3.5 HEALTH AND SAFETY

3.5.1 Existing Conditions

Hazardous Materials

Hazardous materials are used in San Diego for a variety of purposes including maintenance and operations at airfields and waterfront ports, manufacturing, service industries, various small businesses, agriculture, medical uses, schools, and households.

Hazardous Materials Handlers/Generators

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 of San Diego are monitored by the United States (U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Small quantity hazardous waste generators include facilities such as automotive repair, dry cleaners, and medical offices.

San Diego County Area Plan

The County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division established the San Diego County Area Plan (Area Plan) based on requirements of Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code, Title 19 of the California Code of Regulations and the United States (U.S.) Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act Title III for emergency response to a release or threatened release of a hazardous material within the County. The Hazardous Materials Program and Response Plan contained in the Area Plan serves the majority of the cities in San Diego County, including the City of San Diego.

As part of the Area Plan, the Federal Risk Management Plan (RMP), as incorporated and modified by the State of California Accidental Release Prevention (CalARP) program, is designed to prevent harm to people and the surrounding environment by the use of various organized systems to identify and manage hazards. The goal of the CalARP program is to make all facilities that handle regulated substances free of catastrophic incidents.

Any stationary source (business) that exceeds the threshold quantities of regulated substances is required to submit a RMP under the CalARP program. A Business Emergency Plan (BEP) must be submitted by all businesses that handle hazardous materials over a designated threshold quantity. Upon completion of a BEP, the BEP is submitted to San Diego's local Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA). The CUPA with responsibility for the City of San Diego is the County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. A BEP contains vital information that may be utilized to minimize the effects and extent of a threatened release of hazardous materials. In addition, this information allows emergency response personnel to determine potential risks and hazards while developing a strategy for handling an emergency involving hazardous material. Annually submitted RMPs are currently reviewed by the County Environmental Health Department.

If a hazardous materials emergency occurred within the City of San Diego, the first response would be from the San Diego Fire-Rescue Department and the County of San Diego Hazardous Incident Response Team (HIRT), located within the City of San Diego.

Leaking Underground Storage Tanks

According to the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) database (LUST, 2006), 32 LUST tanks have been identified within the Draft General Plan planning area. These cases remain open and are currently being assessed. The majority of these tanks have leaked gasoline, and the remaining has leaked diesel and/or waste oil. The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health also maintains a list of open and closed sites on their website.

Oil and Gas Wells

According to the State Department of Conservation's Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) database, 21 idle wells and 12 plugged and abandoned oil or gas wells have been identified with the Draft General Plan planning area as shown in Figure 3.5-1. DOGGR also maintains a list and maps oil and gas wells on their website. The state defines an idle well as a well that has not produced oil and/or gas or has not been used for fluid injection for six consecutive months during the last five years. Plugged and abandoned wells are wells that have ceased oil or gas production and have been sealed with a concrete plug.

Transportation of Hazardous Materials

Hazardous materials pass through the City via the freeway, rail and surface street system. Interstates 5 (I-5), 805, 8, and 15, and State Highways 56, 52, 94, 163, and 905 pass through the City. The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe railway runs generally parallel to I-5. While train derailment can occur at anytime, it is during an earthquake that a derailment and hazardous materials release would pose the greatest risk. The major automotive transportation routes through the City include the freeways above, as well as dozens of major arterial roads dispersed across the City.

The City has no direct authority to regulate the transport of hazardous materials on state highways or rail lines. Transportation of hazardous materials by truck and rail is regulated by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). The DOT regulations establish criteria for safe handling procedures. Federal safety standards are also included in the California Administrative Code. The California Health Services Department regulates the haulers of hazardous waste.

Flooding

Urbanization involving buildings, pavement, roofs, and generally any new impervious surface increases the amount of water runoff entering local drainage systems. Rainfall that might otherwise have been absorbed by vegetation and soil and cleansed through the natural filtration process is free to flow over the solid surface. Hence, urbanization has the potential to further

increase the frequency and occurrence of flooding because of increases in peak flow velocities and volumes.

San Diego often experiences prolonged dry periods, punctuated by infrequent wet periods of a one- to two-year duration. **Table 3.5-1** shows the average yearly rainfall, based on a water year (October-September), for 1964 thru 2005. The average yearly rainfall in coastal San Diego areas is 10.3 inches per year. A wet year is defined as having a yearly average above 10.3 inches. Much of the development in the San Diego region has taken place during the extended dry periods. Residential development has occurred within many of the region's natural watersheds. This construction directly increases the potential for flood damage.

Table 3.5-1
Average Yearly Rainfall in San Diego

Year	Average Yearly Rainfall (inches)	Year	Average Yearly Rainfall (inches)	Year	Average Yearly Rainfall (inches)
1964	5.2	1978	17.3	1992	12.5
1965	8.8	1979	14.9	1993	18.3
1966	14.8	1980	15.6	1994	9.9
1967	10.9	1981	8.1	1995	17.1
1968	7.9	1982	11.9	1996	5.2
1969	11.5	1983	18.5	1997	8.7
1970	6.2	1984	5.4	1998	20.9
1971	8.0	1985	9.6	1999	6.5
1972	6.1	1986	14.6	2000	15.8
1973	11.0	1987	9.3	2001	8.8
1974	6.6	1988	12.4	2002	3.4
1975	10.6	1989	5.9	2003	10.2
1976	10.1	1990	7.6	2004	5.3
1977	9.2	1991	12.3	2005	22.8

Source: SDCWA 2006

Federal Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, was issued in 1997. The major requirements of this order are to discourage 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 (NFIP). The NFIP program provides federal flood insurance and federally financed loans for property owners in flood prone areas. To qualify for federal flood insurance, the City must identify flood hazard areas and implement a system of protective controls. The City of San Diego participates in the NFIP, which is administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and as required by the program's regulations, has adopted and enforces its own floodplain development ordinance.

FEMA has outlined the floodplains for the major water bodies in the region. This designation is determined by predicting the amount of discharge associated with a 100-year flood. A 100-year flood has a one percent probability of occurrence in any given year. A map of FEMA Special Flood Hazard Zones, floodplains, or other areas prone to flooding with the City of San Diego is depicted on **Figure 3.5-2**.

