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Mitigation measures have been identified in the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the proposed Town Centre I/Bayfront redevelopment plan amendments which would reduce or eliminate potential environmental impacts of the project. The Redevelopment Agency of the City of Chula Vista (‘Lead Agency’ under the state CEQA Guidelines) is required to implement adopted mitigation measures. In order to ensure compliance, the following mitigation monitoring and reporting program has been compiled in matrix format. This program is to be adopted by the Lead and Responsible agencies upon formulation of Findings, in order to comply with the requirements set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21080.6.

This mitigation monitoring and reporting program is intended to be administered by the City of Chula Vista and San Diego Unified Port District (SDUPD), as appropriate. These agencies, augmented by possible contracts personnel, would be responsible for enforcement of applicable zoning and land use regulations. No authorization to commence any activity within the Bayfront Redevelopment Area and Port Tidelands area (collectively referred to as ‘expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area’) shall be granted except with the concurrence of the controlling jurisdiction.

The following matrix is intended to be used by personnel from the above-listed agencies, as the appointed monitoring entities. Information contained within the matrix clearly identifies the mitigation measure, defines the conditions required to verify compliance, and delineates the monitoring schedule. Following is an explanation of the four columns which constitute the matrix.

| Column 1 | MITIGATION MEASURE: Each mitigation measure in the PEIR is repeated here. |
| Column 2 | TYPE: Each mitigation measure is classified as either Construction-related Mitigation (CRM), One-time Mitigation (OTM) or On-going Mitigation (OGM) based on the following definitions: |
|          | • CRM - mitigation requires monitoring during project construction (e.g., dust control, erosion control); |
|          | • OTM - mitigation requires monitoring only at the time of implementation of the required mitigation measure to ensure compliance (e.g., circulation improvements, field survey, habitat creation); and |
|          | • OGM - mitigation requires monitoring over the life of the project (e.g., landscape maintenance, lighting). |
| Column 3 | **Monitor**: The agency responsible for determining compliance with the mitigation measure and informing the Lead Agency is identified here. |
### MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use and Planning</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3.1. Review individual project plans and building design and include plan/architectural modifications, if necessary, to avoid conflicts with surrounding uses, community character, and adopted land use plans.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geophysical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geophysical</th>
<th>OTM</th>
<th>Approval by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate</th>
<th>Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3.1. A detailed geophysical investigation shall include field work (e.g., subsurface exploration, sampling) and laboratory analysis to determine the exact location and extent of potential geologic/seismic hazards. All applicable remedial grading measures and seismic design parameters recommended by the geotechnical investigation shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, or designated monitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drainage and Water Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drainage and Water Quality</th>
<th>OTM</th>
<th>Approval by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate</th>
<th>Prior approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.1. A site-specific hydrology study shall identify the on- and off-site facilities necessary to adequately convey surface runoff to avoid or minimize on-site ponding, which could impact the integrity of building footings, and/or off-site flooding at downstream properties. This study shall also evaluate measures to avoid or minimize flooding of low-lying areas during high tide conditions, the effects of wind-driven waves generated from within San Diego Bay, flooding from the Sweetwater River, and erosion from inland or coastal flooding. All applicable measures recommended by the hydrology study shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts. The hydrology study and mitigation measures shall be in conformance with criteria set forth by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for design of coastal structures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.2. A detailed erosion/siltation control plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following measures to protect existing downstream areas from erosion, scour, and sediment deposition:</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Approval by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.2a. Install energy dissipaters, riprap aprons, water bars, or drop structures at all drainage outlets (e.g., subdrains, storm drains, culverts, brow ditches, and drainage crossings or swales) to protect downstream areas from erosion, channel scour, siltation, and sedimentation;</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.2b. Implement short- and long-term stabilization (erosion control) and structural (sediment control) measures to: (1) limit the exposure of graded areas to the shortest duration possible, (2) divert upslope runoff around graded areas, and (3) store flows and remove sediment from runoff before it leaves the construction site. Stabilization measures may include dust control, surface roughening, hydroseeding, temporary and permanent landscaping, mulching, matting, blankets, geotextiles, sod stabilization, slope protection (e.g., geogrid fabric), tree protection (e.g., caging), and vegetative buffer strips. In addition, rubber hydraulic liners shall be placed on bare soil disturbed by construction activities when weather conditions indicate any possibility of rain and the activities are temporarily suspended for any reason.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural measures may include slope drains and benching, subdrains, storm drains, culverts, brow ditches, vegetation-lined drainage crossings or swales, silt fencing, brush barriers, hay bales, gravel bags, berms, dikes, check dams, sediment traps, infiltration trenches, French drains, catch basins, desilting and detention basins, and vegetative controls. Such controls would likely be required at the base of manufactured slopes and/or areas adjacent to, or upstream of, major drainage courses and wetlands;</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.2c. Maintain temporary and permanent landscaping on manufactured slopes, and use native or drought-tolerant vegetation, where applicable, to reduce irrigation requirements;</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.2d. Prevent tracking of soil from the construction site via gravel strips, temporary paving, sediment trapping devices, and/or wheel washing facilities at access points;</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.2e. Install/maintain gravel filters at all temporary drainage inlets; and</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.2f. Inspect/maintain all erosion and sediment control measures to ensure that</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Approval by the State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they function properly during the entire construction period. All desilting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traps/basins shall be cleaned when filled to 10% of their capacity, and all silt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barriers shall be cleaned when accumulated sediment reaches six inches in depth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All areas planted with erosion-control vegetation shall be monitored daily for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vegetation establishment and erosion problems, and any repairs and/or replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of vegetation made promptly. Stabilization and structural controls shall be inspected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least monthly and after every significant storm event, and shall be repaired or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintained as needed to reduce sediment discharge. Access to these facilities shall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be maintained during wet weather.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.3. A Notice of Intent shall be submitted and a Storm Water Pollution</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Approval by the State Water Resources Control Board</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be developed and implemented in compliance with the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit of the National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). In addition to the stabilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and structural controls specified above, the SWPPP shall include, but shall not be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limited to, the following Best Management Practices (BMPs):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.3a. Implement material and waste management programs during grading and</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction, including solid, sanitary, septic, hazardous, contaminated soil,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concrete and construction waste management, spill prevention, appropriate material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delivery and storage, employee training, dust control, and vehicle and equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cleaning, maintenance and fueling;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.3b. Implement routine procedures or practices after grading and</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction to reduce the amount of pollutants available for transport in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>typical rainfall/runoff process, such as a material use control program including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proper storage and disposal practices for potential pollutants (e.g., motor oils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and antifreeze); prohibiting storage of uncovered hazardous substances in outdoor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas; prohibiting the use of pesticides and herbicides listed by the Environmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Agency; and spill prevention/response and shipping/receiving practices;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3.3c. Install/maintain grease and oil traps or other filtration systems (e.g.,</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fossil filters) at all permanent storm drain inlets; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.3.3.3d. Implement a monitoring program involving the following inspection and maintenance procedures for all post-construction storm water pollution control measures to ensure that they continue to function properly:  
- If utilized onsite, permanent detention basins shall be cleaned when filled to 10% of their capacity;  
- Drainage inlet filters shall be inspected and maintained at a frequency appropriate to the type of filter system used;  
- Landscaping sprinkler systems shall be maintained to prevent excess runoff due to leaking or broken sprinkler heads;  
- Drainage facilities shall be routinely inspected and repaired as needed; and  
- Records shall be kept of all control measure implementation, inspection and maintenance. | OGM | City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, RWQCB | |
### Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.3.1b.</strong> Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose materials, or maintain at least two feet of clearance between top of piled material and truck bed, in accordance with the requirements of the California Vehicle Code, Section 23114.</td>
<td></td>
<td>CRM OGM</td>
<td>During and after grading and construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.3.1c.</strong> Limit truck speeds on unpaved areas to 15 mph or less via temporary signage, speed bumps or other speed control measures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.3.1d.</strong> Sweep streets at least once a day if visible soil materials are carried out by project vehicles and equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.3.2.</strong> Random periodic field inspections shall be conducted to verify implementation of applicable construction-related measures identified in Mitigation Measures 3.4.3.1 in accordance with approved plans and permits. If observed conditions and/or grading/construction activities vary significantly from those documented in approved plans and permits, such activities shall be halted temporarily or diverted away from affected area(s) and the city or SDUPD notified immediately to determine appropriate mitigation.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, or designated monitor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.3.3.</strong> Future project applicants shall provide evidence that an &quot;Authority to Construct&quot; has been issued by the APCD for any equipment requiring such permit.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>APCD and City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit for any facility containing stationary sources large enough to require APCD permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.3.4.</strong> Future project applicants shall provide evidence that the facilities and processes which require APCD permits have been reviewed by the APCD, and that all required permits have been issued.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>APCD and City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.4.3.5.</strong> Traffic mitigation measures shall be implemented, as identified in Mitigation Measures 3.6.3.1, to avoid potential CO hotspots which could occur in the project vicinity intersections as a result of traffic contribution from future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>Approval by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Noise

**3.5.3.1.** Where future project-related traffic volumes would result in significant noise impacts to noise-sensitive areas adjacent to receiving circulation facilities, an acoustical analysis shall identify the locations, extent, and height of sound attenuation barriers required to mitigate project-related offsite traffic noise impacts.

The required barriers identified by the acoustical analysis shall be constructed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Approval by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measures</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitor</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3.2. Design review shall ensure that noise attenuation features are incorporated into project design, as appropriate. Noise attenuation features shall include, but shall not be limited to, orientation of loading docks and trash collection facilities away from noise-sensitive areas; use of streets, parkways, greenbelts, parking lots, and landscaping as horizontal buffers; construction of berms, walls, or combination berm/wall barriers; screening/shielding of loading dock and rooftop mechanical ventilation equipment; and limiting hours of operation to less noise-sensitive periods of the day. All applicable noise attenuation features and design measures shall be shown on the face of final building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3.3. Subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area shall comply with the applicable City of Chula Vista nuisance ordinance which limits construction activities to the weekday hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Items a through d below shall also be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications as necessary.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>During future project grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3.3a. When siting stationary equipment such as generators and compressors, sensitive receptors shall be sheltered from construction noise. This can be accomplished using existing barriers such as ground elevation change and buildings, or temporary barriers such as plywood walls or noise blankets.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, or designated monitor</td>
<td>During future project grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3.3b. Several loud operations should occur simultaneously to decrease the duration of impacts resulting from each of the actions completed separately.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, or designated monitor</td>
<td>During future project grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3.3c. When pile driving, alternate and less intrusive construction methods such as vibration or hydraulic insertion should be used (as available) to lower noise levels.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, or designated monitor</td>
<td>During future project grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3.3d. Each internal combustion engine used for project construction shall be equipped with a muffler as required by Caltrans Standard Specifications 7-1.011, January 1988.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, or designated monitor</td>
<td>During future project grading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3.3e. During grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable noise requirements for future project-specific grading operations in accordance with approved plans and permits.</td>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, or designated monitor</td>
<td>During future project grading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRM</td>
<td>Satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to grading for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.5.3.4. Where future projects within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could result in significant indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat, a survey for the presence of noise-sensitive animal species shall be conducted within the potential noise impact exposure zone by a qualified biologist. If present, the biologist shall monitor the species' behavior during grading to determine if the species is being adversely affected by noise. If the biologist determines that wildlife behavior is being significantly impacted by grading/construction-related noise, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD shall be notified immediately and such activities directed away from the area of impact. The City or SDUPD shall coordinate with the state and federal resource agencies to determine appropriate mitigation for noise impacts, including, but not limited to, construction of temporary berms or other sound attenuation barriers or restriction of grading/construction activities to less noise-sensitive periods of the day. Grading and construction shall resume in the area of impact after written confirmation from the biologist that the required mitigation measures identified during agency consultation have been implemented and, through monitoring of the affected species’ behavior, are effectively reducing indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat to below a level of significance.

#### Transportation/Circulation

| OTM | Approval by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate | Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. |

#### 3.6.3.1. For projects that would generate 2,440 or more ADT, or 200 or more peak-hour trips, a detailed traffic study shall be prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Congestion Management Program (SANDAG 1994). At a minimum, facilities to be evaluated in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) analysis shall include all designated regionally significant arterials (RSA) where the project would add 50 or more peak-hour trips in either direction; key intersections along the affected RSA facilities; and mainline freeways where the project would add 150 or more peak-hour trips in either direction. LOS E (or LOS F if that is the 1990 base year LOS) is the minimum standard for acceptable traffic operations established by the BMP. LOS analysis shall be conducted under short- and long-term peak-hour conditions using the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) for key RSA intersections (Chapter 9 of the HCM), RSA facilities (Chapter 11 of the HCM), and freeway mainlines (Chapter 3 of the HCM). The traffic study shall identify the circulation system improvements necessary to mitigate project-related traffic impacts. Bonds or other financing mechanisms shall be posted for all offsite circulation improvements identified in the traffic study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The traffic study shall also address the following transportation/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circulation issues, as appropriate: (1) in addition to geometric improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., road widening, lane restriping, intersection reconfiguration), traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flow improvements to reduce congestion should include traffic signal installation,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timing, and phasing; (2) bicycle and pedestrian pathways should be developed in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excess of standards; and (3) the City of Chula Vista and SDUPD should encourage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the extension of public transit into the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. To</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further reduce traffic impacts, the following transportation demand management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies (TDM) shall be addressed in the traffic study for possible incorporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as conditions of the lease and/or subsequent permits for future development or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote use of public transportation, including increased bus and trolley service/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usage and possible extension of light rail transit service into the expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayfront Redevelopment Area;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create park and ride lots;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide bicycle storage facilities;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote a ride sharing program; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote flexible work shifts from area businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.3.2. The circulation system improvements identified in Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Satisfaction of Caltrans, City of Chula</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.3.1 shall be constructed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>development or redevelopment activities within the expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.3.3. Review future project-specific circulation plans and include</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modifications, if necessary, to avoid significant conflicts with Marina Parkway,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>which provides primary access to the Bayfront, and to ensure that adequate onsite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access and parking requirements are satisfied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Biological Resources**

3.7.3.1. A detailed biological study shall include focused surveys for sensitive  
species and formal wetland delineations where appropriate. The preferred mitigation  
for impacts to sensitive biological resources would be avoidance, but if avoidance  
is infeasible, the next preferable mitigation would be minimization of impacts with  
appropriate resource-specific mitigation.

Because of the federal policy of "no net loss" of wetlands and special aquatic  
sites, impacts to these habitats would require habitat creation at a replacement  
ratio of at least 1:1. Enhancement of degraded wetlands and exotic species removal  
may also qualify as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological Resources</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7.3.1. A detailed biological study shall include focused surveys for sensitive</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>Approval by the resource agencies, City of</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for projects that would affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>species and formal wetland delineations where appropriate. The preferred mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>biological resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Measures | Type | Monitor | Schedule
--- | --- | --- | ---
mitigation depending upon the quantity, quality and sensitivity of habitat impacted. Impacts to wetland habitats that are occupied by sensitive species, especially listed species, would require mitigation at a higher replacement ratio. Because wetlands and special aquatic sites, as well as the open water of San Diego Bay, are regulated by the ACDE, a Section 404 Permit from this agency would be required. In addition, a Section 401 certification or waiver from the RWQCB, a coastal zone management consistency statement from the Coastal Commission, and a Streambed/Lake Alteration Agreement from CDFG would also likely be required.

Until the City of Chula Vista’s Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement are approved, impacts to federally listed species and/or their habitat could be permitted through a Section 10a or Section 7 consultation. Impacts to state-listed species and/or their habitat would require a California Endangered Species Act Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) from the CDFG. With the approval of the Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement, impacts to listed species and/or their habitat that were in compliance with the city’s Subarea Plan would be covered under the State Fish and Game Code Section 2835. Appropriate mitigation for significant direct impacts to any sensitive species would be habitat creation/preservation. The NWR would present the most appropriate location for habitat creation, enhancement and preservation because of the high amount of disturbed habitat within its boundaries.

Additional significant indirect impacts would require specific mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts to below a level of significance, including, but not limited to, project-level predator control measures, lighting plans, and appropriate buffers, fencing, and signage to reduce unauthorized human and domestic pet intrusions.

Public Services and Utilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3.1. Future project applicants shall coordinate with the respective utility companies to ensure that any work in and around existing utility lines (e.g., extension, relocation) is performed in accordance with standard procedures to avoid service interruptions in the area.</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>Satisfaction of utility companies</td>
<td>Prior to approval of utility plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3.2. Energy resource conservation measures shall be incorporated into project building plans, as necessary. Such methods shall include, but shall not be limited to, sealed doors and windows, double-pane glass, increases in wall and ceiling insulation, solar benefits, and time-controlled lighting systems.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Measures | Type | Monitor | Schedule |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3.3. Provide adequate police service to meet response times.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3.4. Review individual project plans and building design and include plan modifications, if necessary, to ensure conformance with standard requirements for fire safety.</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>Satisfaction of Chula Vista Fire Department</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3.5. A recycling program shall be implemented for any new development within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. In conjunction with a local recycling company, this program shall identify the following measures, at a minimum: (1) provision of bins on site for the collection of recyclable materials such as glass, plastic, metal, and paper products; and (2) provision of trash compactors to reduce solid waste volume and the number of trips to the Otay Landfill.</td>
<td>OGM</td>
<td>Approval by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3.6. Future project applicants shall coordinate with the Sweetwater Authority to ensure that adequate water service is provided to the new development.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Sweetwater Authority</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3.7. A detailed drainage study shall demonstrate that future development is conditioned such that adequate drainage facilities are designed and provided to control and convey runoff in a manner that does not exceed the downstream storm drain capacity.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Approval of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to approval of utility plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.3.8. Individual project applicants shall pay school mitigation fees in accordance with state law.</td>
<td>OTM</td>
<td>Satisfaction of the respective school district</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aesthetics**

| 3.9.3.1. Review individual project plans and building design and include plan/architectural modifications to protect viewsheds and visual quality in and around the Tidelands. | OTM | City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate | Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. |

**Cultural Resources**

| 3.10.3.1. If in the unlikely event that buried cultural material is discovered during excavations below the fill, work in that area shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the importance of the find. If the cultural resource is determined to be significant, a testing program shall be approved and implemented. | OTM | Satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate | During future project grading. |

**Hazardous Materials**

<p>| 3.11.3.1. A detailed Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be prepared to evaluate the potential for soil and groundwater contamination. Based on the results of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, soil and possibly groundwater sampling may be warranted. | Approval by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate | Prior to development of any property formerly occupied by or adjacent to existing industrial facilities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measures</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.11.3.2. A Phase II evaluation of possible soil and groundwater contamination shall be conducted in the drainage channel, adjacent to all storm water culverts and discharge pipes.</td>
<td>Approved by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to development of the approximate 15-acre parcel bounded by J Street and Marina Parkway, within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11.3.3. Asbestos and lead-based paint surveys of existing buildings located within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area shall be conducted.</td>
<td>Satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to any renovation or demolition activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11.3.4 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for any property within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area where the results of a Phase I, Phase II, and/or asbestos evaluation indicate the potential for hazardous materials at levels requiring mitigation, all remedial measures identified in these studies shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications.</td>
<td>Satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate</td>
<td>Prior to award of construction contracts and prior to issuance of a grading permit for any property within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11.3.5 During and after grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted to verify implementation of remedial measures in accordance with approved plans and permits. If observed conditions and/or grading/construction activities vary significantly from those documented in approved plans and permits, such activities shall be halted temporarily or diverted away from affected areas and the city or SDUPD notified immediately to determine appropriate mitigation.</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista, SDUPD, or designated monitor</td>
<td>During and after grading and construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF CHULA VISTA

RE: TOWN CENTRE I/BAYFRONT
REDEVELOPMENT PLAN
SCII# 98021056

FINDINGS OF FACT

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

Pursuant to California Community Redevelopment Law, the City of Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency ("the Agency") is proposing to amend the adopted Town Centre I and Bayfront redevelopment plans. Both plans would be amended to extend the time periods within which the Agency may commence eminent domain proceedings, incur debt, undertake redevelopment activities, and collect tax increment revenue. In addition, the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan is being amended to include approximately 398 acres within the San Diego Unified Port District (SDUPD) boundaries, of which approximately 145 acres comprise the land area herein referred to as "the proposed expansion area" or "Tidelands". If adopted, the amended Bayfront Redevelopment Plan will supersede and replace the existing plan, and both amended redevelopment plans will guide future redevelopment activities, projects, and programs in the respective redevelopment areas. The amendments will not, however, affect the existing plans' obligations or indebtedness.

The project involves amendment of the existing land use plan for the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan, but does not propose changes to adopted land uses as designated by controlling land use documents for the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area and the proposed expansion area (collectively referred to as "the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area") nor the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area. The proposed amendment to the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Plan's "Statement of Basic Objectives and General Land Use Controls" would more comprehensively correlate with the Agency's current redevelopment goals, and provide that land uses in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are consistent with the City of Chula Vista General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Local Coastal Program (LCP), as well as the SDUPD Port Master Plan, and all other state and local building codes, guidelines, or specific plans, as they now exist or are hereafter amended.

The proposed expansion area is within the Chula Vista Bayfront Planning District (District 7) of the Port Master Plan and will remain under the jurisdiction of the SDUPD. The Chula Vista General Plan land use designations for the proposed expansion area are not consistent with the recently revised Port Master Plan. To correct this inconsistency, the project includes a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to conform the General Plan to the Port Master Plan for this area. Land uses approved by the SDUPD within the proposed expansion area would be incorporated into the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Land Use Plan. By incorporating this additional land, the Agency can provide economic redevelopment tools to assist the SDUPD in their efforts to remove impediments to development, provide financial options to help correct incompatible and
nonconforming land uses, and combine resources to aid in the redesign of obsolete buildings within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. The proposed project would also encourage development of uses that produce income and jobs for the region.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the proposed amendments to the Town Centre I and Bayfront Redevelopment plans. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Redevelopment Agency is the Lead Agency and the City of Chula Vista is a Responsible Agency.

At this time, no site-specific development or redevelopment proposals are contemplated for the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area or the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Therefore, a focused analysis of specific environmental impacts associated with implementation of any project pursuant to existing plans would be premature and speculative. Environmental impacts related to specific development proposals in these areas will be evaluated in detail at the time such proposals are submitted to the City of Chula Vista or to the SDUPD, as appropriate.

The expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area contains vacant or underdeveloped parcels. Future development of these parcels may result in potential environmental impacts. As such, the EIR provides a program-level analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with future ‘worst-case’ development of these parcels, and is defined as a Program EIR (PEIR) pursuant to Sections 15152, 15168 and 15180 of the state CEQA Guidelines. The worst-case development scenario for these parcels assumes development of the entire area at the maximum intensities allowed by existing land use regulations.

Because the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area is largely built-out and no site-specific redevelopment activities are proposed at this time, the PEIR does not provide a program-level environmental analysis for this area. As stated above, future redevelopment projects within the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area will be required to undergo the appropriate level of CEQA analysis as determined by the City of Chula Vista. Although program-level environmental analysis is not provided for the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area, the PEIR evaluates the potential for growth inducement resulting from proposed amendments to both redevelopment plans due to the extension of time frames for redevelopment activities to occur, as proposed by this project.

II. ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD

For purposes of CEQA and the Findings set forth in the following pages, the administrative record of the City Council decision on this project shall consist of the following:

1. The Draft and Final PEIR for the project, both of which reflect the independent judgement of the Chula Vista City Council;
2. All reports, memoranda, maps, letters, and other planning documents prepared by the environmental consultant and the that are not privileged communications under the Public Records Act;

3. All documents submitted by members of the public and public agencies in connection with the proposed project;

4. Minutes and verbatim transcripts of all public meetings and public hearings held by the in connection with the proposed project;

5. Any documentary or other evidence submitted at public meetings and public hearings in connection with the proposed project; and,

6. Matters of common knowledge to the, including but not limited to, the following:
   
a) Chula Vista General Plan
b) Chula Vista Zoning Ordinance
c) Chula Vista Threshold/Standards Policy
d) Chula Vista Local Coastal Program and Bayfront Specific Plan (1993)
e) City of Chula Vista, Bayfront Specific Plan EIR, SCH#84103108, January 15, 1985
f) City of Chula Vista, Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment EIR, SCH#89062807, July 1991.
g) SDUPD, Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR, SCH#96101030, September 1997, certified by the California Coastal Commission on March 10, 1998.

III. TERMINOLOGY/THE PURPOSE OF FINDINGS UNDER CEQA

Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that, for each significant environmental effect identified in an EIR for a proposed project, the approving agency must issue a written finding reaching one or more of three allowable conclusions. The first is that "changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR." The second potential finding is that "such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency." The third permissible conclusion is that "specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR."

As regards the first of the three potential findings, the CEQA Guidelines do not define the difference between "avoiding" a significant environmental effect and merely "substantially lessening" such an effect. The meaning of these terms therefore must be gleaned from other contexts in which they are used. Public Resources Code Section 21081, on which CEQA Guideline Section 15091 is based,
uses the term "mitigate" rather than "substantially lessen." The CEQA Guidelines therefore equate "mitigating" with "substantially lessening." Such an understanding of the statutory term is consistent with Public Resources Code Section 21001, which declares the Legislature's policy disfavoring the approval of projects with significant environmental effects, where there are feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that could "avoid or substantially lessen" such significant effects.

For purposes of these Findings, the term "avoid" will refer to the ability of one or more mitigation measures to reduce an otherwise significant effect to below a level of significance. In contrast, the term "substantially lessen" will refer to the ability of such measure or measures to substantially reduce the severity of a significant effect, but not to reduce the effect to below a level of significance. Although CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 requires only that approving agencies specify that a particular significant effect is avoided or substantially lessened, these Findings, for purposes of clarity, in each case will specify whether the effect in question has been fully avoided (and thus reduced to below a level of significance) or substantially lessened (and thus remains significant).

IV. LEGAL EFFECT OF FINDINGS

To the extent that these Findings conclude that various proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final PEIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded, or withdrawn, the Agency hereby binds itself and any other responsible parties to implement those measures. These Findings, in other words, are not merely informational or hortatory, but constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the adopts a resolution approving the project.

V. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

As required by Public Resources Code Section 21081.6, the City Council of the City of Chula Vista, in adopting these Findings, also adopts a mitigation monitoring and reporting program. The program is designed to ensure that, during project implementation, the and other responsible parties comply with the feasible mitigation measures. That program is described in the document entitled, Town Centre I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

VI. SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The Final PEIR identifies the following significant environmental effects (or impacts) that the proposed Town Centre I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment would cause. These effects will be avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures identified in Section VII of these Findings.

A. GEOPHYSICAL

The lack of information about the nature and extent of future development or redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area precludes the identification of specific soils and/or geology impacts. Nonetheless, there are no unusual or
unmitigable soil or geologic conditions which would preclude development on any of the vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. A maximum credible earthquake event along either the Coronado Banks, Elsinore, or Rose Canyon fault zones would result in significant seismic hazards to future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area relative to potential liquefaction, tsunamis, and earthquake-induced flooding and slope failures.

B. DRAINAGE AND WATER QUALITY

Future conversion of presently unpaved vacant parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to impervious surfaces (e.g., rooftops, parking lots, and other hardscape) would increase storm water runoff. If uncontrolled, this increase in runoff volumes could result in significant erosion, surface water quality, groundwater quality, and flooding impacts.

C. NOISE

Future development or redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could result in traffic noise, operational noise, and construction noise impacts to the Chula Vista recreational vehicle park, noise-sensitive areas along surrounding circulation facilities outside the project area, and noise-sensitive habitat within the Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (NWR).

D. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Under a worst-case analysis, projected traffic volumes associated with buildout of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in significant traffic impacts on surrounding circulation facilities. Future development of the 15-acre vacant parcel at the northeast corner of J Street, where it turns north into Marina Parkway, could significantly impact the primary access to the Chula Vista Bayfront.

E. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Future development or redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could result in the direct loss of sensitive habitats, including Diegan coastal sage scrub/maritime succulent scrub and wetlands, and federal- or state-listed species which would be a significant impact. Potential impacts to non-listed, sensitive species may be significant depending upon the number of individuals impacted.

Future development or redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could result in the following significant indirect impacts to adjacent sensitive biological resources: (1) changes in hydrology, reduced watersheds, erosion, sediment accretion, influxes of nutrients and contaminants from urban runoff, and freshwater intrusion could impact southern coastal salt marsh, freshwater and brackish marsh, shallow water/mudflats, and
eelgrass beds as well as sensitive plants and animals associated with these habitats; and (2) increased predation from domestic pets, human intrusion, and light and noise levels could interfere with the normal physiology of wildlife species.

F. PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Existing utilities would be extended or upgraded to provide service to future development on vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Work in and around utility lines, if not performed in accordance with standard procedures of the respective utility companies, could result in potential service interruptions which would be considered a significant impact.

Because police response times to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area currently exceed the thresholds for Priority I calls, future development of vacant and underutilized parcels would exacerbate this problem and would be considered a significant impact.

Future development or redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would increase impervious surfaces (e.g., rooftops, parking lots, and other hardscape). The resulting increase in the volume and velocity of storm water runoff which is ultimately discharged into San Diego Bay would exceed the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Without mitigation, this would be a significant effect.

Impacts to other public services and utilities including fire, solid waste, water, sewer, and schools were not considered significant.

G. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The use of hazardous materials associated with the operation of future commercial and industrial uses within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area will be subject to regulatory requirements of local, state and federal agencies. Compliance with the regulatory standards of these agencies would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance. If not mitigated, however, public exposure to hazardous materials could occur through handling of potentially contaminated soil by construction workers, public contact with potentially contaminated surface or groundwaters (e.g., leaking underground storage tanks, urban runoff pollution), and exposure to volatile emissions from heating/cooling systems.

VII. MITIGATION MEASURES

The subsections below restate the impacts and mitigation measures to be adopted to avoid the significant environmental impacts of the project. For future development or redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels within the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area, implementation of the following mitigation measures or alternatives are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the Agency. For future development or redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels within
the proposed expansion area, implementation of the following mitigation measures or alternatives are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the SDUPD.

A. GEOPHYSICAL

**Significant Effect:** See Section VI.A of these Findings.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final PEIR.

**Mitigation Measures:** A project-specific geotechnical investigation shall be implemented and include field work (e.g., subsurface exploration, sampling) and laboratory analysis to determine the exact location and extent of potential geologic/seismic hazards. All applicable remedial grading measures and seismic design parameters recommended by the geotechnical investigation shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.

B. DRAINAGE AND WATER QUALITY

**Significant Effect:** See Section VI.B of these Findings.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final PEIR.

**Mitigation Measures:** A project-specific erosion/siltation control plan shall be implemented to protect existing downstream areas from erosion, scour, and sediment deposition. All applicable measures recommended by the erosion/siltation control plan shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.

A project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be implemented and include Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as waste management programs, material use control programs, filtration systems at all permanent storm drain inlets, and a long-term monitoring program. All applicable measures recommended by the SWPPP shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.

Future project applicants shall provide evidence to the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD that: (1) a hazardous materials business plan has been prepared and implemented in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations; and (2) all local, state, and permit requirements to generate, use, store, and transport hazardous materials have been satisfied.
A project-specific hydrology study shall be implemented to identify the on- and off-site facilities necessary to adequately convey surface runoff to avoid or minimize on-site ponding, which could impact the integrity of building footings, and/or off-site flooding at downstream properties. This study shall also evaluate measures to avoid or minimize flooding of low-lying areas during high tide conditions, the effects of wind-driven waves generated from within San Diego Bay, flooding from the Sweetwater River, and erosion from inland or coastal flooding. All applicable measures recommended by the hydrology study shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.

C.   NOISE

**Significant Effect:** See Section VI.C of these Findings.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final PEIR.

**Mitigation Measures:** An acoustical analysis that is correlated to future project-related traffic shall identify the locations, extent, and height of sound attenuation barriers required to mitigate noise impacts, as necessary.

The City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review individual project plans and building design. Design review shall include plan/architectural modifications to ensure that noise attenuation features are incorporated into project design, as necessary. All applicable noise attenuation features and design measures shall be shown on the face of final building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate.

Project-specific grading operations shall include the following requirements as necessary: siting stationary equipment such as generators and compressors away from, or shielding them from, noise-sensitive receptors; conducting separate loud construction operations simultaneously; using alternative pile driving techniques; and using Caltrans-approved mufflers on internal combustion engines. All applicable construction noise requirements shall be shown on the face of final building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate.

A survey for noise-sensitive animal species shall be conducted and if present, the biologist shall monitor the species' behavior during grading to determine if the species is being adversely affected by noise. If the biologist determines that wildlife behavior is being significantly impacted by grading/construction-related noise, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall be notified immediately and such activities directed away from the area of impact. The city or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall coordinate with the state and federal resource agencies to determine appropriate mitigation for noise impacts. Grading and construction shall resume in the area of impact after
written confirmation from the biologist, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, that the required mitigation measures identified during agency consultation have been implemented and, through monitoring of the affected species’ behavior, are effectively reducing indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat to below a level of significance.

D. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

**Significant Effect:** See Section VI.D of these Findings.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final PEIR.

**Mitigation Measures:** For projects that would generate 2,440 or more ADT, or 200 or more peak-hour trips, a traffic study shall be prepared in accordance with the *Guidelines for Congestion Management Program* (SANDAG 1994). The traffic study shall identify the circulation system improvements necessary to mitigate future project-related traffic impacts. Bonds or other financing mechanisms shall be posted for all offsite circulation improvements identified in the traffic study.

The City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review future project-specific circulation plans and include modifications, as necessary, to avoid significant conflicts with Marina Parkway, which provides primary access to the Bayfront, and to ensure that adequate onsite access and parking requirements are satisfied.

E. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

**Significant Effect:** See Section VI.E of these Findings.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final PEIR.

**Mitigation Measures:** A detailed biological study shall be performed for projects that would result in direct or indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources. The study shall include focused surveys for sensitive species and formal wetland delineations where appropriate. The preferred mitigation for impacts to sensitive biological resources would be avoidance, but if avoidance is infeasible, the next preferable mitigation would be minimization of impacts with appropriate resource-specific mitigation. Impacts to wetlands and special aquatic sites would require habitat creation at a replacement ratio of at least 1:1. Enhancement of degraded wetlands and exotic species removal may also qualify as appropriate mitigation depending upon the quantity, quality and sensitivity of habitat impacted. Impacts to wetland habitats that are occupied by sensitive species, especially listed species, would require mitigation at a higher replacement ratio. Because wetlands and special aquatic sites, as well as the open water of San Diego Bay, are regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a Section 404 Permit from this agency would be required. In addition, a Section 401 certification or waiver from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, a coastal zone...
management consistency statement from the Coastal Commission, and a Streambed/Lake Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) would also likely be required.

Until the City of Chula Vista's Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement are approved, impacts to federally listed species and/or their habitat could be permitted through a Section 10a or Section 7 consultation. Impacts to state-listed species and/or their habitat would require a California Endangered Species Act Memorandum of Understanding from the CDFG. With the approval of the Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement, impacts to listed species and/or their habitat that were in compliance with the city's Subarea Plan would be covered under the state Fish and Game Code Section 2835. Appropriate mitigation for significant direct impacts to any sensitive species would be habitat creation/preservation. The NWR would present the most appropriate location for habitat creation, enhancement and preservation because of the high amount of disturbed habitat within its boundaries.

In addition to the sediment/erosion, water quality, and noise control measures identified in the Final EIR, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review individual project plans and include modifications, as necessary, to avoid or reduce to below a level of significance the potential indirect impacts to biological resources, including predator control measures, lighting plans, and appropriate buffers, fencing, and signage.

F. PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

**Significant Effect:** See Section VI.F of these Findings.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final PEIR.

**Mitigation Measures:** Future project applicants shall coordinate with the respective utility companies during extension/relocation of utility lines to avoid service interruptions in the area. The City of Chula Vista shall ensure that adequate police service is provided to meet response times. A detailed drainage study shall be performed to demonstrate that future development is conditioned such that adequate drainage facilities are designed and provided to control and convey runoff in a manner that does not exceed the downstream storm drain capacity. All applicable measures recommended by the utility companies, Police Department, and drainage study shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.
G. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

**Significant Effect:** See Section VI.G of these Findings.

**Findings:** Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which will avoid the significant environmental effects identified in the Final PEIR.

**Mitigation Measures:** A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be performed for any property formerly occupied by or adjacent to existing industrial facilities. Based upon results of the Phase I survey, Phase II sampling and evaluation may be required. Phase II evaluation for possible soil and groundwater contamination shall be performed for the approximate 15-acre parcel bounded by J Street and Marina Parkway within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Asbestos and lead-based paint surveys shall be conducted on existing buildings scheduled for renovation or demolition. All remedial measures identified in these studies shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts.

VIII. INFEASIBILITY OF ALTERNATIVES OTHER THAN PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

**Findings:** Specific considerations related to the ability of the alternatives to achieve the project objectives and their inability to reduce impacts to below a level of significance make infeasible the six project alternatives identified in the Final PEIR. The reasons for infeasibility of the project alternatives are provided below.

Alternative Land Uses

The Chula Vista General Plan, SDUPD Master Plan, and Bayfront Specific Plan consider a wide range of land uses for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. The location, size, and configuration of these land uses, and their relationship to each other, are designed to meet one of the primary project objectives, which is to encourage vacant and underutilized land in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to be developed with uses that attract visitors to, and produce income and jobs for, the region. Alternative types of land uses were not considered because they would not satisfy this objective. In addition, although not the sole cause of its rejection, a general plan amendment, master plan amendment, and/or specific plan amendment would be required for approval of alternative land use designations.

Reduced Project

Another project alternative that was considered but rejected involves the evaluation of a reduced buildout intensity for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to avoid or reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with future ‘worst-case’ development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in the Final PEIR. With implementation of recommended mitigation measures identified in the Final PEIR, potential environmental impacts associated with future development
or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance. A reduction in development intensities throughout the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area may reduce certain environmental impacts, but would not change the determination regarding significance of impacts and would, therefore, not serve the purpose of an alternatives analysis. Without site-specific development information, however, it is not possible at this time to determine the extent to which buildout intensities should be decreased to either avoid the worst-case environmental impacts, reduce them to below a level of significance, or eliminate the need for mitigation, as identified in the Final PEIR. Any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of the Final PEIR, as reinforced in Section 15145 the state CEQA Guidelines.

Modified Project

A modified project alternative was also considered which would avoid or reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in the Final PEIR, while maintaining the buildout development potential of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Such an alternative would generally involve limiting development in and adjacent to environmentally-constrained areas and increasing densities in less constrained areas. Environmental issues that would benefit from such an alternative typically include land use, soils/geology, drainage/hydrology, noise-sensitive areas, and biological, visual/scenic, and cultural resources. As with the reduced project alternative discussed above, this alternative was rejected because the absence of site-specific development information does not allow evaluation of project redesign measures to either avoid the worst-case environmental impacts, reduce them to below a level of significance, or vitiate the need for mitigation, as identified in the Final PEIR. Any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of the Final PEIR.

Offsite Alternative

Regarding alternative locations, the state CEQA Guidelines mandates that “only those that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project need be considered for inclusion in this analysis. If the Lead Agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, [the EIR] must disclose the reasons for this conclusion.” An analysis of offsite alternative locations for the project is not a feasible or practical endeavor due to the unique location of the Bayfront Redevelopment Area and proposed expansion area (i.e., SDUPD property). In particular, the unique and special characteristics of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that underlie its fundamental recognition by the Agency as a prime location for redevelopment activities cannot be achieved elsewhere. The blight targeted for removal is specific to the proposed project location. Therefore, any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of the Final PEIR.
No Development Alternative

The No Development alternative is often considered the environmentally superior alternative due to the absence of environmental impacts as compared to the proposed project. This alternative assumes that all existing development, including abandoned buildings and blighted areas, would be retained and not redeveloped. Vacant or underutilized parcels would also remain in their current condition. To prevent future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, this alternative would require a general plan amendment, master plan amendment, and/or specific plan amendment to redesignate and rezone vacant parcels for open space uses, with possible acquisition of some or all of these properties by the Agency. In the event that the No Development alternative is chosen, the SDUPD would retain sole control of the Port Tidelands.

While this alternative would eliminate the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in the Final PEIR, it would not fulfill any of the project objectives. This alternative is infeasible because it would allow conditions of blight to remain and it would be inconsistent with approved land use and zoning designations.

No Project Alternative

As defined in Section 15126(d)(4) of the state CEQA Guidelines, evaluation of the No Project alternative contemplates “what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” The No Project alternative is similar to the proposed project in that existing land use and zoning designations within the Bayfront Redevelopment Area and proposed expansion area (i.e., SDUPD property) would remain. Since the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in the Final PEIR, would be similar for the proposed project and No Project alternative, no additional analysis is required.
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INTRODUCTION TO THE FINAL EIR

This Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the proposed Town Centre 1/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment (EIR #98-2, SCH #98021056) complies with all criteria, standards and procedures of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (Cal. Pub. Res. Code, § 21000, as amended), the state CEQA Guidelines (Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, § 15000, as amended February 1996.), and the City of Chula Vista's environmental review procedures. Pursuant to Section 15132 of the state CEQA Guidelines, this Final PEIR consists of the following components:

- **Draft PEIR** - including letters of public comment and responses by the city on the draft PEIR, and modifications to the draft PEIR as a result of public comments, pursuant to Section 15088(c) of the state CEQA Guidelines.
- **Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program** - as required by Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and recommended by Section 15091(a)(1) of the state CEQA Guidelines when making Findings as described below.
- **Findings** - discussion of changes or alterations that have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment, pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15093(b) of the state CEQA Guidelines.

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) identifying the scope of the draft PEIR (Appendix B) was circulated by the city for public review on January 16, 1998. The public review comment period for the draft PEIR extended from March 9 to April 23, 1998. This Final PEIR incorporates comments on the project which were received during both the NOP and public review periods. The draft PEIR was distributed to Responsible Agencies (as defined in Section 15381 of the state CEQA Guidelines), public agencies having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project, and interested organizations and individuals. Ten (10) copies of the draft PEIR were sent to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (State Clearinghouse) along with the required Notice of Completion (NOC). Simultaneously, Notices of Availability (NOA) were mailed directly to the County Clerk and those who requested a copy of the PEIR. The draft PEIR was also available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and the Planning Department.

During the 45-day public review period, two comment letters were received on the draft PEIR, one each from the San Diego Unified Port District (SDUPD) and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). In accordance with Section 15207 of the state CEQA Guidelines, written responses from the City of Chula Vista are provided only to written comments received on or before April 23, 1998. The following pages contain the comment letter on the left side, with each specific comment numbered in the left-hand margin, and corresponding numbered responses to each comment on the right side. For comments that are outside the scope of this Final PEIR or that address non-environmental issues (as defined in Section 15088 of the state CEQA Guidelines), the response either explains why the comment is not being addressed or indicates where outside the Final PEIR the specific concerns or requested information are addressed. Where similar comments
are received from multiple sources, the reader is referred to the first time the applicable response was given, for a detailed explanation, followed by a brief summary of the response. For comments that require modifications to the Final PEIR, the response indicates the locations in the document where the requested changes have been incorporated.

The City of Chula Vista will subsequently consider whether to certify the Final PEIR as complete and in compliance with CEQA, and must consider it in approving or disapproving the proposed project. If the project is approved, a Notice of Determination (NOD) shall be filed with the State Clearinghouse and the County Clerk. In the final review of the proposed project, environmental considerations as well as economic, social, and other factors will be weighed to determine the most appropriate course of action.
Mr. Joseph Monaco  
Environmental Projects Manager  
City of Chula Vista  
276 Fourth Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 91910  

RE: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT:  
TOWN CENTER I/BAYFRONT REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT  
(CITY OF CHULA VISTA - FEBRUARY 1998)  

Dear Mr. Monaco:  

The City of Chula Vista and its Redevelopment Agency (the Agency) have had a long-established Bayfront Redevelopment Area (1974) adjacent to the San Diego Unified Port District’s (SDUPD) Planning District 7. On March 10, 1998, the City of Chula Vista issued a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) on their proposal to amend their Bayfront Redevelopment Area to include 145 acres of Port Tidelands and 253 acres of adjacent water area. The expansion of the Redevelopment Area to include the tidelands would allow the Agency to “assist the SDUPD in correcting existing physical and economic blight conditions in the area.”  

