6.1 through 6.14 of this PEIR can be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of the identified mitigation framework and through compliance with the adopted General Plan and Clairemont Mesa and Linda Vista Community Plan policies.

11. The first paragraph on p. 9-3 is revised as follows:

~~**Paleontological Resources**~~

~~Impact 6.6-2: 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 or grading in excess of 2,000 cubic yards, extending to a depth of 10 feet or greater, into moderate sensitivity formations could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.~~

12. The second paragraph of Ch 10.0, Alternatives, has been revised as follows:

As discussed in Chapter 6.0, implementation of the Morena Corridor Specific Plan and the associated discretionary actions (collectively referred to as the "Specific Plan"; or the proposed project) would result in significant and/or cumulative environmental impacts related to transportation and circulation, noise, air quality, historical and tribal cultural resources, ~~paleontological resources,~~ and visual effects and neighborhood character.

13. Table 10-2 has been revised as follows:

Table 10-2
Alternatives Comparison to the Proposed Project

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project	No Project/ Adopted Plan Alternative	Mid-Density Land Use Plan Alternative	Low-Density Land Use Plan Alternative
Land Use	LS	LS (<)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Transportation and Circulation	SU	SU (<)	SU (<)	SU (<)
Noise	SU	SU (=)	SU (=)	SU (=)
Air Quality	SU	LS (<)	SU (<)	SU (<)
Historical and Tribal Cultural Resources	SU	SU (<)	SU (=)	SU (=)
Paleontological Resources	~~SU~~ LS	~~SU~~ LS (<)	~~SU~~ LS (=)	~~SU~~ LS (=)
Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character	SU	LS (<)	SU (=)	SU (<)
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LS	SU (>)	LS (=)	LS (>)
Energy	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Health and Safety	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Hydrology and Water Quality	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Geologic Conditions	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Public Services and Facilities	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)
Public Utilities	LS	LS (=)	LS (=)	LS (=)

Notes: SU = Significant and Unavoidable; LS = Less than Significant;
(=) Impacts the same/similar to the proposed project; (<) Impacts less than the proposed project; (>) Impacts greater than the proposed project.

14. The first paragraph on p. 10-4 has been revised as follows:

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 Specific Plan are

provided in the following subsections. Only issue areas where the proposed project analysis identified significant and unavoidable impacts or issues where the alternatives would alter the significance of the impact as identified for the proposed project are further analyzed below. ~~Although the PEIR analysis found the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to the issue of paleontological resources, all of the project alternatives would have the potential to result in significant and unavoidable impacts for this issue area; thus, it is not discussed further in the alternatives analysis.~~