The City of San Diego owns and maintains nine reservoirs in the region: Barrett, El Capitan, Hodges, Lower Otay, Upper Otay, Miramar, Murray, San Vicente, and Sutherland. Should a dam at these reservoirs fail during a major seismic event, there would likely be severe loss of life or property downstream. The potential for dam failure has been evaluated at each of the City-operated dams, and all have been found to be capable of resisting seismic damage (county of San Diego 1991). Nevertheless, failure could potentially occur, and affected areas would be similar to natural floodplains. Specific areas which could be affected by dam inundation are illustrated on **Figure 3.5-2**. Major water bodies located in proximity to potential target areas for the Draft General Plan include the San Diego Bay, Mission Bay, Otay River, Los Penasquitos Lagoon, Tecolote Creek, and Lake Hodges (SANGIS, 2004). In addition, the San Diego, Otay, Tijuana, and San Dieguito rivers can experience flooding that impact roadways and vehicular circulation. Flooding typically affects local streets and roads, but some regional arterials are also impacted.

Wildland Fires

Due to climate, topography, and native vegetation, the City of San Diego is subject to both wildland and urban fires. In October 2003, over 28,000 acres of the City of San Diego (12 percent of City acreage) between the communities of Scripps Ranch and Tierrasanta burned in what was known as the Cedar Fire. Approximately 335 structures, mostly single-family homes, were destroyed and another 71 structures were damaged. In June 1985, a wildfire started and raced up the canyon hillsides of the dense mid-city neighborhood of Normal Heights, destroying 76 homes and damaging dozens more. These fires revealed the severity of the risk of wildland fires and the devastation that can result.

The extended droughts characteristic of the region's Mediterranean climate result in large areas of dry vegetation that provide fuel for wildland fires. The most critical times of year for wildland fires are late summer and fall when Santa Ana winds bring hot, dry desert air into the region. The air temperature quickly dries vegetation, thereby increasing the amount of natural fuel. Development pressures increase the threat of wildland fire on human populations and property as development is located adjacent to areas of natural vegetation.

Figure 3.5-3 depicts the areas of the City which are within a High Fire Hazard Area. For residents in these areas, wildfire is a potential hazard. The urbanized portions of the City are also subject to structural fires. The San Diego Fire-Rescue Department is responsible for the preparation, maintenance, and execution of Fire Preparedness and Management Plans. In the event of a large wildfire within or threatening City limits, they could be assisted by the California Department of Forestry, Federal Fire Department, or other local fire department jurisdictions.

Emergency Preparedness

Local Emergency Operations Plans are intended to help local jurisdictions respond to emergency situations with a coordinated system of emergency service providers and facilities. San Diego recently updated its 1995 Multi-Hazard Functional Plan and modernized its Emergency Operations Center (EOC). The City will continue to make regular modifications to these in the future as hazards, threats, population and land use, or other factors change. The plan identifies resources available for emergency response and establishes coordinated action plans for specific emergency situations including earthquake, fire, major rail and roadway accidents, flooding, hazardous materials incidents, terrorism and civil disturbances.

San Diego places a high priority on public disaster education. Citizens are provided a range of emergency management training, including FEMA Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) training, emergency preparedness workshops, disaster presentations at schools, CPR, first aid training, and terrorism awareness training. CERT, organized through the San Diego Fire-Rescue Department, is comprised of volunteers who are trained to assist during times of emergency.

The response phase includes increased readiness, initial response and extended response activities. During an emergency response, the City would generally coordinate activities through its EOC. County, state and federal emergency response resources are located within San Diego and are available to assist the EOC if a situation demanded additional support. The EOC is manned 24 hours a day by both public safety and other City personnel to coordinate emergency response activities. Recovery activities involve restoration of services and returning the affected area to pre-emergency conditions as soon as practical. Recovery activities range from restoring water and power to providing information to the public regarding state and federal disaster assistance programs. Mitigation efforts occur both before and after emergencies or disasters. Mitigation includes eliminating or reducing the likelihood of future emergencies.

Aircraft Hazards

San Diego International Airport, Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, Brown Field Municipal Airport, and Montgomery Field Municipal Airport are located within the City of San Diego, Tijuana International Airport, Gillespie Field, Naval Air Station North Island, and Naval Outlying Field Imperial Beach are located adjacent to the City of San Diego, but have the potential to affect land use and people within the City as shown on **Figure 3.5-4**.

San Diego International Airport (SDIA) at Lindbergh Field is the commercial air carrier airport serving the region and is located adjacent to downtown San Diego. Primarily commercial air carrier aircraft with a limited number of cargo, general aviation corporate jet, and military aircraft use SDIA totaling over 210,000 flights per year. It is the busiest single-runway airport in the nation. In 2005, SDIA served 17.4 million passengers and handled 188,000 tons of air cargo. The Airport Authority has forecasted that by 2015 there could be 22.8 million annual passengers using SDIA. The forecast also indicates that the demand for air travel will increase beyond 2015; SDIA will be constrained by the capacity of its single runway at 2015. Although various industrial, commercial, and residential uses surround the airport, residential is the primary use and the most affected by the airport due to be located in the City's urban center. The San Diego

County Regional Airport Authority (Airport Authority) as the operator of SDIA is currently in the process of preparing an updated airport master plan to increase the number of gates, terminal space, vehicle and aircraft parking, and surface access. It does not include increasing runway capacity.

Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar, which is located north of Kearny Mesa and south of Mira Mesa, operates a mixture of jet fighter, transport, and helicopter aircraft. Military readiness requires constant training which includes touch and goes (takeoffs and landings with a close-in circuit around the airport), aircraft carrier simulated landings, practice instrument approaches, and normal departures to and arrivals from other installations or training areas.

Brown Field and Montgomery Field municipal airports provide business, corporate, training, and charter aviation services that support commercial and industrial activities within the region for propeller and jet powered aircraft and helicopters. They serve as locations for public safety and law enforcement agencies to provide services to the region. Both airports help to relieve general aviation congestion at SDIA. Brown Field is a port of entry for private aircraft coming from Mexico. The City has issued a request for qualifications to develop and operator a fixed base operator or other related aviation business on Brown Field adjacent to Otay Mesa Road.

Brown Field is located in Otay Mesa near the border with Mexico, and is rapidly developing from an undeveloped mesa to an industrial, commercial, and residential community. Montgomery Field is located in Kearny Mesa which primarily contains industrial and commercial uses. Adjacent to Kearny Mesa are the residential communities of Serra Mesa, Tierrasanta, Linda Vista, and Clairemont Mesa. The City is in the process of updating the Montgomery Field Airport Master Plan.