Section 4 of the SDUPD Act (1997), as amended, clearly states that the SDUPD is responsible for the “development, operation, maintenance, control, regulation, and management of the Harbor of San Diego upon the tidelands and lands lying under the inland navigable waters of San Diego Bay.” Moreover, § 5(b) of the SDUPD Act grants sole land management authority and powers over “tidelands and submerged lands granted to the district . . . any other lands conveyed to the district by any city or San Diego County . . .” Thus, the SDUPD welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Town Center I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment.
Discussion

1. Expansion of the Bayfront Redevelopment Area to include Port Tidelands should encourage development in the Chula Vista Bayfront Tidelands that is consistent with the Port Master Plan certified by the California Coastal Commission.

2. The expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area encompasses 637 acres outside of Port Tidelands. These "uplands" are under the planning jurisdiction of the City of Chula Vista and the Agency. However, the 398 land and water acres in the proposed expansion area are under the sole land-use jurisdiction of the SDUPD. The SDUPD retains all planning and land-use authority in the expanded redevelopment area on Port Tidelands. This includes, but is not limited to, the following issues and comments relating to the DEIR:

   • Land use planning for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area Tidelands is outlined in the Chula Vista Industrial-Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment (10/7/97). Section 30711 of the California Coastal Act requires that the City of Chula Vista incorporate the Port Master Plan (as amended) into its Local Coastal Plan. The Port Master Plan is the overriding land-use policy document for the Port Tidelands. (p. 3-4, para. 1 and p. 3-6, para. 2.)

   • Inclusion of the Port Tidelands into the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan does not give the Agency eminent domain authority over Port Tidelands (p. ES-1, para. 2, p. 1-3, para. 1.2(1), and p. 8-2 para. 4).

   • The DEIR addresses the entire Town Center /Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Throughout the text, items requiring approval are addressed as "shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate." It should be explicitly stated at the outset of the EIR that projects/sections taking place on the Uplands (non-Port Tidelands) will be approved by the City of Chula Vista and those projects/sections taking place on the Port Tidelands will be approved by the SDUPD.

   • Figure 3.1-2 on page 3-5 should be replaced with the approved Port Master Plan Precise Plan for Planning District 7 (enclosed) that was certified by the California Coastal Commission on March 10, 1998.

1. This concept is expressed consistently throughout the PEIR and additional text has been incorporated, where necessary, to reinforce this statement.

2. As stated in response to comment 1, the City of Chula Vista recognizes that the SDUPD has sole land use jurisdiction within the Port Tidelands area. Additional text has been incorporated into the PEIR, where necessary, to reinforce this statement.

3. Additional clarification has been added to Pages 3-4 and 3-6 of the PEIR to state that the Port Master Plan is the overriding land use policy document for the Tidelands.

4. Additional clarification has been incorporated into the referenced PEIR sections to reinforce this comment.

5. Section 1.1 (Project Description and Objectives) of the PEIR has been revised to include clarification of future project approval. Specifically, projects within Port Tidelands would be approved by the SDUPD while projects within the Bayfront Redevelopment Area and outside of the Tidelands would be approved by the City of Chula Vista.

6. Figure 3.1-2 has been revised to include the new approved Port Master Plan Precise Plan for Planning District 7.
• When the phrase "expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area" is used throughout the DEIR, the SDUPD understands this to refer to the entire Redevelopment Area, including tidelands. Therefore, any impacts to the tidelands must be processed through the SDUPD. This includes, but is not limited to the following revisions:

Air Quality impact, articulated under "Impact, Air Quality, Long-term Mobile- and Stationary-Source Emissions" on page ES-8 should be amended to read "Site specific air quality analyses would be required by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD (for Port Tidelands Impacts) for projects that exceed these designated land use intensities."

Access and Parking Impacts (p. ES-10) refer to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Therefore, developers will be required to "proviso adequate parking in accordance with the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD parking guidelines as appropriate."

• The 'No Development' Alternative paragraph of the Project Alternatives section of the DEIR (p. 4-4, para. 1) alludes to the City Redevelopment Agency acquiring "some or all" of the vacant properties to redesignate and retain them as open space. In the event that the No Development Alternative is chosen, the SDUPD would retain sole control of the Port Tidelands.

• The Summary of Environmental Consequences (p. 8-1, para. 2) should be amended to state: "the short-term and long-term uses of the expanded redevelopment area, as facilitated by the proposed amendment to the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan and the Chula Vista Industrial-Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment . . . ."

• Page 8-2, para. 6 and p. 1-2, para. 1 both refer to the Agency helping the SDUPD to "correct incompatible and nonconforming land uses. . . and . . . aid in the redesign of obsolete buildings within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area." The SDUPD retains sole jurisdiction over the tidelands and maintains the final authority for land-use planning and management.

3. Please address the environmental impacts from the proposed annual car race (Indy Car Grand Prix) on Port Tidelands in the expanded redevelopment area.

7 Pages ES-8 and 3-31 of the PEIR have been revised as suggested.

8 Pages ES-10 and 3-47 of the PEIR have been revised as suggested. In addition, mitigation measure 3.6.3.3 has been added to the PEIR to ensure appropriate mitigation monitoring and reporting for this significant impact, pursuant to state CEQA Guidelines.

9 Section 4.3 of the PEIR has been revised to include the following sentence: "In the event that the No Development alternative is chosen, the SDUPD would retain sole control of the Port Tidelands."

10 Section 8.1 of the PEIR has been revised as suggested.

11 As stated in response to comment 2, additional text has been incorporated into the referenced PEIR sections to reflect this information.

12 Only preliminary planning has been performed to date for the proposed annual Indy Car Grand Prix race. Cumulative analysis of this project in the Final EIR would be speculative, and it is not clear if this project is related to the proposed action. Defined as a separate project under the state CEQA Guidelines, the appropriate level of environmental analysis will be conducted at the time a specific proposal is submitted to the City of Chula Vista and/or SDUPD.
Mr. Joseph Monico  
Page 4  
April 14, 1998

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the DEIR. We appreciate the close working relationship between the SDUPD and the City of Chula Vista. Please feel free to contact Kevin Trepa at (619) 686-8253 or myself should you have any questions regarding this letter.

Since/dly,

DAN E. WILKENS, Senior Director  
Strategic Planning Services

DW-KT  
Enclosure  
File: 327  
cc: Melissa Mallander  
KT-1/CVEIR
April 15, 1998

11:00P.M.

P.M. 7:30

Mr. Joseph Monaco, Environmental Projects Manager
City of Chula Vista
Community Development Department
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 92010

Dear Mr. Monaco:

NOP for the Town Center I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment - SCH 98021056

Caltrans District 11 comments are as follows:

- A Traffic Study is needed to analyze impacts and mitigations for State Highway facilities in the project area. Interstate Route 5 (I-5) is currently congested and should be analyzed for operational improvements, as any additional traffic would only aggravate the situation.
- All State owned signalized intersections should be analyzed using the intersecting lane vehicle (ILV) method outlined in Topic 406 of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual.
- Short term and long term mitigation measures should be proposed. Caltrans supports the concept of "fair share" contributions on the part of developers toward present and future improvements to State Highway facilities.

Our contact person for I-5 is Ed Haj, Route Manager, at (619) 230-5433. For Traffic Operations our contact person is Fred Yazdan, Branch Chief, at (619) 688-6881.

Sincerely,

BILL FIGGE, Chief
Planning Studies Branch

13 Because the proposed project is the expansion of the Bayfront Redevelopment Area, existing traffic data was relied upon for the preparation of the Transportation/Circulation Section of the PEIR. As stated in Section 3.6 of the PEIR, transportation/circulation information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on traffic studies prepared by JHK & Associates for the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on studies by Katz, Okitsu & Associates (KOA) for the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997).

As required by mitigation measures 3.6.3.1 and 3.6.3.2, a traffic study shall be prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Congestion Management Program (SANDAG 1994) for future projects in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that would generate 2,440 or more ADT, or 200 or more peak-hour trips. The traffic study shall identify the circulation system improvements necessary to mitigate future project-related short- and long-term traffic impacts. Bonds or other financing mechanisms shall be posted for all offsite circulation improvements identified in the traffic study. As part of future traffic studies, all state-owned circulation facilities, including I-5 and signalized intersections would be analyzed using the intersection lane vehicle method outlined in Topic 406 of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This summary provides a brief synopsis of the project description, project alternatives considered, and the results of the environmental analysis contained within this Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR). While it provides a general overview, by necessity, this summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found in the document. Therefore, the reader should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

2.0 PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

Both the existing Town Centre I and Bayfront redevelopment areas are located in the City of Chula Vista, in southwestern San Diego County, California. Pursuant to California Community Redevelopment Law, the City of Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency ("the Agency") is proposing to amend the adopted Town Centre I and Bayfront redevelopment plans. Both plans would be amended to extend the time periods within which the Agency may commence eminent domain proceedings, incur debt, undertake redevelopment activities, and collect tax increment revenue. In addition, the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan is being amended to include approximately 398 acres of adjacent land and water area located within the San Diego Unified Port District (SDUPD) boundaries ("the proposed expansion area"). The proposed expansion area extends between the combined U.S. Pierhead and Bulkhead lines (i.e., SDUPD bayward boundary) in San Diego Bay and the ordinary high water mark. Approximately 145 acres of the proposed expansion area comprise the land mass ("Tidelands") within which the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment would apply. Inclusion of the Tidelands into the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan does not give the Agency eminent domain over Port Tidelands.

The project proposes to amend the existing land use plan of the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan, but does not propose changes to adopted land uses as designated by controlling land use documents for the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area and the proposed expansion area (collectively referred to as "the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area") nor the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area. The proposed amendment to the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Plan would more comprehensively correlate with the Agency’s current redevelopment goals, and provide that land uses in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are consistent with the City of Chula Vista
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General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Local Coastal Program (LCP), as well as the SDUPD Port Master Plan, and all other state and local building codes, guidelines, or specific plans.

The proposed expansion area is within the Chula Vista Bayfront Planning District (District 7) of the Port Master Plan and will remain under the jurisdiction of the SDUPD. The Chula Vista General Plan land use designations for the proposed expansion area are not consistent with the recently revised Port Master Plan. To correct this inconsistency, the project includes a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to conform the General Plan to the Port Master Plan for this area. Land uses approved by the SDUPD within the proposed expansion area would be incorporated into the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Land Use Plan. By incorporating this additional land, the Agency can provide economic redevelopment tools to assist the SDUPD in their efforts to remove impediments to development, provide financial options to help correct incompatible and nonconforming land uses, and combine resources to aide in the redesign of obsolete buildings within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. The proposed project would also encourage development of uses that produce income and jobs for the region. Future projects within the Tidelands would be approved by the SDUPD and projects within the uplands (non-Port Tidelands) would be approved by the City of Chula Vista. The SDUPD retains sole jurisdiction authority over the Tidelands and maintains the final authority for land use planning and management of the Tidelands.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

No site-specific development or redevelopment proposals are contemplated for the Town Centre I or expanded Bayfront redevelopment areas. Therefore, a focused analysis of specific environmental impacts associated with implementation of any project pursuant to existing plans would be premature and speculative. Environmental impacts related to specific development proposals in these areas will be evaluated in detail at the time such proposals are submitted to the City of Chula Vista or to the SDUPD, as appropriate.

The expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area contains vacant or underdeveloped parcels. Future development of these parcels may result in potential environmental impacts. As such, this PEIR provides a program-level analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with future ‘worst-case’ development of these parcels. The worst-case development scenario for these parcels assumes development of the entire area at the maximum intensities allowed by existing land use regulations.
Because the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area is largely built-out and no site-specific redevelopment activities are proposed at this time, this document does not provide a program-level environmental analysis for this area. This PEIR, however, evaluates the potential for growth inducement due to the proposed extension of time frames for redevelopment activities in both redevelopment areas.

Table ES-1 summarizes the significant environmental impacts (first column) and proposed mitigation measures (second column), by major issue as evaluated in Section 3.0 of this PEIR, associated with buildout of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Please refer to these sections for specific mitigation language. The third column of Table ES-1 indicates that either the impact is not significant (NS) or that the impact would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of proposed mitigation (SM). The last column provides the implementation “trigger” for the proposed mitigation measure.

4.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The City of Chula Vista General Plan and Local Coastal Program, which includes the Bayfront Specific Plan, and the SDUPD Port Master Plan consider a wide range of land uses for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. The location, size, and configuration of these land uses, and their relationship to each other, are designed to meet one of the primary project objectives, which is to encourage vacant and underutilized land in the expanded redevelopment area to be developed with uses that attract visitors to, and produce income and jobs for, the region. Alternative types of land uses were not considered because they would not satisfy this objective.

Another project alternative that was considered but rejected involves the evaluation of a reduced buildout intensity for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to avoid or reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with future ‘worst-case’ development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in this PEIR. A reduction in development intensities throughout the expanded redevelopment area may reduce certain environmental impacts, but would not change the determination regarding significance of impacts and would therefore not serve the purpose of an alternatives analysis. Without site-specific development information, it is not possible at this time to determine the extent to which buildout intensities should be decreased to either avoid the worst-case environmental impacts, reduce them to below a level of significance, or eliminate the need for mitigation, as identified in this PEIR. Any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of this document, as reinforced in Section 15145 the state CEQA Guidelines.
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A modified project alternative was also considered which would avoid or reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in this PEIR, while maintaining the buildout development potential of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Such an alternative would generally involve limiting development in and adjacent to environmentally-constrained areas and increasing densities in less constrained areas. Environmental issues that would benefit from such an alternative typically include land use, soils/geology, drainage/hydrology, noise-sensitive areas, and biological, visual/scenic, and cultural resources. As with the reduced project alternative discussed above, this alternative was rejected because the absence of site-specific development information does not allow evaluation of project redesign measures to either avoid the worst-case environmental impacts, reduce them to below a level of significance, or vitiate the need for mitigation, as identified in this PEIR. Any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of this document.

An analysis of offsite alternative locations for the project is not a feasible or practical endeavor due to the unique location of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. In particular, the unique and special characteristics that underlie its fundamental recognition by the Agency as a prime location for redevelopment activities cannot be achieved elsewhere. The blight targeted for removal is specific to the proposed project location. Therefore, any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of this document.

The No Development alternative is often considered the environmentally superior alternative due to the absence of environmental impacts as compared to the proposed project. This alternative assumes that all existing development, including abandoned buildings and blighted areas, would be retained and not redeveloped. Vacant or underutilized parcels would also remain in their current condition. While this alternative would eliminate the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in this PEIR, it would not fulfill any of the project objectives. This alternative is infeasible because it would allow conditions of blight to remain and it would be inconsistent with approved land use and zoning designations.

The No Project alternative is similar to the proposed project in that existing land use and zoning designations within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would remain. Since the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in this PEIR, would be similar for the proposed project and No Project alternative, no additional analysis is required.
5.0 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY OR UNRESOLVED ISSUES

Section 3.0 of this PEIR contains detailed analysis of the significant environmental impacts associated with project implementation. Mitigation is proposed that would reduce all impacts to below a level of significance; however, the proposed project contains one area of controversy and one potentially unresolved issue. The area of controversy stems from a letter received from the Sweetwater Authority commenting on the Notice of Preparation (NOP). The Authority references a petition to the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) proposed by the City of Chula Vista to redesignate the beneficial use grade of the groundwater basin that underlies the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Although this proposal is a separate action from the project addressed in this PEIR, the Authority is concerned that the basin redesignation may lead to less stringent compliance efforts by future commercial and industrial operations on the vacant and/or underutilized parcels within the expanded redevelopment area. Specifically, the concern is that future operators would not be required to comply with certain standards for clean-up and abatement of potential groundwater contamination related to documented release(s) of hazardous materials, thereby, allowing contaminants to remain at higher levels.

The proposed basin redesignation requested by the city would not relieve future operators from their responsibility to comply with applicable local, state, and federal regulations governing the generation, use, treatment, storage, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials, including clean-up and abatement requirements pertaining to documented release(s). These requirements are reinforced by the recommended mitigation measures in Section 3.11.3 of this PEIR. In addition, the onsite groundwater is not currently used, nor has it been used historically, as a potable water source due to documented high concentrations of total dissolved solids (TDS), sodium, and chloride. Therefore, beneficial use standards for the groundwater are not currently met, precluding its use for domestic purposes, agriculture, or industrial uses. With implementation of recommended mitigation measures, future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would not contribute to groundwater quality degradation.

The Town Centre I Redevelopment Area was not analyzed in Section 3.0 of this PEIR for the reasons stated above; however, an unresolved issue involves the presence of potentially significant historic structures in that area. If redevelopment is proposed for any of these structures, appropriate historic surveys will be required and mitigation measures shall be implemented, as necessary, prior to redevelopment, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista and the SDUPD, as appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table ES-1: Impacts, Proposed Mitigation and Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future development of vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, in accordance with the underlying land use and zoning designations, is intended to be compatible with surrounding land uses and the community character of the area. Because the project does not propose changes to adopted land uses as designated by the Bayfront Specific Plan or Port Master Plan, it is consistent with applicable land use and environmental plans, programs, guidelines, goals, objectives, and policies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Geophysical</strong>                                          |
| Soils/Geology: Grading in fill soils may result in localized instability of temporary excavation (construction) slopes. This would result in a significant geologic constraint to future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, however, with implementation of standard remedial measures during grading, such as structural reinforcement of manufactured slopes and/or removal/compaction of potentially unstable soils. Uncontrolled fill soils and bay deposits are subject to differential ground settlement and are therefore considered unsuitable in their present condition for the support of any additional fill and/or structures. The presence of these compressible soils would not result in a significant constraint to future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area provided that standard remedial measures are implemented during grading, such as removal of excess organic material and oversized rock fragments and/or excavation/recompaction of fill. | A project-specific geotechnical investigation shall include field work (e.g., subsurface exploration, sampling) and laboratory analysis to determine the exact location and extent of geologic/seismic hazards. All applicable remedial grading measures and seismic design parameters recommended by the geotechnical investigation shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate. | SM | Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. During and after grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable remedial grading measures in accordance with approved plans and permits. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erosion.</strong> The conversion of presently unpaved vacant parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to impervious surfaces (e.g., rooftops, parking lots, and other hardscapes) would increase storm water runoff. If uncontrolled, this increase in runoff volumes could result in erosive velocities at storm drain outlet facilities which discharge directly into natural marshes or the Bay. Under a worst-case analysis, erosive runoff velocities at these outlet structures could result in a significant impact with respect to scouring effects.</td>
<td>A project-specific erosion/siltation control plan shall be implemented to protect existing downstream areas from erosion, scour, and sediment deposition. All applicable measures recommended by the erosion/siltation control plan shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. During and after grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable erosion control measures in accordance with approved plans and permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface Water Quality.</strong> Under a worst-case analysis, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in a significant impact with respect to potential siltation, sedimentation, and water quality degradation from storm water runoff, including urban pollutants such as hydrocarbons, organic wastes, nutrients, litter, hazardous chemicals, and pesticides and fertilizers.</td>
<td>A project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be implemented for future development within the project area, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) for waste management programs, material use control programs, filtration systems at all permanent storm drain inlets, and a long-term monitoring program. All applicable measures recommended by the SWPPP shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. During and after grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable BMPs in accordance with approved plans and permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groundwater Quality.</strong> The generation, use, storage, treatment, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials may be associated with future development of commercial, industrial and research/limited manufacturing uses within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Such activities would be regulated by local, state, and federal requirements to control the accidental release of hazardous materials. Mandatory compliance with these regulations would reduce to below a level of significance the potential for groundwater contamination.</td>
<td>Future project applicants shall provide evidence to the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD that: (1) a hazardous materials business plan has been prepared and implemented in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations; and (2) all local, state, and permit requirements to generate, use, store, and transport hazardous materials have been satisfied.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flooding.</strong> Portions of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that are flood-prone would subject future structures and facilities to potential flooding impacts if not properly designed. Potential flooding impacts would not result in a significant constraint to future development or redevelopment within the expanded redevelopment area, however, with implementation of standard site design measures such as elevation of structures above the 100-year flood plain or high tide mark and/or construction of levees, berms, or embankments.</td>
<td>A project-specific hydrology study shall identify the on- and off-site facilities necessary to adequately convey surface runoff to avoid or minimize on-site ponding, which could impact the integrity of building footings, and/or off-site flooding at downstream properties. This study shall also evaluate measures to avoid or minimize flooding of low-lying areas during high tide conditions, the effects of wind-driven waves generated from within San Diego Bay, flooding from the Sweetwater River, and erosion from inland or coastal flooding. All applicable measures recommended by the hydrology study shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Air Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Mobile- and Stationary-Source Emissions. Future development of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in an increase in mobile- and stationary-source emissions from cars and equipment such as boilers and generators. If such future development is in accordance with adopted land use designations, these emissions would be consistent with SANDAG and San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) projections. Site-specific air quality analyses would be required by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD (for Port Tidelands impacts) for projects that exceed these designated land use intensities. Future projects which propose the installation of stationary sources would be required to comply with applicable APCD regulations. Compliance with adopted land uses and APCD regulations would avoid significant long-term air quality impacts.</td>
<td>Although the project would not result in a significant long-term air quality impact, future project applicants shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, that the facilities and processes which require APCD permits have been reviewed by the APCD, and that all required permits have been issued, as part of standard requirements of the APCD.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of building permits and certificates of occupancy for applicable facilities and processes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Short-term Construction-Related Emissions. Temporary dust and equipment emissions would be generated during construction of individual projects. The San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) is a state non-attainment area for particulates of equal to or less than 10 microns in size (PM<sub>10</sub>); however, anticipated grading would be much less than the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) standard (grading of 177 acres under a single operation). Therefore, short-term emissions from construction of future projects within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would not result in a significant air quality impact. | Although the project would not result in a significant short-term air quality impact, future project-specific grading operations shall include the following standard requirements of the APCD: dewatering exposed soils and haul roads, covering material hauling tracks or maintaining adequate clearance between the material and the top of the truck bed, limiting construction vehicle speeds on-site, and street sweeping. All applicable measures shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate. | NS | Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. During grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable APCD requirements for future project-specific grading operations in accordance with approved plans and permits. |

| Carbon Monoxide (CO) "Hotspots". If future project-related traffic would cause or contribute to a degradation in the level of service (LOS) on a roadway or intersection to LOS E or F, adjacent sensitive receptors may be exposed to significant air quality impacts due to CO hotspots. Such traffic impacts are not anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project; therefore, CO hotspot impacts to sensitive receptors are anticipated to be less than significant. | Implementation of traffic mitigation measures identified in this PEIR would avoid potential CO hotspots that would otherwise occur in the surrounding circulation system if traffic contribution from future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area results in unacceptable LOS. | NS | Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. |