Military aircraft operations at Naval Air Station (NAS) North Island and Naval Outlying Field (NOLF) Imperial Beach primarily use the airspace over the Pacific Ocean and the San Diego Bay, but have the potential to fly over land within the City of San Diego. The primary traffic pattern for helicopters training at NOLF Imperial Beach is along the Tijuana River Valley and then offshore. NAS North Island is located in the city of Coronado with a small portion within the City of San Diego tidelands and operates a mixture of jet fighter, transport, and helicopter aircraft. NOLF Imperial Beach is located in the city of Imperial Beach with a small portion within the City of San Diego and serves as a training area for helicopter aircraft.

The Tijuana International Airport (TIJ) at Rodriquez Field is the commercial air carrier airport serving the Tijuana, Baja California region and is located in Mexico adjacent to the U.S.-Mexico border south of the Otay Mesa community. It provides services to commercial passenger air carrier, cargo, and general aviation aircraft. TIJ air traffic is directed to fly within Mexican airspace, but there is the potential for over flights that could affect land use and people within the City of San Diego. Gillespie Field is located in the city of El Cajon and operates general aviation aircraft which have a potential to affect land use and people in the City of San Diego west of the airport.

Existing Policies and Regulations

The state requires that the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority Board, as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), prepare Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for each public-use airport and military air installation in San Diego County. Prior to 2003, the San Diego Association of Governments served as the ALUC and adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plans (CLUPs) for SDIA, MCAS/NAS Miramar, Brown Field Municipal Airport, and Montgomery Field Municipal Airport within the City as well as Gillespie Field in El Cajon, McClellan-Palomar in Carlsbad, and Oceanside Municipal in Oceanside.

In 2003, the Airport Authority was designated by the state as the ALUC for the county. In October 2004, the Airport Authority adopted amendments to the CLUPs and as part renamed them to Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs). NAS North Island and NOLF Imperial Beach do not have adopted ALUCPs. In 2005, the Airport Authority released draft ALUCPs for all airports within the county. In 2006, the Airport Authority adopted ALUCPs for the airports in the unincorporated area of the county. Currently, the Airport Authority is in the process of revising the draft ALUCPs for the airports within and adjacent to the City with a target adoption of 2008. Since the revised draft ALUCPs for the airports within and adjacent to the City have not yet been prepared, the Draft General Plan EIR analysis is based on the adopted ALUCPs currently in place. Since the state requires that the ALUC adopt ALUCPs for airports within San Diego County, the Airport Authority is not drafting an ALUCP for the Tijuana International Airport.

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 for each airport over a 20-year horizon. **Figure 3.5-4** shows the airport influence area for each airport in the City. The 20-year horizon is based on information contained in a master plan or layout plan for an airport. Since the ALUC does not have land use authority, the City implements the ALUCPs through land use plans (General Plan, community plans, and specific plans), development regulations, and zoning ordinances.

When an ALUCP is amended or updated, the City, as the land use jurisdiction, is required to submit the land use plans that are within an airport influence area to the ALUC for a consistency determination. At the same time, when an action is proposed to amend or update a land use plan, airport plan (master plan or layout plan), development regulation, and/or zoning ordinance (rezone) within an airport-influence area, the City is required to submit these actions to the ALUC for a consistency determination prior to adoption of the action. The City can revise the proposed action to meet determination made by the ALUC or the City Council may overrule their determination by a two-thirds vote if it makes specific findings that the proposed action is consistent with the purposes of protecting public heath, safety, and welfare, minimizing the public's exposure to excessive noise, and minimizing safety hazards within areas surrounding the airport. Section 3.10 of this EIR addresses aircraft noise.

The City implements the adopted ALUCPs with the Airport Environs Overlay Zone (AEOZ). The AEOZ boundaries cover less area than the boundaries of the airport influence area. As such, the City is submitting discretionary projects within the airport influence area for each airport in the City with an adopted ALUCP to the ALUC for consistency determinations. The City is also

in discussions with the Airport Authority regarding the types of ministerial projects within the airport influence area which should be submitted to the ALUC for consistency determinations. The City will submit development projects up until the time when the ALUC adopts the updated ALUCPs and subsequently determines that the City's affected land use plans are consistent with the ALUCPs. After which time, the City will only submit proposed amendments or updates to land use plans, airport plans, development regulations, and zoning ordinances within an adopted airport-influence area prior to final City Council approval as required by state law.

The adopted ALUCPs, with the exception of MCAS Miramar, do identify Runway Protection Zones (RPZs) (also referred to as flight activity zones). The RPZs are a trapezoidal area off the end of a runway end that serves to enhance the protection of people and property on the ground in the event an aircraft lands or crashes beyond the runway end. The RPZ for SDIA, Montgomery Field, and Brown Field are shown on **Figures 3.5-5, 3.5-6, and 3.5-7**. The size of the RPZ for each runway is determined by established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) criteria. For RPZ that include non-airport property, the ALUCPs do identify compatible uses in the RPZs that are consistent with FAA guidelines for compatible land uses in a RPZ.

The adopted ALUCP for MCAS Miramar identifies Accident Potential Zones (APZs). The APZs are those areas that military aircraft routinely over fly that have higher potential for an aircraft accident or crash to occur. For MCAS Miramar, the APZs are incorporated in the adopted ALUCP from the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) study published by the United States Navy in 1977 and updated in 1992. The size and location of the APZs are determined by Department of the Navy criteria. The APZs used by the adopted ALUCP currently in place affect property located off the MCAS Miramar property in the Mira Mesa, Torrey Pines and University communities as shown on **Figure 3.5-6**. The adopted ALUCP for MCAS Miramar identifies compatible uses and provides a safety land use/compatibility matrix criteria for future uses proposed in the APZs. The City uses the APZ boundaries to implement the safety land use/compatibility matrix criteria in the community plans for Mira Mesa, Torrey Pines, and University and the AEOZ.

In 2005, the United States Marine Corps released an updated AICUZ study for MCAS Miramar, which contains updated APZ boundaries, as shown on **Figure 3.5-8**, and a safety land use/compatibility matrix. The matrix in the AICUZ study shows the land use compatibility criteria for proposed development projects within APZs. The federal government has Restrictive Use Easements (RUE) on property adjacent to MCAS Miramar that serve to limit the type and intensity of development as shown on **Figure 3.5-8**. Any proposed development requires adherence to specific RUE development conditions and should not be undertaken without concurrence from the United States Marine Corps.