**Noise**

<p>| Traffic Noise. The traffic volumes generated by future development of vacant and underutilized parcels (with primarily industrial uses) near the Chula Vista recreational vehicle park would not result in significant traffic noise impacts to these residents as long as such development includes driveway placement, roadway striping, signing and traffic controls to encourage use of the G Street/Marina Parkway/J Street corridor. Significant traffic noise impacts would occur to these residents, | An acoustical analysis that is correlated to specific project-related traffic shall identify the locations, extent, and height of sound attenuation barriers required to mitigate project-related traffic noise impacts. | SM | Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, where future project-related traffic volumes would result in significant noise impacts to noise-sensitive areas adjacent to receiving circulation facilities. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the mitigation measures specified in the approved acoustical analysis, |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, if the neighboring vacant and underutilized parcels are developed with primarily commercial uses with primary access to Sandpiper Way.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If any, shall be constructed to the satisfaction of the Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would not result in significant traffic noise impacts to users of the Bayside and Marina View public parks.</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildout traffic volumes within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are not expected to result in significant noise impacts to visitors at/users of the Chula Vista Nature Center and associated trails because the marshlands surrounding the Center are anticipated to provide adequate horizontal buffering to reduce projected traffic noise levels to below applicable noise standards. Buildout traffic volumes are not expected to result in significant indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat or species within the Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (NWR).</td>
<td></td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under a worst-case analysis, traffic generated by future development of vacant parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area may result in significant traffic noise impacts to noise-sensitive areas along surrounding circulation facilities outside the expanded redevelopment area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Noise.</strong> The Chula Vista recreational vehicle park, Bayside and Marina View public parks, and biological habitat in the Sweetwater Marsh NWR would be subject to significant noise impacts from daily operations associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, if these uses are not designed with consideration to adjacent noise-sensitive areas. These impacts are expected to be reduced to below a level of significance, however, with implementation of standard site design and noise attenuation features.</td>
<td>The City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review individual project plans and building design. Design review shall include plan/architectural modifications to ensure that noise attenuation features are incorporated into project design, as necessary. All applicable noise attenuation features and design measures shall be shown on the face of final building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Noise.</strong> Short-term noise impacts at noise-sensitive land uses within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area (e.g., Chula Vista recreational vehicle park, Bayside and Marina View public parks, and Chula Vista Nature Center) from future project-specific construction activities would not be significant with adherence to the city’s nuisance ordinance, which limits construction activities to the weekday hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.</td>
<td>Although future construction activities would not result in significant short-term noise impacts to adjacent noise-sensitive land uses, project-specific grading operations shall include the following standard requirements of the city and SDUPD, as necessary: siting stationary equipment such as generators and compressors away from, or shielding them from, noise-sensitive receptors; conducting separate loud construction operations simultaneously; using alternative pile driving techniques; and using Caltrans-approved mufflers on internal combustion engines. All applicable construction noise requirements shall be shown on the</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>During future project-specific grading and construction activities. Random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable noise requirements for future project-specific grading operations in accordance with approved plans and permits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction activities associated with future development or redevelopment of vacant or underutilized parcels adjacent to the Sweetwater Marsh WNR would result in significant indirect impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat.</td>
<td>face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate. A survey for noise-sensitive animal species shall be conducted and if present, the biologist shall monitor the species' behavior during grading to determine if the species is being adversely affected by noise. If the biologist determines that wildlife behavior is being significantly impacted by grading/construction-related noise, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall be notified immediately and such activities directed away from the area of impact. The city or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall coordinate with the state and federal resource agencies to determine appropriate mitigation for noise impacts. Grading and construction shall resume in the area of impact after written confirmation from the biologist, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, that the required mitigation measures identified during agency consultation have been implemented and, through monitoring of the affected species' behavior, are effectively reducing indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat to below a level of significance.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to grading for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, where such projects could result in significant indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transportation/Circulation

**Buildout Traffic Volumes.** Under a worst case analysis, projected traffic volumes associated with buildout of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in significant traffic impacts on surrounding circulation facilities.

For projects that would generate 2,440 or more ADT, or 200 or more peak-hour trips, a traffic study shall be prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Congestion Management Program (SANDAG 1994). The traffic study shall identify the circulation system improvements necessary to mitigate future project-related traffic impacts. Bonds or other financing mechanisms shall be posted for all offsite circulation improvements identified in the traffic study.

| SM | Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Construction of the circulation system improvements identified in the traffic study shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, and to the satisfaction of Caltrans for improvements on circulation facilities within their jurisdiction, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. |

**Access and Parking.** Future development of the 15-acre vacant parcel at the northeast corner of J Street as it turns north into Marina Parkway could significantly impact the primary access to the Chula Vista Bayfront.

The City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review future project-specific circulation plans and include modifications, if necessary, to avoid significant conflicts with Marina Parkway, which provides primary access to the Bayfront, and to ensure that adequate onsite access and parking requirements are satisfied.

| SM | Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Construction of the access and parking improvements identified in the traffic study and/or during plan review shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. |

Since on-street parking is generally limited along roadways within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, future development or redevelopment of vacant or underutilized parcels will be required to provide adequate parking in accordance with the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD parking standard, as appropriate. With

| NS | |

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provision of adequate parking supply, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded redevelopment area would not result in a significant increase in parking demand at the bayfront public use areas, including the Chula Vista Marina, Marina View and Bayside public parks, and Chula Vista Nature Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Impacts.</strong> The direct loss of sensitive habitats (Diegan coastal sage scrub/maritime succulent scrub and wetlands) from future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be a significant impact. Impacts to sensitive wetland habitats, although addressed in the City of Chula Vista draft Subarea Plan, will still continue to require permits from all relevant regulatory agencies.</td>
<td>A detailed biological study shall be performed for projects that would result in direct or indirect impacts to sensitive biological resources. The study shall include focused surveys for sensitive species and formal wetland delineations where appropriate. The preferred mitigation for impacts to sensitive biological resources would be avoidance, but if avoidance is infeasible, the next preferable mitigation would be minimization of impacts with appropriate resource-specific mitigation. Impacts to wetlands and special aquatic sites would require habitat creation at a replacement ratio of at least 1:1. Enhancement of degraded wetlands and exotic species removal may also qualify as appropriate mitigation depending upon the quantity, quality and sensitivity of habitat impacted. Impacts to wetland habitats that are occupied by sensitive species, especially listed species, would require mitigation at a higher replacement ratio. Because wetlands and special aquatic sites, as well as the open water of San Diego Bay, are regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a Section 404 Permit from this agency would be required. In addition, a Section 401 certification or waiver from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, a coastal zone management consistency statement from the Coastal Commission, and a Streambed/Lake Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) would also likely be required.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that would affect biological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The direct loss of any federal- or state-listed species from future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be a significant impact. The direct loss of any non-listed, sensitive species may be significant depending upon the number of individuals impacted. For impacts to sensitive uplands, impacts to species covered by the City of Chula Vista's final Subarea Plan must comply with the constraints, goals, and objectives of that Plan.</td>
<td>Until the City of Chula Vista's Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement are approved, impacts to federally listed species and/or their habitat could be permitted through a Section 10a or Section 7 consultation. Impacts to state-listed species and/or their habitat would require a California Endangered Species Act Memorandum of Understanding from the CDFG. With the approval of the Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement, impacts to listed species and/or their habitat that were in compliance with the city's Subarea Plan would be covered under the state Fish and Game Code Section 2835. Appropriate mitigation for significant direct impacts to any sensitive species would be habitat creation/preservation. The NWR would present the most appropriate location for habitat creation, enhancement and preservation because of the high amount of disturbed habitat within its boundaries.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that would affect biological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</td>
<td>Significance of Impact</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Impacts. Future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could result in the following significant indirect impacts to adjacent sensitive biological resources: changes in hydrology, reduced watersheds, erosion, sediment accretion, influxes of nutrients, contaminants, and freshwater intrusion from urban runoff could impact southern coastal salt marsh, freshwater and brackish marsh, shallow water/mudflats, and eelgrass beds and sensitive species; and increased predation from domestic pets, human intrusion, and light and noise levels could interfere with the normal physiology of species.</td>
<td>In addition to the sediment/erosion, water quality, and noise control measures identified in this PEIR, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review individual project plans and include modifications, as necessary, to avoid or reduce to below a level of significance the potential indirect impacts to biological resources, including predator control measures, lighting plans, and appropriate buffers, fencing, and signage.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that would affect biological resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services and Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas and Electric Service. Existing utilities would be extended or upgraded to provide service to future development on vacant or underutilized parcels. Work in and around utility lines, if not performed in accordance with standard procedures of the respective utility companies, could result in potential service interruptions which would be considered a significant impact.</td>
<td>Future project applicants shall coordinate with the respective utility companies to ensure that any work in and around existing utility lines is performed in accordance with standard procedures to avoid service interruptions in the area.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to approval of utility plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without site-specific development plans, it is not possible to quantify the gas and electricity demand from future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area; nevertheless, adequate capacity is available to service projected buildout in accordance with current plans.</td>
<td>Although the project would not result in significant impacts with respect to gas/electric service, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review individual project plans and building design and include standard energy resource conservation measures, if necessary, such as sealed doors and windows, double-pane glass, increases in wall and ceiling insulation, solar benefits, and time-controlled lighting systems.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection. Because police response times to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area currently exceed the thresholds for Priority I calls, future development of the vacant and underutilized parcels would exacerbate this problem and would be considered a significant impact.</td>
<td>The City of Chula Vista shall ensure that adequate police service is provided to meet response times.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection. Future development of vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would not cause the average response time to be exceeded for emergency calls for fire protection.</td>
<td>Although the project would not result in significant impacts with respect to fire protection, the City of Chula Vista Fire Department shall review individual project plans and building design and include modifications, if necessary, to ensure conformance with standard requirements to avoid the potential for significant fire hazards at future structures associated with development of these parcels.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Removal. Because no site-specific development or redevelopment projects are currently proposed, it is not possible to determine the extent of impacts to solid waste removal services. It is anticipated, however, that with implementation of a recycling program, the solid waste demand from buildout of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront</td>
<td>Although the project would not result in a significant impact on regional landfill capacity, a recycling program shall be implemented in conjunction with a local recycling company as part of standard requirements of the County’s Solid Waste Management Plan. At a minimum, this program shall provide bins on site for the collection of recyclable materials, such as glass, plastic, metal, and</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</td>
<td>Significance of Impact</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Area would not cause projected landfill capacity to be exceeded or significantly reduce the projected life span of solid waste disposal capacity within Chula Vista.</td>
<td>Paper products, and provide trash compactors to reduce solid waste volume and the number of trips to the Otay Landfill.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Prior to approval of utility plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water.</strong> According to the Sweetwater Authority, the existing water facilities are adequate to service the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area at buildout. Therefore, impacts on water service would not be significant.</td>
<td>Although the project would not result in significant impacts on water service, future project applicants shall coordinate with the Sweetwater Authority to ensure that adequate water service is provided to the new development as part of standard requirements of the Authority.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer.</strong> Projected wastewater generation from buildout of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be within the remaining available wastewater capacity of the City of Chula Vista. Therefore, impacts on sewer service would not be significant.</td>
<td>No mitigation is necessary.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Storm Drains.</strong> Future development or redevelopment of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would increase impervious surfaces (e.g., rooftops, parking lots, and other hardscape). The resulting increase in the volume and velocity of storm water runoff which is ultimately discharged into San Diego Bay, Chula Vista Marina, and the tidal mud flat south of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, would exceed the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Without mitigation, this would be a significant effect.</td>
<td>A detailed drainage study shall be performed to demonstrate that future development is conditioned such that adequate drainage facilities are designed and provided to control and convey runoff in a manner that does not exceed the downstream storm drain capacity.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to approval of utility plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Schools.</strong> The proposed expansion area does not include residential uses. Therefore, impacts on local school facilities would not be significant.</td>
<td>Although the project would not result in significant impacts to school facilities, future project applicants shall pay school mitigation fees in accordance with standard requirements of state law.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual Character.</strong> Future development of vacant and underutilized parcels within the proposed expansion area, in accordance with the Port Master Plan, would be consistent with the existing visual character of the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area, which is already comprised of similar uses. Site plan review is required for all new development within the proposed expansion area, which would avoid conflicts with the Port Master Plan and reduce potential visual character impacts to below a level of significance.</td>
<td>Although the project would not result in a significant visual quality impact, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review individual project plans and building design as part of standard design review procedures. Design review shall include plans/architectural modifications, if necessary, to protect viewsheds and visual quality in and around the Tidelands.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viewsheds.</strong> Future development within the proposed expansion area would not significantly impact the I-5, SR-54, E Street, and F Street view corridors due to intervening distance, buildings and landscaping, and due to the short viewing time frame for motorists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Executive Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>along the identified segments of these facilities. Designated development would increase the urban character of the area, but would not interfere with public views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the Port Master Plan, business park uses are designated to the east of the Bayside Park and Marina Bay viewsheds. Views from these areas are primarily to the west, across San Diego Bay, and future development within the proposed expansion area would not affect these views.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate foreground views of the marsh areas surrounding the Chula Vista Nature Center would not be significantly impacted by future development within the proposed expansion area because, although such development would increase the urban character of areas to the southwest, they would not be within the viewshed of visitors at the Nature Center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future development within the proposed expansion area, pursuant to the Port Master Plan, would alter the visual character of the bayfront as viewed from the Bay; however, such development would be similar to the B.F. Goodrich industrial facilities in the background. Therefore, buildout of planned uses within the proposed expansion area would not significantly impact the Bay viewshed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenic Roads.</strong> As designated by the city’s LCP and Port Master Plan, future development within the proposed expansion area would occur adjacent to Marina Parkway. A mixture of industrial business park, commercial recreation, and marine-related industrial uses would be in close proximity to this scenic roadway. Specific visual quality impacts of such development would be intensification of the existing urban character; however, views from this scenic road segment would not be significantly impacted because similar uses currently exist and designated development would represent an extension of such uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>Although the project would not result in a significant impact to cultural resources, in the unlikely event that buried cultural material is discovered during excavations below the fill, work in that area shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the importance of the find, in accordance with standard grading monitoring procedures of the City of Chula Vista and SDUPD. If the cultural resource is determined to be significant, a testing program shall be approved and implemented, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>During future project-specific grading and construction activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Measures/Standard Requirements</th>
<th>Significance of Impact</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>The use of hazardous materials associated with the operation of future commercial and industrial uses within the expanded redevelopment area will be subject to regulatory requirements of local, state and federal agencies. Compliance with the regulatory standards of these agencies would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance. If not mitigated, public exposure to hazardous materials could occur through handling of potentially contaminated soil by construction workers, public contact with potentially contaminated surface or groundwaters (e.g., leaking underground storage tanks, urban runoff pollution), and exposure to volatile emissions from heating/cooling systems.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit for any property within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area where the results of a Phase I, Phase II, and/or asbestos evaluation indicate the potential for hazardous materials at levels requiring mitigation. During and after grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable remedial measures in accordance with approved plans and permits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be performed for any property within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area formerly occupied by or adjacent to existing industrial facilities. Based upon results of the Phase I survey, Phase II sampling and evaluation may be required. Phase II evaluation for possible soil and groundwater contamination shall be performed for the approximate 15-acre parcel bounded by J Street and Marina Parkway. Asbestos and lead-based paint surveys shall be conducted on existing buildings scheduled for renovation or demolition. All remedial measures identified in these studies shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts.</td>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit for any property within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area where the results of a Phase I, Phase II, and/or asbestos evaluation indicate the potential for hazardous materials at levels requiring mitigation. During and after grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable remedial measures in accordance with approved plans and permits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

Pursuant to California Community Redevelopment Law, the City of Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency ("the Agency") is proposing to amend the adopted Town Centre I and Bayfront redevelopment plans. Both plans would be amended to extend the time periods within which the Agency may commence eminent domain proceedings, incur debt, undertake redevelopment activities, and collect tax increment revenue. In addition, the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan is being amended to include approximately 398 acres within the San Diego Unified Port District (SDUPD) boundaries, of which approximately 145 acres comprise the land area ("the proposed expansion area" or "Tidelands"). This EIR addresses environmental impacts within the 145-acre land area only, since redevelopment is not related to water areas. If adopted, the amended Bayfront Redevelopment Plan will supersede and replace the existing plan, and both amended redevelopment plans will guide future redevelopment activities, projects, and programs in the respective redevelopment areas. The amendments will not, however, affect the existing plans’ obligations or indebtedness.

The project proposes to amend the existing land use plan of the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan, but does not propose changes to adopted land uses as designated by controlling land use documents for the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area and the proposed expansion area (collectively referred to as "the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area") nor the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area. The proposed amendment to the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Plan’s "Statement of Basic Objectives and General Land Use Controls" would more comprehensively correlate with the Agency’s current redevelopment goals, and provide that land uses in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are consistent with the City of Chula Vista General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Local Coastal Program (LCP), as well as the SDUPD Port Master Plan, and all other state and local building codes, guidelines, or specific plans, as they now exist or are hereafter amended.

The proposed expansion area is within the Chula Vista Bayfront Planning District (District 7) of the Port Master Plan and will remain under the jurisdiction of the SDUPD. The Chula Vista General Plan land use designations for the proposed expansion area are not consistent with the recently revised Port Master Plan. To correct this inconsistency, the project includes a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to conform the General Plan to the Port Master Plan for this area. Land uses approved by the SDUPD within the proposed expansion area would be incorporated into the
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Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Land Use Plan. By incorporating this additional land, the Agency can provide economic redevelopment tools to assist the SDUPD in their efforts to remove impediments to development, provide financial options to help correct incompatible and nonconforming land uses, and combine resources to aide in the redesign of obsolete buildings within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. The proposed project would also encourage development of uses that produce income and jobs for the region. Future projects within the Tidelands would be approved by the SDUPD and projects within the uplands (non-Port Tidelands) would be approved by the City of Chula Vista. The SDUPD retains sole jurisdiction authority over the Tidelands and maintains the final authority for land use planning and management of the Tidelands.

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzes the potential environmental impacts of the proposed amendments to the Town Centre I and Bayfront Redevelopment Plans. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Redevelopment Agency is the Lead Agency for preparation of this EIR and the City of Chula Vista is a Responsible Agency.

At this time, no site-specific development or redevelopment proposals are contemplated for the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area or the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Therefore, a focused analysis of specific environmental impacts associated with implementation of any project pursuant to existing plans would be premature and speculative. Environmental impacts related to specific development proposals in these areas will be evaluated in detail at the time such proposals are submitted to the City of Chula Vista or to the SDUPD, as appropriate.

The expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area contains vacant or underdeveloped parcels. Future development of these parcels may result in potential environmental impacts. As such, this EIR provides a program-level analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with future "worst-case" development of these parcels. The worst-case development scenario for these parcels assumes development of the entire area at the maximum intensities allowed by existing land use regulations.

Because the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area is largely built-out and no site-specific redevelopment activities are proposed at this time, this document does not provide a program-level environmental analysis for this area. As stated above, future redevelopment projects within the Town Center I Redevelopment Area will be required to undergo the appropriate level of CEQA analysis as determined by the Agency. Although program-level environmental analysis is not
provided in this document for the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area, this EIR evaluates the potential for growth inducement resulting from proposed amendments to both redevelopment plans due to the extension of time frames for redevelopment activities to occur, as proposed by this project.

1.2 DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS

The discretionary actions that are included in the proposed project and evaluated in this EIR are as follows:

1) Amendments to the Town Centre I and Bayfront Redevelopment Plans to extend time periods within which the Agency may commence eminent domain proceedings, incur debt, undertake redevelopment activities, and collect tax increment revenue. (Inclusion of the Tidelands into the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan does not give the Agency eminent domain authority over Port Tidelands.)

2) Amendment to the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan to add 145 acres of land area (398 acres of total area, including land and water), known as the Tidelands, that is and will remain under the land use jurisdiction of the SDUPD.

3) Amendment to the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Land Use Plan to eliminate existing inconsistencies that the Plan has with the city’s LCP and the Port Master Plan.

4) Amendment to the Chula Vista General Plan land use element and map to designate the Tidelands as “Mixed Land Use”, providing conforming land uses to the Port Master Plan.

1.3 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The existing Town Centre I Redevelopment Plan was originally adopted by the Chula Vista City Council by Ordinance No. 1691 on July 6, 1976, and the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan by Ordinance No. 1541 on July 16, 1974. Both plans have subsequently been amended on four separate occasions. These amendments primarily involved merging the financial provision of both plans and extending the time limits on collection of tax increment and bonded indebtedness.
Portions of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area have undergone previous environmental review. The existing redevelopment area was evaluated by the City of Chula Vista in the Bayfront Specific Plan EIR (January 1985; State Clearinghouse #84103108) and the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment EIR (July 1991; State Clearinghouse #89062807). Approximately 67 acres of the proposed expansion area were evaluated by the SDUPD in the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (September 1997; State Clearinghouse #96101030). In accordance with Section 15063(f) of the state CEQA Guidelines, these previous environmental documents have been reviewed by the city and serve as the environmental initial study for the currently proposed project. Based on this preliminary environmental review, the City of Chula Vista has determined that an EIR is required for the proposed project because the previous EIRs identified significant environmental impacts.

1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (Public Resources Code, 21000, et seq.), as amended, the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (California Code of Regulations, Section 15000, et seq.), as amended, and the City of Chula Vista’s environmental review procedures. The document is intended to serve as a ‘first tier’ or Program EIR (PEIR) as defined in Sections 15152, 15168 and 15180 of the state CEQA Guidelines. As stated in Section 15180, “An EIR on a redevelopment plan shall be treated as a program EIR with no subsequent EIRs required for individual components of the redevelopment plan unless a subsequent EIR or a supplement to an EIR would be required by Section 15162 or 15163.”

The proposed project would facilitate future development and redevelopment activities within the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area and the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area by correcting constraining provisions of the respective redevelopment plans that inhibit the ability of the Agency to implement them. As previously stated, these constraining provisions include the need to extend time frames to accomplish planned redevelopment activities and the need to update redevelopment plan policies to better correlate with adopted, underlying land use controls. Furthermore, by expanding the Bayfront Redevelopment Area to incorporate the tidelands, the project would allow the Agency to assist the SDUPD in correcting existing physical and economic blight conditions in that area. According to the background discussion in Section 15180 of the state CEQA Guidelines, “If the later activities in the program [i.e., redevelopment plans] involve no new significant effects beyond those analyzed in the program EIR and are adequately handled by mitigation measures
identified in the program EIR, there is no need for further documentation in the EIR process. If, however, a particular activity would involve a new significant effect, then there must be additional CEQA compliance for that effect.”

Pursuant to the ‘tiering concept’ authorized in Section 15152 of the state CEQA Guidelines, the Agency or SDUPD, as appropriate, will rely on this PEIR in the environmental assessment of later activities in the program, including site-specific development and redevelopment projects. Specifically, this PEIR will be used as the environmental initial study for future projects that implement the redevelopment plans. Based on the initial study, the Agency or SDUPD, as appropriate, will determine whether this PEIR adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts and required mitigation measures associated with future projects. If it does, the Agency may issue a negative declaration pursuant to Article 6 of the state CEQA Guidelines. If the Agency determines that additional environmental documentation is necessary, any subsequent environmental analysis for implementing redevelopment projects should be focused to address only the substantial changes or new information as defined in Sections 15162 and 15163 of the state CEQA Guidelines.

As authorized in Section 15150 of the state CEQA Guidelines, subsequent environmental documentation for future projects that implement the redevelopment plans may incorporate by reference information from this PEIR relative to

- the environmental setting for both redevelopment plan areas;
- existing conditions for the specific environmental issues under evaluation, as long as conditions have not changed substantially between the time this document is adopted and receipt of future project proposals;
- consistency with applicable land use and environmental plans, programs, policies, and regulations, as long as they have not changed substantially between the time this document is adopted and receipt of future project proposals;
- applicable mitigation measures for significant environmental impacts; and
- other CEQA-mandated analyses including cumulative impacts, growth-inducing effects, environmental effects found not to be significant, relationship between local short-term uses of man’s environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.
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Information that is incorporated by reference, according to Section 15150, should not be repeated, but rather summarized briefly. This method also reduces subsequent environmental review processing delays and paperwork, as suggested in Section 15006 of the state CEQA Guidelines.

The City of Chula Vista circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on January 16, 1998 to the state Office of Planning and Research (OPR), other responsible agencies (as defined in Section 15381 of the state CEQA Guidelines), agencies with jurisdiction by law over natural resources that could be affected by the project, and other interested parties to solicit comments on the contents of this PEIR. The NOP and associated comment letters are included in Appendix B.

The draft PEIR will be released for a 45-day public review period. Upon completion of the public review period and a Planning Commission hearing at the close of public review, the Final PEIR will be prepared which will include responses to public comments, modifications to the draft PEIR and MMRP as a result of public comments (if necessary), a mitigation monitoring and reporting program, Findings, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (for any significant, unmitigable impacts). The PEIR will be reviewed and considered by the Agency, which will determine whether to approve the project and certify the PEIR.

1.5 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF REPORT

This PEIR is an informational document intended to inform public decision-makers, other responsible or interested agencies, and the general public of the potential effects of the project. The environmental review process will enable public agencies to evaluate the project in terms of its environmental consequences, to examine and implement methods of eliminating or reducing any potentially significant adverse impacts, and to consider alternatives to the project as proposed.

This chapter (Section 1.0) provides the project description, objectives, and background, and introduces the project in light of required environmental procedures. Section 2.0 of this PEIR describes the location and environmental setting in and around the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area and the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

During the environmental initial study for the proposed project, the Agency identified the following issues which are the focus of this PEIR: land use and planning, geophysical, water, air quality, noise, transportation/circulation, biology, public services/utilities, aesthetics, cultural resources, and hazardous materials. Section 3.0 of this PEIR (Environmental Analysis) addresses each issue in detail, including a description of existing conditions, a discussion of potential impacts and their
significance, and recommended or incorporated mitigation measures to lessen the significant impacts. In accordance with Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code, the mitigation measures identify responsible parties, timing of implementation, and monitoring procedures. The significance of impact after mitigation, including environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the project and/or mitigation are implemented, is identified at the end of each issue section. As stated above, environmental analysis of the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area is not provided in Section 3.0 because the project does not involve actions within this redevelopment area that would have the potential for resulting in adverse environmental impacts. Changes to the Town Center I Redevelopment Plan proposed by this project are related only to extension of time frames to allow implementation of planned redevelopment activities.

Other CEQA-mandated sections provided in this PEIR include an evaluation of project alternatives (Section 4.0), cumulative impacts (Section 5.0), growth-inducing impacts for both the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area and the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area (Section 6.0), and environmental effects found not to be significant (Section 7.0); a summary of environmental consequences (Section 8.0), including the relationship between local short-term uses of man’s environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity, and any significant irreversible environmental changes which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented; and a list of preparers of/contributors to this PEIR (Section 9.0), references (Section 10.0), and persons contacted during its preparation (Section 11.0). Technical reports and supporting materials discussed and/or cited in the text are listed in Section 10.0 or are included as appendices to this PEIR, as indicated in the Table of Contents.
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2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

2.1 PROJECT LOCATION

Both the existing Town Centre I and Bayfront Redevelopment Areas are located in the City of Chula Vista, in southwestern San Diego County, California (Figure 2.1-1). Figure 2.1-2 shows the respective redevelopment areas. The proposed expansion area is within SDUPD jurisdiction and extends between the combined U.S. Pierhead and Bulkhead lines (i.e., SDUPD bayward boundary) in San Diego Bay and the ordinary high water mark (Figure 2.1-2). As stated in Section 1.1 of this PEIR, approximately 145 acres of the 398-acre proposed expansion area comprise the land mass within which activities pursuant to the proposed Bayfront Redevelopment Plan amendment would be relevant.

2.2 EXISTING LAND USES WITHIN THE REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Existing land uses within the approximate 139-acre Town Centre I Redevelopment Area include high- and medium-high-density residential; retail, professional and administrative commercial; open space; and public and quasi-public uses. The primary arterial roadway extending north-south through the approximate center of the redevelopment area is 3rd Avenue, with predominantly commercial uses along both sides of the street in the north portion of the redevelopment area, and public, quasi-public and professional/administrative commercial uses in the south. Residential development surrounds these uses along the 3rd Avenue corridor.

Figure 2.2-1 is an aerial photograph that depicts the majority of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Land uses within the approximate 637-acre existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area include the 316-acre Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge, with the Chula Vista Nature Center and 26-acre F & G Street Marsh; a portion of Marina View Park; industrial facilities and the large parking areas occupied by B.F. Goodrich Aerospace/Air Structures Group (formerly Rohr Corporation) and other companies; commercial and professional office and medical buildings of the Marina Gateway Business Park along Bay Boulevard, north of J Street; restaurants and hotels along Bay Boulevard, north of Lagoon Drive; and a portion of the land occupied by the San Diego Gas and Electric (SDG&E) South Bay Power Plant.
Existing land uses within the proposed expansion area include Bayside Park (with excursion pier and boat launching ramp), Chula Vista recreational vehicle park, Chula Vista Marina (including boatyards, warehouses, restaurants, and marine sales and services establishments), a portion of Marine View Park, and a portion of B.F. Goodrich Aerospace/Air Structures Group.

Major buildings include three 20-foot high concrete warehouses along Sandpiper Way, totaling about 145,000 square feet of floor area, and approximately 32 buildings on the B.F. Goodrich leasehold, totaling about 197,000 square feet. Approximately 33 acres of vacant and underutilized land are located at Marina Parkway and G Street. This relatively flat property has been previously cleared and graded, contains little vegetation, and is surrounded by four-foot-high chain link fences. Another approximately 86 acres of vacant or underutilized land occurs throughout the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area (Figure 2.2-1).

Police and emergency services are provided to the South Bay from the Harbor Police substation near the Bayside Park boat launching ramp and through an agreement with the Chula Vista Police Department. The Bayside Park Pier provides public fishing and large vessel berthing, and the Marina Parkway Pier provides berthing and landside automobile parking for users.

2.3 EXISTING LAND USES SURROUNDING THE REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Existing land uses surrounding the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area include a park; public and quasi-public facilities; low-medium-, medium-, medium-high-, and high-density residential; and retail, professional and administrative commercial uses.

Existing land uses surrounding the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area include a mixture of residential, commercial, industrial, public, and open space uses. To the west is San Diego Bay. To the north are tourist commercial, industrial, and open space uses on the north side of the Sweetwater River within the City of National City. To the east beyond Interstate 5 (I-5) are highway-related commercial uses, restaurants, institutional facilities, and residential areas of varying densities. The Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) trolley line is adjacent to I-5 on the east, and the San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD&AE) railroad runs parallel to I-5 on the west. The following uses occur to the south of the South Bay Power Plant: the Bayside Office Park, the Grainger Industrial Maintenance Supply Store, brine ponds of the Western Salt Works, and a light industrial office park, storage yards, and a residence on the east side of Bay Boulevard.
2.0 Environmental Setting
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3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The following Environmental Analysis sections focus on the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Because no land use or boundary changes are proposed in the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area and because the area is largely built-out and no site-specific redevelopment activities are proposed at this time, the Environmental Analysis Section of this document does not address this area. As stated in Section 1.0 of this PEIR, future redevelopment projects within the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area will be required to undergo the appropriate level of CEQA analysis as determined by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Chula Vista ("Agency").

3.1 LAND USE AND PLANNING

Land use information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on the Mdbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of land use conditions for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.1.1 Existing Conditions

Existing Land Uses

Land uses within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area include industrial, commercial, residential, and public and open space uses. Due to these mixed uses, the community character varies within the area. The north portion of the expanded redevelopment area is characterized by natural open space of the Sweetwater Marsh; the east, central, and south portions are predominantly industrial; and the west portion is characterized by residential, visitor-serving and recreational uses, including a recreational vehicle park, public parks, the Chula Vista Marina, and associated commercial development (Figure 2.2-1). Further discussion of the land use setting is provided in Section 2.2 of this PEIR.
3.1 Land Use and Planning

Relevant Land Use Plans

Chula Vista General Plan

According to the *Chula Vista General Plan* (City of Chula Vista 1995), the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area includes the land use designations of open space, parks and recreation; public and quasi-public; low-medium, medium, medium-high, and high-density residential; visitor commercial; professional and administrative commercial; research and limited manufacturing; and general industrial (Figure 3.1-1). Vacant and underutilized parcels exist within the general industrial, research and limited manufacturing, residential, and visitor commercial land use designations. Please refer to the documents listed at the beginning of this section for information regarding allowable uses and densities for these land use designations.

Of particular note is the high-density residential and visitor and thoroughfare commercial designations in the north portion of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, which is bounded by Lagoon Drive, Bay Boulevard, Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (NWR), and the planned extension of Marina Parkway. This area has been the subject of previous project proposals, the most recent involving a waterfront development with multi-family residences surrounding a mixed-use commercial retail center. Future development in this area is envisioned as a community focus destination intended to attract visitors to the bayfront area. For this reason, attention is given to this area in the ‘worst-case’ analysis of several environmental issues of concern in this PEIR, including traffic, noise, visual quality, and biological resources.

San Diego Unified Port District Master Plan (Port Master Plan)

The State Lands Commission has jurisdiction and authority over state tidelands on San Diego Bay; however, the state legislature has granted much of this land in trust to the SDUPD, including the Chula Vista wetlands and estuary lands. The proposed expansion area for the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan is therefore subject to the following applicable goals, objectives, and planned uses identified in the *Port Master Plan* (SDUPD 1996):

- Administer tidelands to provide economic, social, and aesthetic benefits;
- Emphasize public, state-wide considerations over private considerations;
- Cooperate with adjacent communities;
- Enhance and maintain the biological and physical entity of the bay and tidelands;
- Ensure access to the water; and
- Maintain water quality.
3.1 Land Use and Planning

Revised land use classifications within the proposed expansion area (Figure 3.1-2) were approved by SDUPD in September 1997, as addressed in the Port Master Plan Amendment EIR. The Port Master Plan is the overriding land use policy for the Tidelands. The Final EIR and amended Master Plan was certified by the California Coastal Commission on March 10, 1998. At that time, the Port Master Plan will be revised to reflect the amendment. The proposed expansion area is designated with marine-related industrial park, industrial-business park, and commercial-recreation uses. Water uses to the west of the proposed expansion area, within San Diego Bay, are designated as specialized berthing industrial, recreational boat berthing commercial, boat navigation corridor, and estuary conservation. Land use designations within the proposed expansion area are substantially similar (i.e., industrial, commercial, and open space) to those designated for this area by the Chula Vista General Plan.

California Coastal Act and Chula Vista Bayfront Local Coastal Program

The entire expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is within the coastal zone as designated by the California Coastal Act of 1976. The Act establishes the following basic goals for the coastal zone:

- Protect, maintain, and, where feasible, enhance and restore the overall quality of the coastal zone environment and its natural and manmade resources;
- Assure orderly, balanced utilization and conservation of coastal zone resources taking into account the social and economic needs of the people of the state;
- Maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resource conservation principles and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners;
- Assure priority for coastal-dependent development over other development on the coast; and
- Encourage state and local initiatives and cooperation in preparing procedures to implement coordinated planning and development for mutually beneficial uses, including educational uses, in the coastal zone.

The Coastal Act requires that every coastal city and county prepare a local coastal program (LCP) to be submitted to and approved by the California Coastal Commission. The Act defines an LCP as “local government’s land use plans, zoning ordinances, zoning district maps, and implementing actions which, when taken together, meet the requirements of, and implement the provisions and policies of the Coastal Act at the local level.”
Figure 3.1-2
Port Master Plan
Land Use Designations

SOURCE: San Diego Unified Port District
NOTE: These designations are contingent upon Coastal Commission certification
3.1 Land Use and Planning

Sections 30251 and 30253(5) of the Coastal Act require the protection of scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas, and the preservation of unique visitor-destination communities. The potential visual and scenic qualities of the Bayfront are currently not being fully realized because views of portions of the area from I-5 are impaired by visual blight conditions, including dilapidated vacant and burnout buildings, remnant foundations, trash piles, open storage areas, expansive parking lots, unkept or overgrown vegetation, and denuded transmission line corridors.

Bayfront Specific Plan

The existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area is located within the city’s coastal jurisdiction. Land uses within this area are regulated by the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan and the certified Chula Vista Local Coastal Program (City of Chula Vista 1993), which includes the Bayfront Specific Plan (Figure 3.1-3). The Tidelands is also included in the city’s LCP, for which the Port Master Plan is the overriding land use policy document (see previous discussion). The Specific Plan has five major provisions: Land Use and Development Intensity; Circulation, Public Access and Parking; Physical Form and Appearance; Utilities and Areawide Grading; and Environmental Management. The intent of the Plan is to provide for a variety of land uses which complement the Bayfront while minimizing impacts to wetlands. As a result, the wetland areas are primarily designated as open space.

The Specific Plan provides development objectives and policies on an areawide and subarea basis. Specific policy provisions are defined to guide development and resource enhancement in the Bayfront, and are not repeated in this PEIR. The relevant objectives are summarized below for each of the five major Plan Provisions.

Land Use and Development Intensity. Redevelopment sites would be devoted to mixed use developments including commercial/recreational uses, public parks, and residences. Emphasis is placed on expanding public use and waterfront access; preservation of existing saltwater marshes, ponds, and mudflats; integration of development with the Sweetwater Marsh NWR; and economic development of a size and scale appropriate for the public infrastructure and compatible with existing land uses. Figure 3.1-4 depicts the following subareas identified in the Land Use and Development Intensity Provision of the Plan:

Subarea 1 - Midbayfront. A 116-acre site located in the north portion of the Bayfront. A major mixed-use, visitor-oriented development is programmed for this site. Relevant Subarea 1 objectives include:
3.1 Land Use and Planning

- Provide attractive, first-class, water-oriented development that enhances the image of the city, including hotels, lagoons, residences, and public open space in accord with strict design policies.

- Maximize public access, creating a pleasant pedestrian environment in harmony with the indigenous wetlands.

- Screen vehicle parking areas to achieve a pedestrian-oriented, village-scale atmosphere and open space area.

- Use architectural edges to define views; create enhanced views through a unified architectural character; and establish/preserve panoramic, framed, and axial views.

- Provide clearly identifiable ‘gateways’ along Bay Boulevard and Marina Parkway.

- Establish buffers between major high-rise buildings and the Sweetwater Marsh NWR to preclude shadow effects on sensitive wetlands, and incorporate non-reflective surface materials and muted colors.

**Subarea 2 - Industrial Area.** Primarily the B.F. Goodrich industrial and manufacturing facilities are anticipated to remain with allowances for limited expansion. The relevant Subarea 2 objective is to provide aesthetic improvements to existing and new industrial development.

**Subarea 3 - Southern Parcel.** A 90-acre site south of L Street and west of I-5, approximately 65 acres of which is the SDG&E South Bay Power Plant with the remainder also in industrial use. A four-acre salt works site is to be incorporated into a state wildlife preserve over a 20-year period. The relevant Subarea 3 objective is to provide for maintenance of existing development and long-term conservation of potential habitat areas as protected open space.

**Subarea 4 - Inland Parcel.** An 80-acre site north of C Street and west of Broadway, a major portion of which is occupied by SR-54 and the Sweetwater River channel. It is anticipated that this property would be developed with limited, low-intensity commercial recreation uses. The relevant Subarea 4 objective is to allow, as a conditional use, commercial “group assembly” development outside of the 100-year storm flood hazard zone.
3.1 Land Use and Planning

*Subarea 5 - Faivre Street.* A 10-acre site adjacent to the MTDB trolley tracks, this property is used for truck terminal and open storage. The relevant Subarea 5 objective is to improve the appearance of the current uses and establish a potential redesignation (and development regulations) from industrial to ‘open space’ consistent with the General Plan.

*Subarea 6 - Palomar/Bay Boulevard Reorganization.* A 63-acre site west of Bay Boulevard, north of Palomar Street, along the easterly shoreline of the Bay. This property is currently used for salt evaporation ponds (Western Salt Company) and large steel tanks associated with the SDG&E South Bay Power Plant. The relevant Subarea 6 objective is to establish a land use plan and development regulations consistent with its development capability and environmental value.

*Subarea 7 - Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge.* Owned and operated by the USFWS, this 316-acre site contains most of the important wildlife habitat and wetlands within the Bayfront. The relevant Subarea 7 objective is to maintain and enhance wildlife habitat within the NWR while allowing public enjoyment of coastal resources in a manner consistent with habitat protection.

*Circulation, Public Access and Parking.* Because the Bayfront is programmed for projects with a regional appeal there is an emphasis on access through connections to I-5 and SR-54. All circulation elements are to be located to minimize adverse impacts on marshlands, protect key recreational lands, and avoid fragmentation into parcels of inadequate size and configuration. Pedestrian and bicycle access along the shoreline is to take priority over the automobile. To avoid congestion, the overall land-use mix would be such that the peak traffic generating periods are staggered. Public access to the Chula Vista Nature Center and use of public and private transit services are encouraged for visitors and residents.

*Physical Form and Appearance.* The Bayfront is a unique, high-profile setting which has the potential for defining the city’s image. Therefore, a substantial effort is proposed to assure that the area exhibits high standards for its appearance and quality of design. Preservation of the unique wetlands in a healthy state is emphasized. It is also a priority to execute an aesthetic shift in the appearance of the area from “industrial” in character to an image attractive to quality commercial/recreational development and conducive to public enjoyment of the waterfront. Blighting influences are to be removed or screened by landscaping. The Bayfront is to be integrated into adjoining areas of Chula Vista to act as a high-profile, image-boosting extension of the city as it is viewed from the freeways as well as the bay. Special design attention is given to the interface between developments and public open spaces. View corridors are to be identified, protected, and
enhanced by means of extensive landscaping and strict height, placement, and orientation criteria for new buildings and structures.

The Land Use Plan provides the following visual quality design guidelines: (1) entrances to the Bayfront should be designed to form ‘visual gateways’ to the water’s edge to support the feeling of proximity to the Bay; (2) landscaping and architectural edges should be used to enhance these views throughout the Bayfront; and (3) buildings should be sited to create view corridors, and should be stepped back from the Bay to preserve views.

*Utilities and Areawide Grading.* All utilities are to be adequately sized to assure sufficient capacity for the most intensive uses. Existing natural resources are to be protected from adverse impacts during construction. On site drainage facilities are to be provided to avoid storm-water runoff without filtering of sediments and pollutants. The import of soil is to be restricted to that necessary for the protection of developable areas from flooding during the 100-year design storm.

*Environmental Management.* Because the Bayfront contains or is adjacent to critical natural habitat areas, an objective of the Plan is the long-term protection and enhancement of these areas through a multi-jurisdictional planning and implementation program with adequate safeguards and guarantees. Generally, the specified biological mitigation features and actions focus on the interface areas between the Midbayfront Subarea and the adjoining NWR. This Provision also provides for the preparation of management plans; limitation on the diking, dredging or filling of wetland areas to specific enhancement projects; and implementation of a long-term funding mechanism for the maintenance, improvement, and continued operation of the Chula Vista Nature Center.

**SANDAG Plans**

A number of regional planning documents from the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) were reviewed in relation to the proposed project, including the *Regional Growth Management Strategy* (1993), the *Land Use Distribution Element of the Regional Growth Management Strategy* (1995), the *Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)* (1996), the *Shoreline Preservation Strategy* (1993), and the *Sweetwater River Habitat Conservation Plan* (1991). These plans discuss planning issues on a county-wide or regional basis. Therefore, these documents do not provide specific goals, policies, objectives, guidelines, programs, or planning or land use concerns that are relevant to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.
3.1 Land Use and Planning

3.1.2 Impacts

Based on applicable thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in significant direct and/or indirect land use impacts if they would:

- be incompatible with surrounding land uses within and adjacent to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area;
- conflict with the overall community character of the area; or
- be inconsistent with applicable land use and environmental plans, programs, guidelines, goals, objectives, and policies.

Future development of vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, in accordance with the underlying land use and zoning designations, is intended to be compatible with surrounding land uses and the community character of the area. Because the project does not propose changes to adopted land uses as designated by the Bayfront Specific Plan or Port Master Plan, it is consistent with applicable land use and environmental plans, programs, guidelines, goals, objectives, and policies. Although the project proposes a GPA for the Tidelands, it is outside the jurisdiction of the city; the Port Master Plan is the governing land use document. As stated in Section 1.1 of this PEIR, the purpose of the GPA is to provide consistency between the General Plan and Port Master Plan. The Chula Vista General Plan map and text are proposed to be amended to "mixed land use" for the Tidelands, with the text modified to specifically address this area as follows:

Tidelands property in the Chula Vista bayfront area. A mixture of land uses are recommended on Port District-controlled tideland property, bounded generally on the north by G Street, on the south by J Street, on the west by San Diego Bay, and on the east by the mean high tide line. To provide flexibility in master planning this unique area, a broad range of land uses are envisioned including industrial, commercial, professional, business service, and recreation and facilities. In addition, hotels, restaurants, integrated meeting and conference space, specialized retail commercial, and business-professional office uses would be allowed in a campus setting. To ensure compatibility and continuity of land uses the city and Port District shall coordinate on master planning efforts for this area.
The project also proposes amendments to the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Land Use Plan. These amendments are proposed to update the land use plan to conform to the existing Chula Vista LCP and Port Master Plan. The LCP and Port Master Plan take precedence over land use controls in the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area, and therefore, amendments to the land use plan to conform to the LCP and Port Master Plan would not result in significant impacts to land use.