As directed by state law, the Airport Authority will be incorporating the revised APZs into the updated ALUCP for MCAS Miramar. The Navy is also in the process of updating the AICUZ studies for NAS North Island and NOLF Imperial Beach. When published by the Navy, the Airport Authority will also be incorporating the APZs into the new ALUCPs for NAS North Island and NOLF Imperial Beach. **Figure 3.5-5** shows the APZs from the current 1984 AICUZ study for NAS North Island. **Figure 3.5-7** shows the APZs from the current 1989 AICUZ study for NOLF Imperial Beach.

Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 77, Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, establishes imaginary surfaces for airports and runways as a means to identify objects that are obstructions to air navigation. The FAA uses Part 77 and Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS) obstruction standards as elevations above which structures may constitute a safety problem. The Part 77 regulations require that anyone proposing to construct an object, which could affect the navigable airspace around an airport using the Part 77 notification criteria as shown in Table 3.5-2, submit information about the proposed construction to the FAA. Of the criteria listed in Table 3.5-2, proposed projects that exceed an imaginary 100:1 surface within 20,000 feet of a civilian or military airport or have a height exceeding 200 feet above ground level are the two of the more typical notification criteria that require project applicants to notify the FAA. For illustration purposes, **Figure 3.5-9** shows the imaginary 100:1 surface within 20,000 feet of a civilian or military airport that would affect land use in the City.
Any proposed project having a height exceeding 200 feet above ground level at any location is required to notify the FAA.

When notified, the FAA then conducts an aeronautical study, the outcome of which is a determination as to whether the object would be a potential hazard to air navigation. The FAA examines the TERPS surfaces for obstructions and safety issues as part of the obstruction evaluation for a proposed project. If the proposed object is concluded to pose a hazard, the FAA may object to its construction and issue a determination of a hazard to air navigation, examine possible revisions of the proposal to eliminate the problem, require that the project be appropriately marked and lighted as an airspace obstruction, and/or initiate changes to the aircraft flight procedures for the airport so as to account for the object. In addition to structures that pose an airspace obstruction, land uses that create wildlife hazards, particularly related to birds, and land use characteristics that create visual or electronic interference with air navigation can create particular hazards to air navigation.

Table 3.5-2
Summary of the Part 77 Notification Criteria

- Any construction or alteration exceeding 200 ft above ground level
- Any construction or alteration:
  - within 20,000 ft of a public use or military airport which exceeds a 100:1 surface from any point on the runway of each airport with at least one runway more than 3,200 ft.
  - within 10,000 ft of a public use or military airport which exceeds a 50:1 surface from any point on the runway of each airport with its longest runway no more than 3,200 ft.
  - within 5,000 ft of a public use heliport which exceeds a 25:1 surface.
- Any highway, railroad or other traverse way whose prescribed adjusted height would exceed that above noted standards.
- When requested by the FAA.
- Any construction or alteration located on a public use airport or heliport regardless of height or location.

Source: FAA, Code Federal Regulations Title 14 Part 77.13

The FAA does not have the authority to prevent the encroachment; however, state law can prevent the encroachment if the FAA has made a determination of hazard to air navigation by requiring that project applicant obtain a permit from the California Department of Transportation. If the FAA has made a determination of hazard to air navigation, the ALUC requires that the project be submitted for a consistency determination with the applicable ALUCP.

Although the Part 77 imaginary surfaces for determining obstructions are incorporated into the adopted ALUCPs, the imaginary surfaces extend beyond the adopted airport influence area shown in the ALUCPs projects that FAA determines to be a hazard to air navigation. The Airport Authority, serving as the ALUC, has indicated that the updated ALUCPs will include the extent of the Part 77 imaginary surfaces in the revised airport influence area.

For property surrounding SDIA, the City has adopted the Airport Approach Overlay Zone (AAOZ). The AAOZ provides supplemental regulations that help to ensure that: the FAA obstruction evaluation program and state law is being satisfied; the Airport Authority is provided the opportunity to participate in the evaluation process conducted by the FAA and the California Department of Transportation; and minimum vertical buffers are provided between the FAA-established approach path and structures constructed within the Airport Approach Overlay Zone.

3.5.2 Thresholds of Significance

A significant impact could occur if implementation of the General Plan:

- Exposes people or sensitive receptors to potential health hazards (e.g., exposing sensitive receptors to hazardous materials in Industrial areas or pesticides in areas of previous agricultural uses);
- Exposes 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;
- Exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including as a result of dam or levee failure;
- Exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow;
- Exposes people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from aircraft operations accidents; or,
- Impairs implementation of, or physically interferes with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

3.5.3 Impact Analysis

Could implementation of the Draft General Plan expose people or sensitive receptors to potential health hazards (e.g., exposing sensitive receptors to hazardous materials in Industrial areas or pesticides in areas of previous agricultural uses)?

Implementation of the Draft General Plan will result in development of new residential, commercial, and industrial land uses in selected areas, which are or will be identified in community plans throughout the plan area. In recognition of the potential risks associated with

hazardous materials, similar to existing City policies and regulations, the plan includes policies that direct the City to minimize risks associated with use of hazardous materials, to enforce zoning regulations applicable to businesses that use or manufacture hazardous materials, to monitor neighboring land uses for incompatibility, and to comply with existing federal, state, and county regulations regarding hazardous waste management.

The Draft General Plan allows for collocation of residential and industrial uses, which could expose sensitive receptors in residential areas to hazardous materials produced by industrial operations. This is a potentially significant impact. Conversion/Collocation Sustainability Factors (Appendix C of the Draft General Plan) address where residential and employment uses may be appropriately mixed. These factors include area character, transit availability, impacts on prime industrial land, significant residential components, residential support facilities, airport land use compatibility, public health, public facilities and adequate separation of uses which includes a maximum 1000-foot distance separation between industrial and residential properties or other sensitive receptor land uses with regard to hazardous or toxic air contaminants or hazardous or toxic substances. Sensitive receptors are described in the Draft General Plan as "land uses including residential, schools, child care centers, acute care hospitals, and long term care facilities." These factors are to be used during discretionary project review, plan amendments and plan updates.

Implementation of new base zone use packages, designed to provide new mixed-use zone categories will also address issues to avoid incompatible permitted uses within Industrial and Commercial zones. Existing and future regulations will also provide development standards aimed at reducing land use incompatibilities. As part of the community plan update process, opportunities for employment uses, as well as areas appropriate for locating workforce-housing opportunities near job centers will be identified. Collocation/Conversion Suitability Factors will be used to analyze compatibility of site specific proposals.

The above policies, along with adherence to federal, state, and local regulations pertaining to hazardous materials, serve to preclude or reduce significant impacts to a degree, but cannot guarantee that all future project level impacts will be avoided or mitigated to a level less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with exposure of sensitive receptors to hazards are significant at the program level. Mitigation Framework Measures have been identified to reduce these program level impacts. Because the degree of impact and applicability, feasibility, and success of these measures cannot be adequately known for each specific project at this program level of analysis, the program level impact related to exposure of sensitive receptors to health hazards remains significant and unavoidable.

Development pursuant to implementation of the Draft General Plan could occur on contaminated sites located throughout the plan area as the City continues to grow. In accordance with City, state, and federal requirements, any new development that involves contaminated property will necessitate the clean up and/or remediation of the property in accordance with applicable requirements and regulations. No construction will be permitted to occur at such locations until a "no further action" clearance letter from the Department of Environmental Health, or similar determination is issued by the City's Fire Department, Department of Toxic Substances Control,

Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and/or other responsible agency. Compliance with existing regulations will ensure a level of safety to current standards.

Future development could lead to an increase in the number of Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) and thus, potentially more LUSTs. The RWQCB issues permits to operate USTs. The RWQCB is also responsible for monitoring the USTs and responding to requests to assess and remediate leaking tanks. Future commercial and industrial land uses that propose to install USTs will have to comply with all RWQCB policies. Based on continued oversight by the RWQCB for installation and operation of USTs, no significant impacts are anticipated with this issue.

Development pursuant to implementation of the Draft General Plan could occur on sites with idle, plugged, and abandoned wells. In accordance with state requirements, any new development on sites idle, plugged and abandoned wells will necessitate the clean up and/or remediation of the property in accordance with applicable state requirements and regulations. This may require that the wells be plugged or re-plugged to current state specifications. The state can order the reabandonment of previously plugged and abandoned wells when construction over or in the proximity of wells could result in a hazard (Section 3208.1 of the Public Resources Code). If abandonment or reabandonment is necessary, the cost of operations is the responsibility of the owner of the property upon which the development will be located. If development over an abandoned well is unavoidable, an adequate gas venting system should be placed over the well. If any plugged and abandoned or unrecorded wells are damaged or uncovered during excavation or grading, remedial plugging operations may be required. If such damage or discovery occurs, the state Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR) must be contacted to obtain information on the requirements for and approval to perform remedial operations.

To ensure proper review of development projects, DOGGR has published an informational packet entitled, "Construction Project Site Review and Well Abandonment Procedure" that outlines the information a development applicant must provide to the DOGGR regarding projects with sites or in the proximity of sites with plugged and abandoned wells. No construction would be permitted to occur at such locations until that the City can verify that DOGGR has reviewed and cleared the development project. Based on continued oversight by the DOGGR of development on sites or in the proximity of sites with plugged and abandoned wells, no significant impacts are anticipated with this issue.

New development could result in the increased use, transport, and disposal volumes of hazardous materials within the Draft General Plan area. However, the current regulatory environment provides a high level of protection from the hazardous materials manufactured within, transported to and stored in industrial and educational facilities within the plan area. The City will continue to enforce disclosure laws that require all users, producers and transporters of hazardous materials and wastes to clearly identify the materials that they store, use or transport and to notify the appropriate City, county, state and federal agencies in the event of a violation. By recognizing these hazards and ensuring that an educated public can work with City officials to minimize risks associated with hazardous materials in the urban environment, the City can maintain safe conditions area-wide. It is expected that compliance with existing regulations will preclude significant impacts.

Could implementation of the Draft General Plan 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?

Wildland fires in undeveloped areas results from the ignition of accumulated brush and vegetation. Undeveloped portions of the Draft General Plan area have greater fire danger due to expansive areas of vegetation to fuel a fire. The plan area contains over 900 linear miles of wildland/urban interface due to the multitude of canyons throughout the area and development along the canyon ridgelines where structures meet natural vegetation. Because of this existing layout, around which many communities are formed, new development in the interface areas may expose additional people and structures to wildland fire hazards, representing a potentially significant impact.

Existing policies and regulations will help reduce, but not completely abate, the potential risks of wildland fires. The plan contains several goals and policies to be implemented by the City's Fire-Rescue Department, and through land use compatibility, training, sustainable development, and other measures, these goals and policies are aimed at reducing the risk of wildland fires. The City sponsors outreach and awareness programs to educate residents about fire dangers and what they can do to protect themselves and their homes. The Brush Management Guide was prepared after the devastating October 2003 fires in order to educate landowners about creating defensible space. This document highlights existing development code and educates landowners in better fire protection of their property through the clearing and thinning of flammable vegetation around homes and other structures.

Continued monitoring and updating of existing development regulations and plans will assist in creating defensible space and reduce, but not abate, the impact of wildfire threat on the structures. To the extent possible, growth and development should be located away from known High Fire Hazard areas as depicted on **Figure 3.5-3**. Public education, and firefighter training, support, and emergency operations efforts will reduce the risks of impacts involving wildfires; but cannot guarantee that all future project level impacts will be avoided or mitigated to a level less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with wildfires are significant at the program level. Mitigation Framework Measures have been identified to reduce these program level impacts. Because the degree of impact and applicability, feasibility, and success of these measures cannot be adequately known for each specific project at this program level of analysis, the program level impact related to wildfire hazards remains significant and unavoidable.

Could implementation of the Draft General Plan expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including as a result of dam or levee failure?

Several FEMA Special Flood Hazard Areas are located in the Draft General Plan area. These areas, corresponding to the 100-year floodplain, have the potential to become flooded when major rainstorms cause streams to overflow, or spillovers at dams upstream occur. Areas within the 100-year floodplain in Mission Valley are designated for a variety of uses, including residential, commercial and industrial uses. The development of additional residential and business-related uses in this area must comply with existing programs aimed to reduce flooding hazards. Other flood hazard areas include land surrounding the Otay River, South Bay National Wildlife Refuge, Los Peñasquitos Creek, and San Dieguito River, though these areas are predominantly reserved for Open Space preservation and would not contribute to the impact of

flooding hazards on people or structures.