As stated above, Sections 30251 and 30253(5) of the Coastal Act require the protection of scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas, and the preservation of unique visitor-destination communities. Future development of vacant or underutilized parcels within the proposed expansion area would not affect existing views to the Bay, as described in Section 3.9.2 of this PEIR. The quality of views from the Chula Vista Nature Center and Chula Vista Marina are also expected to be maintained as follows. Foreground views of surrounding marshlands are the primary views from the Nature Center, and future development within the proposed expansion area would not be within the viewshed of visitors to the center. Such future development would blend into the backdrop (mid-and long-range views), which presently consists of similar uses, and therefore would not significantly impact the overall visual experience of visitors to the Center. Similarly, designated development near the marina would not impact the visual experience of users of the Chula Vista Marina, as these views are oriented toward the Bay.

Because views would be maintained for visitors to the waterfront, including the Bayside and Marina View parks, the marina, and the Chula Vista Nature Center, future development would not result in significant conflicts with the visual preservation policies of the Coastal Plan. There is a potential for such development to significantly conflict with the visual quality guidelines of the Bayfront Specific Plan, however, if these guidelines are not taken into consideration in the design of future projects. These considerations are reflected in the mitigation measures provided in Sections 3.1.3 and 3.9.3 of this PEIR.

3.1.3 Mitigation Measures

Future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that are implemented in accordance with adopted land use and zoning designations are not expected to result in significant land use impacts, and implementation of the following standard design review procedure of the city and SDUPD would ensure that future projects avoid potential conflicts with surrounding uses, community character and adopted land use plans.
3.1 Land Use and Planning

3.1.3.1 Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review individual project plans and building design. Design review shall include plan/architectural modifications, if necessary, to avoid conflicts with surrounding uses, community character, and adopted land use plans.

3.1.4 Analysis of Significance

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measure outlined above would avoid significant land use impacts associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area during the design review phase.
3.2 GEOPHYSICAL

Soils, geologic and seismic information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on geotechnical studies prepared by GEOCON, Inc. for the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on studies by Southern California Testing Laboratory, Inc. for SDUPD's Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of geophysical conditions for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.2.1 Existing Conditions

Soils/Geology

The soils and geologic units underlying the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area consist of previously-placed fill soils, bay deposits, and natural soils of the Bay Point Formation. Fill soils underlie the majority of the expanded redevelopment area to a depth of less than 10 feet below existing grade and typically consist of fine- to coarse-grained sands with shell fragments and varying amounts of silt. Bay deposits underlie the fill soils and range in thickness from 15 to 30 feet. The upper 3 to 5 feet of the bay deposits generally consist of soft, silty clays and clayey silts, with abundant organic material. This extremely soft and compressible upper layer is generally underlain by medium-dense, silty fine sands. Underlying the bay deposits are natural soils of the Bay Point Formation (dated at approximately 120,000 years old). These soils typically consist of medium-dense to dense, silty, fine- to medium-grained sands and poorly-graded, medium-grained sands with little silt content.

Seismicity

Major southern California and San Diego fault systems form a northwest-southeast trending regional structural fabric extending between the Gulf of California and Point Reyes, north of San Francisco. These fault systems generally parallel the San Andreas fault zone. As a result, the southern California region is subject to significant hazards from moderate to large earthquakes. Ground shaking is a hazard everywhere in California. Fault displacement of the ground is a potential hazard at and near faults. Tsunamis (ocean tidal waves caused by submarine earth movement), earthquake-
induced flooding, and liquefaction (mixing of solid and liquid soil components creating a slurry incapable of structural support) are all hazards in the San Diego Bay area.

The expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is not traversed by any known fault traces; however, this area could be seismically influenced by both local and regional fault systems. The nearest ‘active’ fault zones and faults include the offshore Coronado Banks Fault Zone (approximately 10 miles to the southwest), the Elsinore Fault Zone (approximately 40 miles to the northeast), the Rose Canyon Fault Zone (approximately five miles to the north), and the offshore San Diego Bay faults (approximately one to two miles to the west). The San Diego Bay faults are generally believed to be the southerly extension of the Rose Canyon fault zone. Active faults are defined as those which exhibit Holocene displacement (i.e., surface displacement within approximately the last 11,000 years) or historical seismicity. The ‘potentially active’ La Nacion Fault Zone is located approximately two to three miles east of the expanded redevelopment area. Potentially active faults are defined as those which exhibit Pleistocene displacement (i.e., surface displacement older than two million years).

3.2.2 Impacts

Based on applicable thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in a significant impact if they would expose the public or human-occupancy structures (structures designed for 2,000 or more person-hours per year) to geologic/seismic hazards such as:

- Failure of manufactured slopes (e.g., landslides, sloughing, shear zones);
- Differential settlement due to improper fills or subsidence; or
- Ground rupture, ground shaking, and/or liquefaction due to improper siting of buildings too near earthquake faults or noncompliance with seismic construction standards.

Soils/Geology

The lack of information about the nature and extent of future site-specific development or redevelopment activities which may occur on any particular parcel within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area precludes the identification of specific impacts. Nonetheless, there are no unusual or unmitigable soil or geologic conditions which would preclude development on any of the vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded redevelopment area.
Grading in fill soils may result in localized instability of temporary excavation (construction) slopes. This would not result in a significant geologic constraint to future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, however, with implementation of standard remedial measures during grading such as structural reinforcement of manufactured slopes and/or removal/compaction of potentially unstable soils.

Uncontrolled fill soils and bay deposits are subject to differential ground settlement and are therefore considered unsuitable in their present condition for the support of any additional fill and/or structures. Differential ground settlement is attributable to the presence of loose, surficial fill soils and relatively shallow deposits of soft, compressible bay muds throughout the historic marshlands and tidal flats, as well as in the deeper water areas. Bay mud, an organic silty clay, is highly compressible under foundation and/or fill loads, and would take years to stabilize under the weight of fill or structures. The presence of these compressible soils would not result in a significant constraint to future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area provided that standard remedial measures during grading, such as removal of excess organic material and oversized rock fragments and/or excavation/recompaction of fill, are implemented.

Seismicity

The Coronado Banks and Rose Canyon fault zones may be associated with a maximum credible earthquake of 6.25 magnitude during a typical 100-year period. The Elsinore Fault Zone may be subject to a maximum credible earthquake of 7.5 magnitude during a typical 100-year period. The magnitude of an earthquake, as expressed by the Richter magnitude scale, is a relative measure of the amount of energy released and is determined from the amount of movement on a standard seismometer. Magnitude varies logarithmically with the wave amplitude of the quake recorded by the seismometer, with each whole number increase in magnitude on the scale representing a ten-fold increase in the measured wave amplitude of an earthquake. For each increase of one unit on the Richter magnitude scale, the energy released increases about 31 times. Maximum ground acceleration is a common unit of measurement of the severity of ground motion during an earthquake and is expressed in terms of gravitational force (g).

Maximum ground acceleration (ground shaking within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area) on the order of 0.3 to 3.5 g is estimated to occur from a magnitude 6.25 earthquake along the Rose Canyon Fault Zone. Maximum ground acceleration from maximum credible earthquakes along the Coronado Banks and Elsinore fault zones would be less than that of a magnitude 6.25 earthquake along the Rose Canyon Fault Zone due to the large distance of these faults from the expanded...
3.2 Geophysical

redevelopment area. In addition to ground shaking, a maximum credible earthquake along any of these faults would result in significant seismic hazards to future development or redevelopment within the expanded redevelopment area relative to potential liquefaction, tsunamis, and earthquake-induced flooding and slope failures, as discussed below. Since the probability for earthquakes along the La Nacion Fault Zone is low, it would not represent a significant seismic hazard to future development or redevelopment within the expanded redevelopment area.

Ground shaking is likely to occur during the anticipated life of the redevelopment period and could affect future uses. Bay muds tend to magnify the effects of ground shaking by amplifying the intensity of movement caused by earthquakes. Liquefaction is a potential hazard in all areas underlain by water-saturated sandy soils. Portions of the bay deposits are considered moderately susceptible to liquefaction. Although clean sands of a medium-dense to dense nature were encountered within the formational soils below -10 to -20 feet AMSL, they may be susceptible to liquefaction during severe ground shaking. Tsunamis and earthquake-induced flooding are also potential hazards within San Diego Bay, and a sufficient length of water surface exists within the Bay to cause earthquake-induced flooding in low-lying areas within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Additionally, the potential exists for earthquake-induced slope failures for future development fronting San Diego Bay, and also for slopes encroaching onto the F and G Street Marsh and the seasonal fresh water marsh.

These seismic hazards are significant; however, standard seismic design criteria and conventional engineering techniques can be implemented to reduce these risks to below a level of significance, including the use of special foundations and/or ground modification in building foundations.

3.2.3 Mitigation Measures

3.2.3.1 Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, a detailed geotechnical investigation shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate. The investigation shall include field work (e.g., subsurface exploration, sampling) and laboratory analysis to determine the exact location and extent of potential geologic/seismic hazards. All applicable remedial grading measures and seismic design parameters recommended by the geotechnical investigation shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.
3.2.3.2 Random periodic field inspections shall be conducted to verify implementation of applicable remedial grading measures and seismic design parameters in accordance with approved plans and permits. If observed conditions and/or grading/construction activities vary significantly from those documented in approved plans and permits, such activities shall be halted temporarily or diverted away from affected area(s) and the city or SDUPD notified immediately to determine appropriate mitigation.

3.2.4 Analysis of Significance

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures listed above, geophysical impacts associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance. Standard (feasible) engineering design criteria exist to provide mitigation for grading impacts (localized instability of temporary construction slopes), geologic constraints to future development or redevelopment (differential ground settlement), and seismic hazards within the expanded redevelopment area.
3.3 DRAINAGE AND WATER QUALITY

Drainage and water quality information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on SDUPD’s Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of drainage and water quality conditions for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.3.1 Existing Conditions

Drainage and Water Quality

Surface waters exist within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area primarily as saltwater marshes, and include Sweetwater Marsh, J Street Marsh, and F and G Street Marsh. Much of this marshland is subject to tidal flooding twice daily by ocean water from San Diego Bay. Other marsh areas, such as Vener Pond, are flooded only occasionally during extreme high tides or periods of heavy rainfall. The Sweetwater River channel, largely at mean sea level through the expanded redevelopment area, is also subject to tidal inundation. Located at the terminus of the Sweetwater drainage basin, freshwater flows in this channel occur perennially due to agricultural and domestic use of water in the basin below Sweetwater Dam (approximately 37 square miles). The 100-year flood level is approximately at +10 feet AMSL.

Drainage in the project vicinity generally flows from east to west into the Sweetwater Marsh, the F and G Street Marsh, the Chula Vista Marina, and the J Street Marsh, before entering the Bay adjacent to the west. No unusual hydrologic or drainage conditions exist at the vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

Surface water quality in the lower elevations of Sweetwater Marsh, which is reached by tidal flooding from the Bay, appears to be generally good. Those portions of the marsh at higher elevations are only inundated by the highest tides. Thus, the surface water present in those areas tends to be highly saline.

Urban runoff draining from the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area commonly includes several contaminants which affect water quality. The most important categories of contaminants found in
urban runoff include, but are not limited to, metals, synthetic organics, sediment, nutrients, and oxygen demanding substances. To address storm water/urban runoff problems, Congress added Section 402(p) to the Clean Water Act in 1987. This Section, and the federal regulations which implement it (40 CFR 122, 123, 124, November 1990), require National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits for storm water runoff discharges from municipalities and industries, including construction. The Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of any pollutant to waters of the United States (surface waters) from a “point source” unless the discharge is authorized by, and in compliance with, an NPDES permit.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and the nine California Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) are the state regulatory agencies responsible for protecting the quality of surface and ground waters in California. Under the authority of the California Water Code, the SWRCB and RWQCBs protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state (such as drinking, swimming, fishing, recreation, and marine habitat) by regulating the discharge of wastes into them. Regulation is accomplished by the development, implementation, and enforcement of water quality control plans and state permits called waste discharge requirements. The SWRCB and RWQCBs are also charged with administration of, and the permitting program established by, the Federal Clean Water Act. These permits contain receiving water quality objectives, effluent limitations, and monitoring and reporting requirements. Please refer to the 1997 Port Master Plan Amendment EIR for more detailed information regarding these pollutants and permit requirements.

**Groundwater**

Groundwater in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area was previously encountered at an approximate elevation of +2 to +4 feet above mean sea level (AMSL). Saturated soil conditions will likely be encountered below an elevation of approximately +6 feet AMSL. This elevation may vary due to tidal fluctuations, rainfall, and irrigation.

Groundwater quality in the lower reaches of Sweetwater Valley has a high percentage of sodium and calcium chloride, 50,000 parts per million (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1982:15). This poor-quality water is due to contamination by seawater intrusion from the Bay. Groundwater in the area is rated as “inferior” for domestic use and “unsatisfactory” for agricultural uses (State of California 1967:132).

These areas are included in the La Nacion and Telegraph hydraulic subareas (HSAs), as identified in the RWQCB’s Basin Plan. That Plan identifies drinking water as a beneficial use throughout the
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HSAs. Due to high levels of Total Dissolved Solids (TDS), including saltwater intrusion from the Bay, in groundwater areas west of I-5, the City of Chula Vista has petitioned the RWQCB to remove beneficial use designations in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

Limited groundwater sampling for hazardous substances was performed for the Midbayfront LCP Resubmittal #8 Amendment EIR on various parcels within the industrial portion of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area (City of Chula Vista 1991). The sampling revealed chlorinated hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and trichloroethene (TCE) in groundwater monitoring wells. These results represent only a portion of the expanded redevelopment area and are not indicative of conditions throughout.

Flooding

The expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is located along the eastern shoreline of the Bay and adjacent to the mouth of the Sweetwater River. The north portion of the expanded redevelopment area is comprised of salt water marsh below five feet AMSL, the central portion is composed of fill material with an elevation of approximately 10 feet AMSL, and the south portion is a combination of salt water marsh near the shoreline and fill in the vicinity of the SDG&E Southbay Power Plant. All of these low-lying areas are subject to inundation during inland flooding, and likewise are susceptible to inundation during tidal highs and wind-generated waves from within the Bay.

3.3.2 Impacts

Based on applicable thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in a significant impact to water resources if they would:

- substantially degrade water quality;
- substantially degrade or deplete ground water resources or interfere with groundwater recharge; or
- cause substantial flooding, erosion or siltation.

Drainage and Water Quality

The conversion of presently unpaved vacant parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to impervious surfaces (e.g., rooftops, parking lots, and other hardscape) would increase storm
water runoff. If uncontrolled, this increase in runoff volumes could result in erosive velocities at storm drain outlet facilities which discharge directly into natural marshes or the Bay. Under a ‘worst-case’ analysis, erosive runoff velocities at these outlet structures could result in a significant impact with respect to scouring effects. In addition, runoff from unprotected graded areas could have significant water quality impacts relative to downstream siltation/sedimentation within surrounding marsh habitats and mudflats/eelgrass beds along tidal areas of the Bay (please refer to Section 3.7.2 of this PEIR for more detailed analysis of these potential impacts to biological resources).

Future development of these parcels with industrial and commercial uses would also increase the potential for urban runoff pollutants, including hydrocarbons, organic wastes, nutrients, litter, hazardous chemicals, and pesticides and fertilizers associated with landscaping. As a result, future development would increase the volume, velocity, and pollutant load transported by the storm drain system, which ultimately discharges into surrounding marshes and the Bay. Because no site-specific development plans are presently proposed, the exact extent of such impacts cannot be determined at this time. Therefore, under a ‘worst-case’ analysis, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in a significant impact with respect to potential erosion, siltation, sedimentation, and water quality degradation from storm water runoff if not mitigated.

**Groundwater**

As evaluated in Section 3.11.2 of this PEIR, the generation, use, storage, treatment, disposal, or transport of hazardous materials may be associated with future development of commercial, industrial, and research/limited manufacturing uses within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Such activities would be regulated by local, state, and federal requirements to control the accidental release of hazardous materials. Mandatory compliance with these regulations would reduce to below a level of significance the potential for groundwater contamination from hazardous materials release(s) associated with future operations within the expanded redevelopment area.

**Flooding**

Portions of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that are flood-prone would subject future structures and facilities to potential flooding impacts if not properly designed. Potential flooding impacts would not result in a significant constraint to future development or redevelopment within the expanded redevelopment area, however, with implementation of standard site design measures
such as elevation of structures above the 100-year flood plain or high tide mark and/or construction of levees, berms, or embankments.

3.3.3 Mitigation Measures

3.3.3.1 Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, a site-specific hydrology study shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate. This study shall identify the on- and off-site facilities necessary to adequately convey surface runoff to avoid or minimize on-site ponding, which could impact the integrity of building footings, and/or off-site flooding at downstream properties. This study shall also evaluate measures to avoid or minimize flooding of low-lying areas during high tide conditions, the effects of wind-driven waves generated from within San Diego Bay, flooding from the Sweetwater River, and erosion from inland or coastal flooding. All applicable measures recommended by the hydrology study shall be shown on the face of final grading and building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate. The hydrology study and mitigation measures shall be in conformance with criteria set forth by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for design of coastal structures.

3.3.3.2 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, a detailed erosion/siltation control plan shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate. This plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following measures to protect existing downstream areas from erosion, scour, and sediment deposition:

3.3.3.2a Install energy dissipaters, riprap aprons, water bars, or drop structures at all drainage outlets (e.g., subdrains, storm drains, culverts, brow ditches, and drainage crossings or swales) to protect downstream areas from erosion, channel scour, siltation, and sedimentation;

3.3.3.2b Implement short- and long-term stabilization (erosion control) and structural (sediment control) measures to: (1) limit the exposure of graded areas to the shortest duration possible, (2) divert upslope runoff around graded areas, and (3) store flows and remove sediment from runoff before it leaves the construction site. Stabilization measures may include dust control, surface roughening, hydroseeding, temporary and permanent
landscaping, mulching, matting, blankets, geotextiles, sod stabilization, slope protection (e.g., geogrid fabric), tree protection (e.g., caging), and vegetative buffer strips. In addition, rubber hypon liners shall be placed on bare soil disturbed by construction activities when weather conditions indicate any possibility of rain and the activities are temporarily suspended for any reason.

Structural measures may include slope drains and benching, subdrains, storm drains, culverts, brow ditches, vegetation-lined drainage crossings or swales, silt fencing, brush barriers, hay bales, gravel bags, berms, dikes, check dams, sediment traps, infiltration trenches, French drains, catch basins, desilting and detention basins, and vegetative controls. Such controls would likely be required at the base of manufactured slopes and/or areas adjacent to, or upstream of, major drainage courses and wetlands;

3.3.3.2c Maintain temporary and permanent landscaping on manufactured slopes, and use native or drought-tolerant vegetation, where applicable, to reduce irrigation requirements;

3.3.3.2d Prevent tracking of soil from the construction site via gravel strips, temporary paving, sediment trapping devices, and/or wheel washing facilities at access points;

3.3.3.2e Install/maintain gravel filters at all temporary drainage inlets; and

3.3.3.2f Inspect/maintain all erosion and sediment control measures to ensure that they function properly during the entire construction period. All desilting traps/basins shall be cleaned when filled to 10% of their capacity, and all silt barriers shall be cleaned when accumulated sediment reaches six inches in depth. All areas planted with erosion-control vegetation shall be monitored daily for vegetation establishment and erosion problems, and any repairs and/or replacement of vegetation made promptly. Stabilization and structural controls shall be inspected at least monthly and after every significant storm event, and shall be repaired or maintained as needed to reduce sediment discharge. Access to these facilities shall be maintained during wet weather.

3.3.3.3 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, a Notice of Intent shall be submitted to the State Water Resources Control Board, and a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be developed and implemented in compliance with the California General Construction Activity Storm Water Permit of the NPDES. In addition
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to the stabilization and structural controls specified above, the SWPPP shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following Best Management Practices (BMPs):

3.3.3.3a Implement material and waste management programs during grading and construction, including solid, sanitary, septic, hazardous, contaminated soil, concrete and construction waste management, spill prevention, appropriate material delivery and storage, employee training, dust control, and vehicle and equipment cleaning, maintenance and fueling;

3.3.3.3b Implement routine procedures or practices after grading and construction to reduce the amount of pollutants available for transport in the typical rainfall/runoff process such as a material use control program including proper storage and disposal practices for potential pollutants (e.g., motor oils and antifreeze); prohibiting storage of uncovered hazardous substances in outdoor areas; prohibiting the use of pesticides and herbicides listed by the Environmental Protection Agency; and spill prevention/response and shipping/receiving practices;

3.3.3.3c Install/maintain grease and oil traps or other filtration systems (e.g., fossil filters) at all permanent storm drain inlets; and

3.3.3.3d Implement a monitoring program involving the following inspection and maintenance procedures for all post-construction storm water pollution control measures to ensure that they continue to function properly:

• If utilized onsite, permanent detention basins shall be cleaned when filled to 10% of their capacity;
• Drainage inlet filters shall be inspected and maintained at a frequency appropriate to the type of filter system used;
• Landscaping sprinkler systems shall be maintained to prevent excess runoff due to leaking or broken sprinkler heads;
• Drainage facilities shall be routinely inspected and repaired as needed; and
• Records shall be kept of all control measure implementation, inspection and maintenance.

3.3.3.4 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, all applicable short- and long-term stabilization (erosion control) and structural (sediment control) measures and
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BMPs recommended by the erosion/siltation control plan and SWPPP shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate.

3.3.3.5 During and after grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, SDUPD, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable stabilization and structural controls and BMPs in accordance with approved plans and permits. If observed conditions and/or grading/construction activities vary significantly from those documented in approved plans and permits, such activities shall be halted temporarily or diverted away from affected area(s) and the city or SDUPD notified immediately to determine appropriate mitigation.