All dams are required by the state of California to be inspected for safety, including capacity to not fail during a major seismic event. Such studies have been conducted for all City-operated reservoirs and dams and with reinforcing materials or modern seismic-resistant building standards where appropriate, all are found to be capable of withstanding a significant seismic event. The El Capitan reservoir, which is upstream of the San Diego River watershed area including Mission Valley, is required to maintain the water level at 30 feet below the spillway. In the unlikely event of dam inundation due to severe seismic activity or other events, some warning time would allow for resident evacuation and the City's Emergency Operations Plan would take effect, though water could distribute over a normal floodplain resulting in significant damage to property. Still, the probability of seismically induced failure is very low, and the probability of a major earthquake when the reservoirs are full is lower still. Therefore, with continued evaluation of dam stability and compliance with state regulations, impacts associated with dam inundation are not expected to occur.

Development occurring during implementation of the General Plan could locate near the water bodies mentioned above which could create a significant impact related to flood hazards; however such projects must be developed in accordance with regulations governing special flood hazard areas. Most of the development which would occur, however, would likely be sited in areas that are not susceptible to flooding and would not be subject to significant impacts related to flood hazards.

Currently, the City participates in the National Flood Insurance Program and enforces its Land Development Code regulations through prohibitive regulations or mitigation measures regarding development in the floodplain and floodway. The Draft General Plan's Conservation Element contains policies which aim to preserve the natural attributes of the floodplain and floodway without endangering persons or structures. Specific policies identified in the Draft General Plan aim to improve public education programs, minimize runoff generated on-site, and manage floodplains to address their multi-purpose use.

These actions, in conjunction with compliance with existing federal, state, and local regulations and plans, are expected to result in less than significant impacts associated with flooding.

Could implementation of the Draft General Plan expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

A seiche is a standing wave in an enclosed or partially enclosed body of water which results from the rhythmic oscillation of water due to meteorological events, earthquakes or tsunamis. When large enough, they can damage shoreline vessels or structures through the rise and fall of the water. While seiches are common and natural in the Draft General Plan area, they usually are undetectable due to low periods, depths and lengths of the local bodies of water. A geologic or other natural event of an unprecedented scale for the region would be required to induce a seiche capable of significant damage; at the same time, existing regulations and development codes would ensure that waterfront development would withstand a seiche, should one occur.

A tsunami is a series of waves caused by large scale displacement of water, usually under the ocean, as a result of a massive underwater disturbance such as an earthquake, volcanic eruption, or other explosion. In the San Diego region, a large earthquake (magnitude >7.0) along the underwater San Diego Trough fault system could occur and the region has record of large seafloor uplift at fault bends which may have generated local tsunamis. However, these are theoretical predictions and the probability of a large-scale earthquake capable of inducing a local

tsunami remains low. Tsunamis are also capable of traveling thousands of miles from the origin of an event, but historical records have demonstrated that large tsunamis generated in Hawaii, Alaska or elsewhere would have lost most of their destructive energy due to the length of travel, the continental shelf off the coast of Southern California, Channel Islands which would act as buffers to the waves, and inward curvature of the Southern California coastline. Furthermore, should a smaller tsunami reach the Draft General Plan area, existing regulations and protective structures enhance the structural integrity of coastal development, and federal emergency notification plans would assist people in affected areas in successful evacuation and avoidance of tsunamis.

Mudflows result from steep hillside soils becoming rapidly saturated with water, extensive erosion, and/or a large disturbance on the hillside such as an earthquake or boulder collapse. While the potential for this event to occur in the hillsides of the Draft General Plan area is significant, existing development guidelines and other regulations ensure that population and development would not occur in high hazard areas. Furthermore, it is expected that continual monitoring of areas potentially affected by mudflows and updating of emergency response procedures will preclude significant health and safety impact of mudflows.

Development that may occur during implementation of the General Plan that is located near major water bodies could potentially be affected by seiche or tsunami. Similarly, development near foothills, at the base of steep canyon hillsides or other landslide-prone areas could potentially be affected by mudslide. This is a potentially significant impact. Current regulations, development code, and emergency management plans would ensure that the potential impact of these natural disasters on people and structures within the plan area will not be substantial and will be less than significant. The continual review and updating of these documents and regulations would further reduce potential impacts.

Could implementation of the Draft General Plan expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death from off-airport aircraft operations accidents?

The regional forecasted growth in population and the economy, which is based on the City's adopted land use policies, would affect the potential demand for aviation services at SDIA and general aviation airports within the City, but only up to the capacity for each airport as stated in its respective airport master plan or layout plan. For military air installations, unforeseeable world events may affect future changes in military operations beyond current operation levels.

The future development of incompatible uses in areas subject to off-airport air crash hazards could substantially increase the risk of loss of lives and property. To prevent incompatible uses in areas of higher aircraft hazard potential, the ALUC has adopted ALUCPs with land use policies and criteria in the interest of public safety. Such land use policies and criteria also help to ensure the long-term utility of the airport.

The proposed Draft General Plan and existing community plan policies address incompatible uses in areas with a greater potential for accidents as identified in the adopted ALUCPs. As required by state law, the City will submit the Draft General Plan to the ALUC for a consistency determination with the adopted ALUCPs. If the ALUC requires revisions to the General Plan for a determination of consistency, the City can make the revisions to meet determination made by the ALUC. Under state law, the City Council may overrule the ALUC determination by a two-thirds vote if it makes specific findings that the proposed action is consistent with the purposes of

protecting public heath, safety, and welfare, minimizing the public's exposure to excessive noise, and minimizing safety hazards within areas surrounding the airport.

In preparing the updated ALUCPs, the ALUC will provide updated policies and criteria for compatible land uses in areas with a greater potential for accidents. Any future adoption of the updated ALUCPs will require the City to submit the General Plan, community plans and specific plans within the airport influence areas to the ALUC for consistency determinations. To ensure consistency with the adopted ALUCPs, the City will submit projects within the airport influence area for each airport in the City with an adopted ALUCP to the ALUC for consistency determinations up until the time when the ALUC adopts the updated ALUCPs and subsequently determines that the City's affected land use plans are consistent with the ALUCPs or the City Council overrules the ALUC determination.