3.3.3.6 Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall provide evidence to the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD that: (1) a hazardous materials business plan has been prepared and implemented in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations; and (2) all local, state, and permit requirements to generate, use, store, and transport hazardous materials have been satisfied.

3.3.4 Analysis of Significance

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures listed above, the drainage, surface and groundwater quality, and flooding impacts associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance. Standard (feasible) engineering design criteria exist to provide mitigation for these potential impacts.
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3.4 AIR QUALITY

Air quality information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of geophysical conditions for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.4.1 Existing Conditions

The project is located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) of California, an area encompassing all of San Diego County.

Regulatory Framework

The federal Clean Air Act of 1970 and the Clean Air Act Amendment in 1977 required the adoption of national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) to protect the public health, safety, and welfare from known or anticipated effects of air pollution. The NAAQS have been updated occasionally. Current standards are set for sulfur dioxide (SO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), ozone (O₃), particulates of equal to or less than 10 microns in size (PM₁₀), fine particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 microns in size (PM₂.₅), and lead. In the most recent change, the 8-hour O₃ and PM₂.₅ standards became effective on September 15, 1997, and policies and systems to implement these new standards will be developed in the coming years. No new controls with respect to the new standards will be required by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) until after the year 2002. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) has established additional standards that are generally more restrictive than the NAAQS. Federal and state standards are shown in Table 3.4-1.

The federal and state regulations also define a group of pollutants called "toxic air contaminants" or "air toxics," including benzene, asbestos, and carbon tetrachloride. These pollutants are regulated by the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants of the federal Clean Air Act, the state Air Toxics Act (AB 1807), and San Diego Air Pollution Control District (APCD) Regulation XI. Exposure to these pollutants can cause or contribute to cancer, birth defects, genetic damage, and other adverse health effects. The source of and effects from these pollutants are generally local, rather than regional, and their evaluation is based on case studies, not standards for ambient concentration.
Table 3.4-1
California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pollutant</th>
<th>Averaging Time</th>
<th>California Standards Concentration</th>
<th>National Standards</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (O₃)</td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.09 ppm (180 μg/m³)</td>
<td>0.12 ppm (235 μg/m³)</td>
<td>Same as Primary Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08 ppm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide (CO)</td>
<td>8 Hour</td>
<td>9.0 ppm (10 mg/m³)</td>
<td>9.0 ppm (10 mg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>20 ppm (23 mg/m³)</td>
<td>35 ppm (40 mg/m³)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂)</td>
<td>Annual Average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.053 ppm (100 μg/m³)</td>
<td>Same as Primary Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.25 ppm (470 μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂)</td>
<td>Annual Average</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80 μg/m³ (0.03 ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>0.04 ppm (105 μg/m³)</td>
<td>365 μg/m³ (0.14 ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Hour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1300 μg/m³ (0.5 ppm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.25 ppm (655 μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Particulate Matter (PM₁₀)</td>
<td>Annual Geometric Mean</td>
<td>30 μg/m³</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>50 μg/m³</td>
<td>150 μg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Particulate Matter (PM₂.₅)</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50 μg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65 μg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfates (SO₃)</td>
<td>Annual Arithmetic Mean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15 μg/m³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>25 μg/m³</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead (Pb)</td>
<td>30 Day Average</td>
<td>1.5 μg/m³</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calendar Quarter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5 μg/m³</td>
<td>Same as Primary Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrogen Sulfide (HS)</td>
<td>1 Hour</td>
<td>0.03 ppm (42 μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinyl Chloride (chloroethene)</td>
<td>24 Hour</td>
<td>0.010 ppm (26 μg/m³)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility Reducing Particles</td>
<td>8 Hour (10 am-6 pm, Pacific Standard Time)</td>
<td>Insufficient amount to produce an extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer due to particles when the relative humidity is less than 70%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ARB Fact Sheet 39 (1/91); SCAQMD bulletin (8/97)
1. California standards, other than O₃, CO, SO₂, NOₓ, and PM₁₀, are values that are not to be equaled or exceeded. The O₃, CO, SO₂ (1 hour), NOₓ, and PM₁₀ standards are not to be exceeded.
2. National standards, other than O₃ and those based on annual averages or annual geometric means, are not to be exceeded more than once a year. The O₃ standard is attained when the expected number of days per calendar year with maximum hourly average concentrations above standard is equal or less than one.
3. Concentration expressed first in units in which it was promulgated. Equivalent units given in parentheses are based upon a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 mm of mercury. All measurements of air quality are to be corrected to a reference temperature of 25°C and a reference pressure of 760 mm of mercury (1.0132 millibar). Parts per million (ppm) in this table refers to ppm by volume or micromoles of pollutant per mole of gas.
4. National Primary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary, with an adequate margin of safety, to protect the public health. Each state must attain the primary standards within a specified number of years after that state's implementation plan is approved by the EPA.
5. National Secondary Standards: The levels of air quality necessary to protect the public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant. Each state must attain the secondary standards within a "reasonable time" after the SIP is approved by the EPA. Prevailing visibility is defined as the greatest visibility that is attained or surpassed around at least half of the horizon circle but not necessarily in continuous sector.
6. The annual PM₁₀ state standard is based on the geometric mean of all reported values taken during the year. The annual PM₁₀ national standard is based on averaging the quarterly arithmetic means.
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In San Diego County, the APCD is the agency responsible for protecting the public health and welfare through the administration of federal and state air quality laws and policies. Among the APCD's tasks are the monitoring of air pollution; the preparation of the State Implementation Plan (SIP); and the promulgation of Rules and Regulations. The Rules and Regulations include procedures and requirements to obtain required permits, to control the emission of pollutants, and to prevent adverse impacts. The SIP includes the regional air quality strategies (RAQS) required to attain air quality and meet the federal O₃ standard by 1999. The most recent EPA approval of the SIP was in June 1997.

Existing Air Quality

The SDAB is classified as a federal and state “serious” nonattainment area for O₃. This designation has the following requirements, among others, for air quality planning and regulation in the basin: (1) the federal O₃ standard must be attained by 1999; and (2) the emission thresholds for the major sources of O₃ precursors, which are VOC and oxides of nitrogen (NOₓ), are 50 tons per year. The SDAB is a federal attainment area for PM₁₀, but is a state nonattainment area for this pollutant. The SDAB is a state and federal attainment area for CO, SO₂, NO₂ and lead.

Ambient air quality is measured by the APCD at nine monitoring stations within the SDAB. The closest APCD monitoring station to the project is located in downtown Chula Vista. Data collected at this station are considered to be representative of the air quality occurring in the project vicinity. The Chula Vista monitoring station exceeded the state O₃ standard on one day in 1996, but did not exceed the federal O₃ standard. The state CO standards, the federal PM₁₀ standards, the federal and state NO₂ standards, the federal and state SO₂ standard, and the federal standard for lead were not violated.

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are those populations that are more susceptible to the effects of air pollution than are the population at large. Sensitive receptors who are in proximity to sources of toxic pollutants and CO are of particular concern. Land uses considered to be sensitive receptors include long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, child care centers, and athletic facilities.

Sensitive receptors within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area include boat live-a-boards within the Chula Vista Marina; visitors to the Chula Vista Nature Center and the Marina View and
Bayside public parks; and the Chula Vista recreational vehicle park. Residential and school uses exist to the east of the expanded redevelopment area, adjacent to I-5.

3.4.2 Impacts

Based on applicable thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in a significant impact on air quality if they would:

- violate any ambient air quality standard;
- contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation; or
- expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

Future development of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in an increase in vehicle trips with a corresponding increase of mobile and stationary source emissions from cars and equipment such as boilers and generators. Mobile emissions from future development within the expanded redevelopment area, pursuant to existing land use planning, would be consistent with SANDAG and San Diego APCD projections. Those projections are based upon development in accordance with current land use designations, including those presented in Section 3.1 of this PEIR (Land Use and Planning). Site-specific air quality analyses would be required by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD (for Port Tideland impacts) for projects that exceed these designated land use intensities. Future projects which propose the installation of stationary sources would be required to comply with applicable APCD regulations. If they comply, long-term impacts would not be considered significant.

Short-term dust and equipment emissions would be generated during construction of individual projects. Construction activities would create a temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed. These pollutants would be associated with site clearing, grading, excavating, and travel on unpaved roadways; and combustion emissions from heavy construction equipment. Dust is the primary concern during grading and construction activities. Emissions which are not amenable to collection and discharge through a controlled source are called fugitive emissions. Fugitive dust can be a nuisance and an adverse impact. Pollutant nuisances are prohibited by APCD Rule 51.

The San Diego APCD does not have qualitative standards for significant construction emissions impact. Guidelines for potential impacts are found in the South Coast Air Quality Management District CEQA Handbook (SCAQMD 1993). These guidelines may be conservative, as emission
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standards in the SCAQMD are more restrictive than in the San Diego area. Grading of 177 acres under a single operation is one of the thresholds for significant construction-related air quality impacts. None of the parcels available for development within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would exceed this threshold. Furthermore, grading would be minimal as the existing terrain at the vacant parcels is relatively flat.

The SDAB is a state non-attainment area for PM$_{10}$ and the construction emissions would be considered a short-term adverse impact; however, the anticipated grading would be much less than the SCAQMD standard and the impact would not be significant. Notwithstanding, grading should be performed in a manner which would minimize dust and PM$_{10}$ emissions and the associated nuisance; mitigation measures to reduce fugitive dust should be included in future project specifications and grading permits. Typically, these measures require the application of water to active grading areas, the cessation of grading during periods of high winds, and a reduction in the “tracking out” of dirt onto paved roads.

The sensitive receptors identified above would be significantly impacted by future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area if these activities would result in or contribute to CO “hotspots” or emissions of toxic pollutants within one-quarter-mile of these receptors. CO hotspots are areas of localized CO concentrations in excess of the state one- or eight-hour CO standards. High levels of CO are associated with traffic congestion and with idling or slow-moving vehicles, particularly near congested intersections. Depending on existing background concentrations of CO, roadways also have the potential to be CO hotspots. Quantitative analysis for hotspot formation is generally performed when project-related CO emissions exceed threshold levels, and when project traffic would cause a degradation in the level of service (LOS) on a roadway or intersection to LOS E or F at high traffic volumes (40,000 to 50,000 ADT). Such traffic impacts are not anticipated to occur as a result of the proposed project; therefore, impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

3.4.3 Mitigation Measures

Future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are not expected to result in significant air quality impacts with implementation of the following standard procedures, measures, and/or requirements of the APCD.

3.4.3.1 Prior to issuance of a final grading permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, the following measures shall
be included in the grading specifications, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate:

3.4.3.1a Water all active grading areas, including the exposed soil involved in the excavation and compaction operations, and active haul roads, with adequate frequency to keep soil moist at all times.

3.4.3.1b Cover all trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose materials, or maintain at least two feet of clearance between top of piled material and truck bed, in accordance with the requirements of the California Vehicle Code, Section 23114.

3.4.3.1c Limit truck speeds on unpaved areas to 15 mph or less via temporary signage, speed bumps or other speed control measures.

3.4.3.1d Sweep streets at least once a day if visible soil materials are carried out by project vehicles and equipment.

3.4.3.2 Random periodic field inspections shall be conducted to verify implementation of applicable construction-related measures identified in Mitigation Measure 3.4.3.1 in accordance with approved plans and permits. If observed conditions and/or grading/construction activities vary significantly from those documented in approved plans and permits, such activities shall be halted temporarily or diverted away from affected area(s) and the city or SDUPD notified immediately to determine appropriate mitigation.

3.4.3.3 Prior to issuance of a building permit for any facility containing stationary sources large enough to require APCD permits, future project applicants shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate, that an “Authority to Construct” has been issued by the APCD for any such applicable equipment.

3.4.3.4 Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, future project applicants shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate, that the facilities and processes which require APCD permits have been reviewed by the APCD, and that all required permits have been issued.

3.4.3.5 Traffic mitigation measures shall be implemented, as described in Section 3.6.3.3 of this PEIR, to avoid potential CO hotspots which could occur in the surrounding circulation
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system as a result of traffic contribution from future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.4.4 Analysis of Significance

With implementation of Mitigation Measure 3.4.3.1 listed above, short-term air quality impacts from future construction within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance. Implementation of the remaining mitigation measures outlined above would avoid significant long-term air quality impacts associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded redevelopment area.
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Acoustical information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of noise conditions for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.5.1 Existing Conditions

Noise Descriptors and Standards

Noise is defined as any sound that is undesirable or interferes with normal hearing processes. The decibel (dB) scale is used to quantify sound intensity and represents the ratio between a given sound and the faintest sound detectable by human hearing. Because sound pressure levels vary widely within the range of human hearing, decibels are measured on a logarithmic scale which quantifies sound intensity in a manner similar to the Richter scale used for earthquake magnitudes. Thus, an increase of 3 dB doubles the noise level; a decrease of 3 dB halves the noise level. The human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies within the entire noise spectrum. Accordingly, noise measurements within the frequencies of maximum human sensitivity are weighted more heavily in a process called “A-weighting,” written as dB(A).

Because cumulative noise exposure typically involves a number of distinct and isolated noise events, the following qualifiers are used to describe ambient noise. Time variations in noise exposure are typically described as the constant energy level equivalent for a given time period, expressed as $L_{eq}$. Specifically, $L_{eq}$ is the steady-state noise level which has an equal acoustical energy level as a noise event varying over a given time. Additionally, because community receptors are more sensitive to unwanted noise intrusion during the evening and at night, Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations requires use of the Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) for planning purposes. CNEL is defined as an average sound level during a 24-hour day, obtained after addition of five decibels to sound levels in the evening from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., and after addition of ten decibels to sound levels in the night between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Title 24 also requires that interior noise levels (attributable to exterior sources) in habitable rooms of all new multi-family residences, hotels, and motels be limited to 45 dB(A) CNEL or below.
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The Noise Element of the Chula Vista General Plan states that noise exposure should be considered in land use decisions, but does not provide specific standards. For noise-sensitive land uses such as residential areas, the city considers an exterior noise level of 65 dB(A) CNEL as the criterion for acceptability. Less sensitive land uses such as commercial and industrial areas are not considered noise impacted up to an exterior noise level of 80 dB(A) CNEL. The adopted Chula Vista ‘Performance Standards and Noise Control’ Ordinance establishes exterior noise limits as shown in Table 3.5-1. If the ambient noise level already exceeds these standards, the allowable noise level is equivalent to the ambient level.

Table 3.5-1
Exterior Noise Limits (Chula Vista Noise Ordinance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receiving Land Use Category</th>
<th>Noise Level dB(A)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 p.m. - 7:00 a.m.</td>
<td>7:00 a.m. - 10:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All residential (except multi-family residential)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-family residential</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light industry</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy industry</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although construction noise is exempted from the exterior noise standards, the General Plan Noise Element states that “abatement in this category will be achieved in part by federal regulations governing decibel output of various types of equipment, while city control occurs through nuisance ordinances which limit construction to daylight hours . . .” Construction noise levels are not strictly relatable to a 24-hour community noise standard because they occur only during selected times and the source strength varies sharply with time. The penalty associated with noise disturbance during quiet hours and the nuisance factor accompanying such disturbance usually leads to time limits on construction activities imposed as conditions on construction and use permits. The weekday hours from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. are typically the allowed times for construction activities if there are noise-sensitive areas within a reasonable exposure zone around the construction site.

Existing Noise-Sensitive Receptors and Noise Levels

Noise-sensitive receptors are generally considered to be human activities or land uses that may be subject to the stress of significant interference from noise. Existing noise-sensitive receptors within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area include the Chula Vista recreational vehicle park, the
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Bayside and Marina View public parks, and the Chula Vista Nature Center and surrounding marshlands. The Belding's savannah sparrow, a noise-sensitive state endangered bird species, has been identified in the marsh area near G Street and Marina Parkway.

Primary noise sources in the project vicinity include industrial and manufacturing operations associated with B.F. Goodrich facilities and noise from transportation facilities including I-5, the San Diego Trolley east of I-5, and the SD&AE railroad west of I-5. Noise from the San Diego Trolley is not substantially audible within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area due to the 'masking' effect of traffic noise along I-5, and the railroad is regularly not used. Based on noise measurements conducted for the 1997 Port Master Plan Amendment EIR, existing noise levels in the expanded redevelopment area are generally below 60 dB(A) $L_{eq}$ except for areas immediately adjacent to I-5 which are in the 78 dB(A) CNEL range.

3.5.2 Impact Analysis

The following analysis addresses both long-term noise impacts from increased traffic volumes and daily operations, and short-term noise impacts from construction activities, associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Based on thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, such future activities would result in a significant noise impact if they would:

- increase ambient levels above the noise standards in noise-sensitive areas, where ambient levels are currently below standards;
- create a 'substantial' noise increase at noise-sensitive areas even if the increase is below the noise standards or where the standards are already exceeded; or
- require construction activities outside the allowable time period as specified by the applicable nuisance ordinance of the City of Chula Vista.

Traffic Noise

According to the buildout noise analysis in the 1997 Port Master Plan Amendment EIR, the traffic volumes generated by future development of vacant and underutilized parcels (with primarily industrial uses) near the Chula Vista recreational vehicle park would not result in significant traffic noise impacts to these residences as long as such development includes driveway placement, roadway striping, signing and traffic controls to encourage use of the G Street/Marina Parkway/J Street corridor. Significant traffic noise impacts would occur to these residents, however, if the
neighboring vacant and underutilized parcels are developed with primarily commercial uses with primary access to Sandpiper Way. Under both the industrial and commercial buildout scenarios, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would not result in significant traffic noise impacts to users of the Bayside and Marina View public parks.

Buildout traffic volumes within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are not expected to result in significant noise impacts to visitors at the Chula Vista Nature Center and associated trails because the marshlands surrounding the Center are anticipated to provide adequate horizontal buffering to reduce projected traffic noise levels to below applicable noise standards. Buildout traffic volumes are not expected to result in significant indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat within the Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). In noise-impacted areas that are occupied by sensitive songbirds, such species may acclimate to these elevated noise levels, particularly since traffic noise is more steady than the sudden bursts of construction noise activities (see analysis below).

Traffic generated by future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could increase noise levels adjacent to freeways, roadways, and intersections outside the expanded redevelopment area. Increases in off-site noise levels due to future project-related traffic may cause noise standards to be exceeded at noise-sensitive areas. The extent of such impacts cannot be determined at this time due to the absence of project-specific information. Therefore, under a ‘worst-case’ analysis, traffic generated by future development of vacant parcels within the expanded redevelopment area may result in significant traffic noise impacts to noise-sensitive areas along surrounding circulation facilities outside the expanded redevelopment area.

Operational Noise

The Chula Vista recreational vehicle park, Bayside and Marina View public parks, and biological habitat in the Sweetwater Marsh NWR would be subject to significant noise impacts from daily operations associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, if these uses are not designed with consideration to adjacent noise-sensitive areas. Typical noise sources from such future development would include continuous noise from mechanical rooftop mechanical ventilation equipment, routine noise from loading docks and trash collection areas, and random noise events from human activities. These impacts are expected to be reduced to below a level of significance, however, with implementation of standard site design
and noise attenuation features such as orientation of facilities away from noise-sensitive areas, horizontal buffers, berms, walls, screening/shielding devices, and limiting hours of operation.

**Construction Noise**

Future construction activities, especially heavy equipment use, would create short-term noise impacts at adjacent noise-sensitive areas that would vary considerably within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area because the noise strength of construction equipment ranges widely as a function of the equipment use and its activity level. Specifically, short-term construction noise impacts would occur in discrete phases dominated initially by site clearing and grading, then by foundation construction, and finally, building construction. Earth moving (grading) and demolition are generally the noisiest activities during construction, with equipment noise ranging from about 75 to 100 dB(A) at 50 feet from the source.

Construction noise impacts at noise-sensitive land uses, including the Chula Vista recreational vehicle park, Bayside and Marina View public parks, and Chula Vista Nature Center, would not be significant with adherence to the city’s nuisance ordinance, which limits construction activities to the weekday hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Construction activities associated with future development or redevelopment of vacant or underutilized parcels adjacent to the Sweetwater Marsh NWR, however, would result in significant indirect impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat in noise-impacted areas that are occupied by sensitive songbirds. In particular, birds that depend on vocalizations to defend territories and attract mates may be startled by sudden loud equipment noise, and their nesting or breeding behavior may be disturbed by such intermittent noise intrusion. Please refer to Section 3.7.2 of this PEIR for more detailed analysis of this potential indirect impact to biological resources.

**3.5.3 Mitigation Measures**

**3.5.3.1** Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, where future project-related traffic volumes would result in significant noise impacts to noise-sensitive areas adjacent to receiving circulation facilities, an acoustical analysis that is correlated to specific project-related traffic shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate. This analysis shall identify the locations, extent, and height of sound attenuation barriers required to mitigate project-related offsite traffic noise impacts. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the required mitigation measures, if any, specified
in the approved acoustical analysis shall be constructed, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate.

3.5.3.2 Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, design review shall be accomplished by the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate, to ensure that noise attenuation features are incorporated into project design, as necessary. Noise attenuation features shall include, but shall not be limited to, orientation of loading docks and trash collection facilities away from noise-sensitive areas; use of streets, parkways, greenbelts, parking lots, and landscaping as horizontal buffers; construction of berms, walls, or combination berm/wall barriers; screening/shielding of loading dock and rooftop mechanical ventilation equipment; and limiting hours of operation to less noise-sensitive periods of the day. All applicable noise attenuation features and design measures shall be shown on the face of final building plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate.

3.5.3.3 Subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area shall comply with the applicable City of Chula Vista nuisance ordinance, which limits construction activities to the weekday hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Items a) through d) below shall also be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications as necessary prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate:

3.5.3.3a When siting stationary equipment such as generators and compressors, sensitive receptors shall be sheltered from construction noise. This can be accomplished using existing barriers such as ground elevation change and buildings, or temporary barriers such as plywood walls or noise blankets.

3.5.3.3b Several loud operations should occur simultaneously to decrease the duration of impacts resulting from each of the actions completed separately.

3.5.3.3c When pile driving, alternate and less intrusive construction methods such as vibration or hydraulic insertion should be used (as available) to lower noise levels.
3.5.3.3d Each internal combustion engine used for project construction shall be equipped with a muffler as required by Caltrans Standard Specifications 7-1.011, January 1988.

3.5.3.3e During grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, Port District, or designated monitor to verify implementation of applicable noise requirements for future project-specific grading operations in accordance with approved plans and permits.