In order to implement the policies and criteria contained in the updated ALUCPs, the City will need to coordinate with the ALUC to update development regulations and zoning ordinances where applicable. This will also include ALUCP policies and criteria addressing the Part 77 imaginary and TERPS surfaces. After which time, the City will only submit proposed amendments or updates to land use plans, airport plans, development regulations, and zoning ordinances within an adopted airport influence area prior to City Council approval as required by state law. To prevent the development of structures that may pose a hazard to air navigation, the City will inform development project applicants concerning the existence of the Part 77 imaginary and TERPS surfaces and FAA requirements. The City will also inform project applicants when proposed projects meet the Part 77 criteria for notification to the FAA as identified in City of San Diego Development Services Department Information Bulletin 520. The City will not approve ministerial projects that require FAA notification without a FAA determination of "No Hazard to Air Navigation" for the project. The City will not recommend approval for discretionary projects that require FAA notification without a FAA determination of "No Hazard to Air Navigation" for the project until the project can fulfill state and ALUC requirements.

The City implements the adopted ALUCPs with the Airport Environs Overlay Zone (AEOZ). The AEOZ boundaries cover less area than the boundaries of the airport influence area, which could allow the development of future projects that could pose a potentially significant impact outside of the AEOZ boundaries, but within the airport influence area. The City will continue to submit discretionary projects within the airport influence area for each airport in the City with an adopted ALUCP to the ALUC for consistency determinations. The City will work with the Airport Authority to identify the types of ministerial projects within airport influence areas to submit to the ALUC for consistency determinations. The City will continue to submit development projects up until the time when the ALUC adopts the updated ALUCPs and subsequently determines that the City's affected land use plans, development regulations, and zoning ordnances are consistent with the ALUCPs. This action will assist in ensuring that future structures located in an airport influence area do not pose potentially significant safety or health impact to people on the ground to the extent that the adopted ALUCPs contain policies and criteria that prevent the future development of incompatible land uses and structures.

The City Council may overrule the ALUC determination by a two-thirds vote if it makes specific findings that the proposed action is consistent with the purposes of protecting public heath, safety, and welfare, minimizing the public's exposure to excessive noise, and minimizing safety hazards within areas surrounding the airport as addressed in Public Utilities Code section 21670. The overrule of an ALUC determination can apply to individual development projects as well as land use plans, development regulations, and zoning ordnances submitted to the ALUC. Since a City Council overrule of the ALUC determination will not be consistent with the ALUCP, it may result in potentially significant land use and planning impacts as a result of the potential conflicts between the ALUCPs, and more importantly, it may result in the creation of physical impacts associated with new incompatible land uses.

By state law, the City will submit the Draft General Plan, prior to adoption by the City Council; to the ALUC for determine if the draft General Plan is consistent with the adopted ALUCPs. If determined to be consistent by the ALUC, the implementation of the General Plan policies that address airport land use compatibility will support the development of future uses consistent with the adopted ALUCP and preclude any health and safety impact of off-airport aircraft accidents. If the ALUC determines that the General Plan is not consistent and the City Council takes the necessary steps to overrule the ALUC, then this action could result in a potentially significant impact to health and safety. Even if the ALUC determines that the General Plan is consistent, the Part 77 imaginary surfaces may extend beyond the boundaries of the Airport Influence Area and the adopted zoning ordinances and development regulations could cause the development of future structures that could pose a potentially significant impact to health and safety. The eventual adoption of the updated ALUCPs by the ALUC for airports affecting land uses in the City as well as the City subsequently taking actions to amend its land use plans, zoning ordinances, and development regulations to be consistent with the updated ALUCPs for the purposes of implementing the ALUCP policies and criteria will reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level.

Although the actions that the City will need to take to be consistent with the ALUCP may result in potentially significant land use and planning impacts as a result of the potential conflicts between the ALUCPs and the General Plan, land use plans, zoning ordinances, and development regulations, the implementation of the ALUCPs may, more importantly, avoid the creation of physical impacts associated with new incompatible land uses. The ALUCPs do not address existing structures or uses that could be incompatible or considered a hazard and therefore these existing uses and structures even after the steps take by the City to implement the ALUCPs would continue to be a potential significant impact. While the ALUCPs contain policies and criteria to limit future incompatible uses and safety impacts, they cannot prevent aircraft accidents from occurring such as a loss of power after takeoff. Therefore, implementation of the Project has the potential to create significant and unavoidable impacts from off-airport aircraft operation accidents which exceeds the existing risk conditions.

Could implementation of the Draft General Plan impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Growth and development that would occur as a result of implementation of the plan would result in greater demands on the successful execution of emergency evacuation plans. This could create a potentially significant impact on the implementation of emergency plans. Improved

roadway and transportation modifications that are analyzed in **Section 3.15** of this EIR would directly help traffic flow and evacuation time. The ongoing implementation and updating of the City of San Diego's Emergency Operations Plan would assure adequate response to emergencies as growth occurs, and reduce the potential for interfering with emergency plans. In addition, the City would continue to cooperate with federal and state emergency preparedness agencies. The City would also continue to conduct drills and training simulations for the EOC to assure improved operation in the event of an actual disaster.

3.5.4 Mitigation Framework

Goals, policies, and recommendations enacted by the City, combined with the federal, state and local regulations described above, provide a framework for developing project level health and safety 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. In general, implementation of the above policies would preclude health and safety impacts. Compliance with the standards is required of all projects and is not considered to be mitigation. However, it is possible that for certain projects, adherence to the regulations may not adequately protect health and safety, and such projects would require additional measures to avoid or reduce significant health and safety impacts. These additional measures would be considered mitigation.

For each future discretionary project requiring, mitigation (i.e., measures that go beyond what is required by existing regulations), site-specific measures will be identified that reduce significant project-level impacts to less than significant or the project level impact may remain significant and unavoidable where no feasible mitigation exists. Where mitigation is determined to be necessary and feasible, these measures will be included in a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the project.

Below is a summary of general measures that may be implemented to preclude impacts. These measures may be updated, expanded and refined when applied to specific future projects based on project-specific design and changes in existing conditions, and local, state and federal laws. Mitigation Framework Measures include:

- Future projects locating non-residential employment uses in proximity to residential development or vice versa must be sited and designed in a manner that reduces or avoids potential health and safety incompatibility impacts. The Conversion/Collocation Suitability Factors (located in Appendix C of the Draft General Plan) will be used to analyze compatibility of site specific proposals.

- Future projects located in known High Fire Hazard Areas must be sited and designed to minimize impacts of fire. Prior to approval of any entitlement for a future project, the City will identify any impacts from wildfire or landslides and measures to preclude or substantially reduce such impacts in accordance with the requirements of the City of San Diego. Fire protection measures may include creating "defensible space" by:

    - Pruning trees and shrubs nearby structures.

- Watering areas near structures regularly.
- Moving most native vegetation away from structures.
- Removing or thinning natural vegetation up to 100 feet from structures.

- Future discretionary projects located in an airport influence area will be submitted to the ALUC for consistency determinations with the adopted ALUCPs up until the time when the ALUC adopts the updated ALUCPs. After the ALUC adoption of the updated ALUCPs, the City will submit future projects located in an airport influence area until the ALUC determines that the City's affected land use plans, development regulations, and zoning ordinances are consistent with the ALUCPs. Amendments to land use plans, development regulations, and zoning ordnances that are within an airport influence area must be submitted the ALUC prior to adoption.

3.5.5 Significance of Impact with Mitigation Framework

The potential for exposure of sensitive receptors to health hazards and wildfires is considered significant and unavoidable at the program level.

Impacts associated with flooding, seiche, tsunami and mudflows, as well as potential conflicts with emergency operations plans, will be less than significant.

The implementation of the General Plan policies that address airport land use compatibility support the development of future uses that are consistent with the adopted ALUCP. Following the mitigation framework identified above and these policies, will ensure that the health and safety impacts of off-airport aircraft accidents will be less than significant. The City implements the adopted ALUCPs within the Airport Environs Overlay Zone (AEOZ). The AEOZ boundaries cover less area than the boundaries of the airport influence area, which could allow the development of future projects that could pose a potentially significant impact to health and safety outside of the AEOZ boundaries. The City will continue to submit discretionary projects within the airport influence area for each airport in the City with an adopted ALUCP to the ALUC for consistency determinations up until the time when the ALUC adopts the updated ALUCPs. After the ALUC adoption of the updated ALUCPs, the City will submit future projects located in an airport influence area. The City will work with the Airport Authority to identify the types of ministerial projects within airport influence areas to submit to the ALUC for consistency determinations. The City will continue to submit development projects until the ALUC determines that the City's affected land use plans, development regulations, and zoning ordnances are consistent with the ALUCPs. The City will either amend the AEOZ or the adoption of new a new overlay zone to be consistent with the airport influence area boundaries after the ALUC adopts updated ALUCPs. Amendments to land use plans, development regulations, and zoning ordnances that are within an airport influence area must be submitted the ALUC prior to adoption.

The Part 77 imaginary surfaces for determining obstructions may extend beyond the boundaries of the Airport Influence Area and the adopted zoning ordinances and development regulations

could cause the development of future structures that could pose a potentially significant impact to health and safety. The City will inform project applicants when proposed projects meet the Part 77 criteria for notification to the FAA as identified in City of San Diego Development Services Department Information Bulletin 520. The City will not approve ministerial projects that require FAA notification without a FAA determination of "No Hazard to Air Navigation" for the project. The City will not recommend approval for discretionary projects that require FAA notification without a FAA determination of "No Hazard to Air Navigation" for the project until the project can fulfill state and ALUC requirements.

Notes and References

Federal Government

1993 Code of Federal Regulations, Title 14, Part 77

2007 Federal Aviation Administration
https://www.oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/portal.jsp
Accessed July 5, 2007.

State of California

2006 Health & Safety Code, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25533 *et seq.*

2006 Public Utilities Code, Division 9, Part 1, Chapter 4, Article 2.7 Section 21655-21660.

2006 Public Utilities Code, Division 9, Part 1, Chapter 4, Article 3.5 Section 21670-21679.5.

2007 California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DOG/
Access: July 5, 2007

2007 California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources Comment Letter to the Draft General Plan EIR, May 24, 2007

Marine Corps Air Bases Western Division

2005 Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar AICUZ Update. March.

2002 OPNAV instructions 11010.36B. December

Project Clean Water

2007a San Diego Watershed Management Plans
http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/ws_efforts.html
Accessed January 2, 2007.

2007b San Diego's Watershed
http://www.projectcleanwater.org/html/watersheds.html
Accessed January 2, 2007.

City of San Diego

2007a Airports. (General Information).
http://www.sandiego.gov/airports/. Accessed January 2, 2007.

2007b Water Department (General Information).
http://www.sandiego.gov/water/. Accessed January 2, 2007.

2007c Development Services Department Information Bulletin 520
http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/news/faa.shtml. Downloaded July 23, 2007

2006a Brush Management Guide, Bulletin #1. Fire-Rescue Department. February.

2006b Mission Valley Public Facilities Financing Plan.
http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/facilitiesfinancing/plans/pdf/mvpffpfv.pdf.
Downloaded January 2, 2007.

2004 Cedar Fire 2003 After Action Report. Fire-Rescue Department. June.
http://www.sandiego.gov/fireandems/pdf/afteraction03.pdf
Downloaded January 2, 2007.

County of San Diego

2006 Department of Environmental Health
http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us/deh/hmd/; Accessed December 29, 2006.
2002 Hazardous Materials Business Plan
http://www.co.san-diego.ca.us/deh/hmd/pdf/hm-952_hmbp (07-02).pdf
Downloaded December 29, 2006.

1991 San Diego County General Plan, Seismic Safety Element. Amended, April.

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority

2004a Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for San Diego International Airport.
Amended, October.

2004b Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for MCAS Miramar. Amended, October.

2004c Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Brown Field. Amended, October.

2004d Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Montgomery Field. Amended, October.

2005a Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Naval Air Station North Island, March

2005b Draft Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan for Naval Outlying Field Imperial Beach, March

2006 San Diego International Airport Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report SDCRAA # EIR-06-01, State Clearinghouse No. 2005091105.

San Diego County Water Authority

2006 Annual Rainfall Amounts at Lindbergh Field. http://www.sdcwa.org/manage/rainfall-lindbergh.phtml. Accessed December 29, 2006.

2005 Urban Water Management Plan. November.

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

2006 LUST Program Open Cases by Age. http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/reports/public/open_age_report.asp Downloaded December 29, 2006.

U.S. Geological Survey

2001 Legg, Mark. Earthquake Potential of Major Faults Offshore Southern California. U.S. Geological Survey Annual Reports, Volume 43. http://erp-web.er.usgs.gov/reports/annsum/vol43/sc/g0017.pdf. Accessed January 2, 2007.