3.5.3.4 Prior to grading for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, where such projects could result in significant indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat, a survey for the presence of noise-sensitive animal species shall be conducted within the potential noise impact exposure zone by a qualified biologist. If such species are present, the biologist shall monitor the species’ behavior during grading to determine if the species is being adversely affected by noise. If the biologist determines that wildlife behavior is being significantly impacted by grading/construction-related noise, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD shall be notified immediately and such activities directed away from the area of impact. The city or SDUPD shall coordinate with the state and federal resource agencies to determine appropriate mitigation for noise impacts, including, but not limited to, construction of temporary berms or other sound attenuation barriers or restriction of grading/construction activities to less noise-sensitive periods of the day. Grading and construction shall resume in the area of impact after written confirmation from the biologist, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, that the required mitigation measures identified during agency consultation have been implemented and, through monitoring of the affected species’ behavior, are effectively reducing indirect noise impacts to noise-sensitive biological habitat to below a level of significance.

3.5.4 Analysis of Significance

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures listed above, noise impacts associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance. Standard (feasible) site design measures exist to provide mitigation (sound attenuation) for operational noise impacts.
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Transportation/ circulation information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on traffic studies prepared by JHK & Associates for the *Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR* (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on studies by Katz, Okitsu & Associates (KOA) for the *Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR* (KEA Environmental 1997). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of traffic conditions for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.6.1 Existing Conditions

Primary Roadways

Figure 2.2-1 shows the existing circulation network in and around the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, to which regional access is provided by I-5. This eight-lane freeway provides interstate travel between Washington state and the California-Mexico border. In the project vicinity, I-5 has interchanges at E Street, H Street, J Street, and L Street.

*Marina Parkway*, which provides north-south access through the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, is four lanes between J Street and Sandpiper Way and two lanes north of Sandpiper Way to Lagoon Drive. The portion of Marina Parkway between G Street and Lagoon Drive is off-set, windy and substandard for its classification. Marina Parkway is classified in the Chula Vista General Plan Circulation Element as a four-lane Major roadway. The speed limit on Marina Parkway is posted at 35 miles per hour (mph). On-street parking is not allowed.

*Bay Boulevard* is a north-south, two-lane road just west of I-5, between E and J streets. Speed limits on Bay Boulevard are posted at 25 mph north of F Street and 35 mph between F Street and J Street/Marina Parkway. Bay Boulevard is classified as a Class II Collector roadway in the General Plan Circulation Element. On-street parking is allowed north of F Street in front of the restaurant and commercial uses along the east side of Bay Boulevard. A freight rail line crosses at-grade just to the north of the F Street/Bay Boulevard intersection. These tracks are seldom used.

*E Street* is an east-west, four-lane road between Bay Boulevard and Interstate 805. In the project vicinity, E Street is classified as a four-lane Major roadway in the General Plan Circulation Element.
E Street is striped with bicycle lanes, on-street parking is generally not allowed, and the speed limit is posted at 35 mph.

*Lagoon Drive* runs east-west in the north portion of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, between I-5 and the northerly terminus of Marina Parkway. This road extends east of I-5 as F Street, but no interchange is provided at I-5. It transitions from a four-lane road west of I-5 to a two-lane road east of Marina Parkway, and is classified as a Class I Collector roadway in the General Plan Circulation Element. No protected left-turn lanes are provided at the intersection of Bay Boulevard. Bicycle lanes are provided on the four-lane segment and on-street parking is generally not allowed. The speed limit on Lagoon Drive is posted at 35 mph.

*G Street* is an east-west, two-lane road in the north portion of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, between B.F. Goodrich facilities and Bayside Park. No interchange is provided at I-5. It is classified as a Class II Collector roadway in the General Plan Circulation Element. G Street is striped with bicycle lanes, on-street parking is generally not allowed, and the speed limit is posted at 35 mph.

*H Street* provides east-west access between Bay Boulevard and downtown Chula Vista. At I-5, H Street is a full interchange and it currently terminates west of I-5 at a gate to the B.F. Goodrich facilities. East of I-5, H Street is a four-lane road and is classified as a six-lane Major roadway in the General Plan Circulation Element.

*J Street* is an east-west, four-lane road in the south portion of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that extends west from the I-5 interchange and becomes Marina Parkway. It is classified as a four-lane Major roadway in the General Plan Circulation Element. J Street is striped with bicycle lanes, on-street parking is generally not allowed, and the speed limit is posted at 35 mph.

Several additional local (two-lane) public roads extend within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. These include the “L”-shaped Sandpiper Way, which connects Marina Parkway and G Street; the east-west Bayside Parkway, which provides access to Bayside Park from Sandpiper Way; and the north-south Quay Avenue, which connects Bayside Parkway and G Street, all in the northwest portion of the expanded redevelopment area. In addition, Marina Way provides east-west access to the Chula Vista Harbor and Bayfront Park from J Street/Marina Parkway.
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**Key Intersections**

Based on the most recent traffic studies for the 1997 Port Master Plan Amendment EIR, the key intersections identified within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area include the I-5 ramp intersections at E, H and J streets and the Bay Boulevard intersections with E Street, Lagoon Drive, H Street, and J Street/Marina Parkway. Figure 3.6-1 shows the existing geometrics and traffic controls at these intersections.

**Traffic Volumes**

Existing average daily traffic (ADT) volumes for primary roadways and peak-hour traffic data at key intersections in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are based on the most recent traffic studies for the 1997 Port Master Plan Amendment EIR. Existing conditions at these facilities are evaluated in terms of LOS, which are used to quantify the degree of freedom or restriction in traffic movement experienced by motorists. Brief LOS definitions are shown below in Table 3.6-1. The current standards for acceptable traffic conditions are recognized by the City of Chula Vista as LOS C for daily roadway segment operations and LOS D for peak-hour intersection operations.

**Table 3.6-1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Traffic Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent, light traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Good, light to moderate traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Moderate traffic, with insignificant delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Heavy traffic, with significant delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Severe congestion and delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Failed, indicated levels cannot be handled</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent traffic studies indicate that the primary roadways within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area currently operate at LOS C or better. During peak hours, the key intersections within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area currently operate within the adopted City of Chula Vista standard of LOS D or better. The traffic controls in place at the unsignalized intersections are adequately handling peak-hour demand. Signalization of these stop-controlled intersections is therefore not required at this time.
Public Transit

The San Diego Trolley runs parallel to the east side of I-5 with stations located near E and H streets in the project vicinity. The northbound and southbound trains at these stations operate daily every 8-15 minutes. The little-used SD&AE railway runs parallel to the west side of I-5, within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. The MTDB plans to use this right-of-way as active open space, including a potential regional bikeway and future light rail transit. Bus service to the Chula Vista bayfront area is provided by the San Diego Transit Authority, which operates two routes with connections to the E Street Trolley Station. Route 706A provides service along J Street and Route 708 provides service to the Chula Vista Nature Center.

Access and Parking

As stated above, access into the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is provided by the following four interchanges along I-5: E Street, H Street, J Street, and south of L Street. The E Street exit primarily provides access to the Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge and associated Chula Vista Nature Center; the H Street exit primarily provides access to the B.F. Goodrich facilities operations; and the L Street exit primarily provides access to the SDG&E South Bay Power Plant operations. Thus, the J Street exit to Marina Parkway is the primary access to the Chula Vista Bayfront.

As indicated above, on-street parking is generally prohibited along the primary roadways within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Ample off-street parking is available for employees of the B.F. Goodrich facilities and South Bay Power Plant; for users/visitors at the Chula Vista Marina, Marina View and Bayside public parks, and Chula Vista Nature Center; and for patrons of the restaurant and commercial uses along the east side of Bay Boulevard, north of F Street.

3.6.2 Impacts

Based on thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in a significant traffic impact if they would cause a substantial increase in traffic which exceeds the capacity of the circulation system, resulting in unacceptable LOS.
Buildout Traffic Analysis

According to the traffic analysis for the 1997 Port Master Plan Amendment EIR, buildout traffic volumes in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are based on the SANDAG Series 8 model. Analysis of buildout traffic conditions assumes: (1) development of all vacant and underutilized parcels in the proposed expansion area in accordance with the land uses designated in the Port Master Plan Amendment; and (2) completion of the circulation system as designated in the Chula Vista General Plan Circulation Element, including circulation improvements related to the H Street extension and the realignment and extension of Marina Parkway between Lagoon Drive and E Street.

The 1997 Port Master Plan Amendment EIR traffic studies evaluated two 'worst-case' buildout scenarios for the proposed expansion area. Under the 'Industrial' build-out scenario, which would involve development of 788,000 square feet of industrial uses and a six-acre hotel, only one roadway segment would be significantly impacted, Bay Boulevard between E and F streets. Under the 'Commercial' buildout scenario, which would involve development of 581,000 square feet of commercial uses and a six-acre hotel, nearly all circulation facilities in the project vicinity would be significantly impacted. These studies concluded that traffic impacts to the Bay Boulevard segment from the 'Industrial' buildout scenario would be reduced to below a level of significance with completion of the General Plan Circulation Element. Traffic impacts associated with the 'Commercial' buildout scenario, however, would require additional project-level mitigation to augment the General Plan Circulation Element improvements, and is expected to include extensive roadway, intersection, and interchange improvements in the project vicinity.

Access and Parking

Future development of the 15-acre vacant parcel at the northeast corner of J Street as it turns north into Marina Parkway could significantly impact the primary access to the Chula Vista Bayfront. For example, vehicles turning into and out of driveways associated with future development of this property may conflict with traffic flow in this area. Since on-street parking is generally limited along expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area roadways, future development or redevelopment of vacant or underutilized parcels will be required to provide adequate parking in accordance with the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD parking standard, as appropriate. With provision of adequate parking supply, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded redevelopment area would not result in a significant increase in parking demand at the bayfront public use areas, including the Chula Vista Marina, Marina View and Bayside public parks, and Chula Vista Nature Center.
3.6.3 Mitigation Measures

3.6.3.1 Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that are anticipated to generate substantial traffic volumes to cause a significant impact, a detailed traffic study shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate. For projects that would generate 2,440 or more ADT, or 200 or more peak-hour trips, the traffic study shall be prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Congestion Management Program (SANDAG 1994). At a minimum, facilities to be evaluated in the Congestion Management Program (CMP) analysis shall include all designated regionally significant arterials (RSA) where the project would add 50 or more peak-hour trips in either direction; key intersections along the affected RSA facilities; and mainline freeways where the project would add 150 or more peak-hour trips in either direction. LOS E (or LOS F if that is the 1990 base year LOS) is the minimum standard for acceptable traffic operations established by the CMP. LOS analysis shall be conducted under short- and long-term peak-hour conditions using the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) for key RSA intersections (Chapter 9 of the HCM), RSA facilities (Chapter 11 of the HCM), and freeway mainlines (Chapter 3 of the HCM). The traffic study shall identify the circulation system improvements necessary to mitigate project-related traffic impacts. Bonds or other financing mechanisms shall be posted for all offsite circulation improvements identified in the traffic study.

The traffic study shall also address the following transportation/circulation issues, as appropriate: (1) in addition to geometric improvements (e.g., road widening, lane restriping, intersection reconfiguration), traffic flow improvements to reduce congestion should include traffic signal installation, timing, and phasing; (2) bicycle and pedestrian pathways should be developed in excess of standards; and (3) the City of Chula Vista and SDUPD should encourage the extension of public transit into the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. To further reduce traffic impacts, the following transportation demand management strategies (TDM) shall be addressed in the traffic study for possible incorporation as conditions of the lease and/or subsequent permits for future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded redevelopment area:

- Promote use of public transportation, including increased bus and trolley service/usage and possible extension of light rail transit service into the expanded redevelopment area;
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- Create park and ride lots;
- Provide bicycle storage facilities;
- Promote a ride sharing program; and
- Promote flexible work shifts from area businesses.

3.6.3.2 Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, construction of the circulation system improvements identified in the recommended traffic study in Mitigation Measure 3.6.3.1, if required, shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, and to the satisfaction of Caltrans for improvements on circulation facilities within their jurisdiction.

3.6.3.3 Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review future project-specific circulation plans and include modifications, if necessary, to avoid significant conflicts with Marina Parkway, which provides primary access to the Bayfront, and to ensure that adequate onsite access and parking requirements are satisfied.

3.6.4 Analysis of Significance

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures listed above, traffic impacts associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance.
3.7 Biological Resources

3.7 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following biological resources analysis includes information contained in the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997), the Midbayfront LCP Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment Final EIR (KEA Environmental 1991) and the Bayfront Specific Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (City of Chula Vista 1985). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of biological conditions for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. A brief field reconnaissance survey was conducted by KEA Environmental on January 29, 1998 to verify previously documented biological resources.

3.7.1 Existing Conditions

Vegetation Communities

The four vegetation communities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area include southern coastal salt marsh, freshwater and brackish marsh, Diegan sage scrub/maritime succulent sage scrub, and ruderal (disturbed) habitat. Though not within the expanded redevelopment area, shallow water/mudflats and eelgrass beds occur along the west boundary and are discussed below because of their proximity and sensitivity.

Southern Coastal Salt Marsh

This community occurs at the Sweetwater River Marsh, E Street Marsh, and F and G Street Marsh, all within the Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). This community also occurs along the Rohr Marsh, which is a small slough that feeds the F and G Street Marsh, and in a small drainage around a ruderal field northeast of the intersection of Marina Parkway and Marina Way. Pickleweed (Salicornia spp.), saltwort (Batis maritima), seabligh (Suaeda esteroa), alkali heath (Frankenia salina), sea lavender (Limonium californicum), salt grass (Distichlis spicata), and alkali weed (Cressa truxillensis) are the most common species associated with this community.

Freshwater and Brackish Marsh

This community occurs just north of Lagoon Drive and in the northeast corner of the Sweetwater River Marsh. Bulrush (Scirpus spp.), cattails (Typha latifolia), seabligh, and southwestern spiny rush (Juncus cutus ssp. leopoldii) are the dominant species in this community. A small patch of
this community occurs in an extremely small roadside depression near the SD&AE railroad right-of-way at F Street and contains salt grass and curly dock (*Rumex crispus*).

**Diegan Sage Scrub/Maritime Succulent Sage Scrub**

Small relictual or recolonizing patches of this community occur along the south fringes of the Sweetwater River Marsh, just northwest of the F and G Street Marsh, and in scattered locations at Gunpowder Point. Flat-top buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum* var. *fasciculatum*), California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), and coast cholla (*Opuntia proliferata*) are the most common species within this community.

**Shallow Water/Mudflats/Eelgrass Beds**

Open water and mudflat habitats occur along the shoreward fringes of San Diego Bay along the entire length of the west boundary of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. These areas are typically unvegetated with seasonal growths of ephemeral algae such as sea lettuce (*Ulva* sp.), *Chaetomorpha* spp. and *Enteromorpha* spp. Within these areas, eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) is common, forming dense and scattered beds. Eelgrass beds are reported from the shallow portions of San Diego Bay, adjacent to the NWR and the expanded redevelopment area.

**Ruderal Habitat**

The most common vegetation community within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is ruderal habitat reflecting past disturbances in these areas. Garland chrysanthemum (*Chrysanthemum coronarium*), fennel (*Foeniculum vulgare*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), slender oats (*Avena barbata*), and brome (*Bromus* spp.) are the most common species noted. This community occurs within the NWR, in several vacant lots within the expanded redevelopment area, and along the south boundary of the SDG&E South Bay Power Plant.

**Sensitive Habitats**

Sensitive habitats are those which are considered rare or threatened within a region; are considered sensitive by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG); or are listed as sensitive under the state Natural Communities Conservation Program (NCCP), locally, the equivalent of which is the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The sensitive habitats in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are southern coastal salt marsh,
freshwater and brackish marsh, Diegan sage scrub/maritime succulent sage scrub, shallow water/mudflats, and eelgrass beds. The southern coastal salt, freshwater and brackish marshes are wetland communities, while the shallow water/mudflats and eelgrass beds are considered special aquatic sites. Wetlands and special aquatic sites are considered sensitive by local, state (CDFG) and federal (USFWS) agencies and are regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE).

Sensitive Species

Sensitive Plants

Sensitive plants are those that are listed, proposed for listing, or considered candidates for listing by the USFWS; and which are listed or considered sensitive by the CDFG and/or the California Native Plant Society (CNPS). Six sensitive plant species are reported in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Salt marsh bird’s-beak (*Cordylanthus maritimus ssp. maritimus*) is a federal- and state-listed endangered species and a CNPS List 1B species that occurs in the salt marsh of the Sweetwater River Marsh. Palmer’s frankenia (*Frankenia palmeri*) is a CNPS List 2 species that occurs in the salt marsh of the Sweetwater River Marsh. Snake cholla (*Opuntia parryi* var. *serpentina*) is a CNPS List 1B species, and coast barrel cactus (*Ferocactus viridescens*) is a CNPS List 2 species. Both of these species occur in the Diegan coastal sage scrub/maritime succulent scrub of the Sweetwater River Marsh. Estuary seabright and southwestern spiny rush are CNPS List 4 species. Estuary seabright occurs within the salt marshes throughout the expanded redevelopment area. Southwestern spiny rush occurs in the freshwater/brackish marsh of the NWR.

Sensitive Animals

Sensitive animals are those that are listed, proposed for listing, or considered candidates for listing by the USFWS; and which are listed or considered sensitive by the CDFG. Table 3.7-1 lists the sensitive animals that either occur within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, in use areas (i.e. open water of San Diego Bay) immediately adjacent to the expanded redevelopment area, and/or could potentially use the site. Of the 27 species mentioned in Table 3.7-1, the following seven are of special concern because of their high sensitivity status. The California brown pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis californicus*), peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*), California least tern (*Sterna antillarum browni*), and light-footed clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris levipes*) are federal- and state-listed endangered species. The California brown pelican would be most common in the open water of the Bay. The peregrine falcon would be most common foraging over
**Table 3.7-1**

Sensitive Wildlife Species Potentially Occurring in the Vicinity of the Expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Loon</td>
<td>Gaver immer</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Grebe</td>
<td>Aechmophorus occidentalis</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American White Pelican</td>
<td>Pelecanus erythrorhynchos</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Brown Pelican</td>
<td>Pelecanus occidentalis californicus</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double-Crested Cormorant</td>
<td>Phalacrocorax auritus</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Blue Heron</td>
<td>Ardea herodias</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Egret</td>
<td>Ardea alba</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowy Egret</td>
<td>Egretta thula</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddish Egret</td>
<td>Egretta rufescens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black-crowned Night Heron</td>
<td>Nycticorax nycticorax</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Harrier</td>
<td>Circus cyaneus</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osprey</td>
<td>Pandion haliaetus</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peregrine Falcon</td>
<td>Falco peregrinus</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Black Rail</td>
<td>Laterallus jamaicensis conmiculus</td>
<td>FSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light-footed Clapper Rail*</td>
<td>Rallus longirostris levipes</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Plover*</td>
<td>Chardinus alexandrinus nivosus</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Gull</td>
<td>Larus californicus</td>
<td>FSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Skimmer*</td>
<td>Rhynchops niger</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gull-billed Tern*</td>
<td>Sterna nilotica</td>
<td>FSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caspian Tern*</td>
<td>Sterna caspia</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elegant Tern*</td>
<td>Sterna elegans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Least Tern*</td>
<td>Sterna antillarum browni</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-eared Owl</td>
<td>Asio flammeus</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrowing Owl</td>
<td>Cathes cucularia</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belding’s Savannah Sparrow*</td>
<td>Ammodramus sandwichensis beldingi</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large-billed Sparrow*</td>
<td>Ammodramus sandwichensis rostratus</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reptiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Diego Horned Lizard</td>
<td>Phynosoma coronatum blainvillei</td>
<td>CSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** San Diego Unified Port District, 1990, and City of Chula Vista, 1991.

* Indicates species currently breeding around the bay and for which San Diego Bay is critical on a statewide or rangewide basis.

FSC = Federal Species of Concern; CSC = California Department of Fish and Game Species of Special Concern; E = Endangered; T = Threatened; W = Natural Diversity Data Base’s Watch List
the open areas of the expanded redevelopment area. The light-footed clapper rail has been reported from the Sweetwater, F and G Street, and E Street salt marshes. The California least tern forages over the open water of the bay, nests on the D Street fill area of the NWR, and is an uncommon forager over Vener Pond.

The western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*) is a federally listed threatened species that breeds in open sandy areas. The Belding’s savannah sparrow (*Ammodramus sandwichensis beldingi*) is a state-listed endangered species that occurs in the salt marsh of the NWR. The California black rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis coturniculus*) is a state-listed threatened species that could potentially occur in the salt marsh habitats of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

### 3.7.2 Impacts

Based on applicable thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would generate significant direct, indirect, and cumulative biological impacts if they would result in:

- the loss of land supporting federal- or state-listed species or species eligible for listing, or rare, declining or sensitive habitats or species identified by other public agencies or private groups;
- severance of a biologically-important wildlife corridor;
- the introduction of urban meso-predators (e.g., dogs, cats), urban runoff, invasive exotic plant species, noise and lighting into a biological system;
- the loss of a biological buffer, such as a wetland buffer, or habitat fragmentation;
- alteration of a dynamic portion of a biological system, such as stream flows or fire cycles; and/or
- a substantial change in the diversity of plant or animal species resulting in the loss of long-term conservation potential of viable populations of endangered, threatened and key sensitive species and their habitats.

Direct impacts would result in the permanent loss of habitat and/or species from the conversion of habitat to development. Indirect impacts would result in the degradation of habitat and/or interference with the normal behavior of species from the close proximity of development. It is assumed that all areas within the NWR, and the open water, tidal/mudflats and eelgrass beds of San Diego Bay would not be directly impacted since development is restricted in those area by existing land use plans and regulations.
Direct Impacts

The direct loss of any sensitive habitats (Diegan coastal sage scrub/maritime succulent scrub and wetlands) due to development would be a significant impact. The amount of sensitive habitat outside of the NWR is very low. Of relevance to potential impacts to sensitive uplands is the City of Chula Vista’s participation in the state’s NCCP. Under this program, local jurisdictions have been allowed interim impacts to sensitive coastal sage scrub habitat in accordance with Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act while regional conservation plans are developed. The city’s draft Subarea Plan, among those of other jurisdictions, was published as an appendix to the regional Multiple Species Conservation Plan EIR. It is expected that the city’s final Subarea Plan will be completed sometime during the summer of 1998. After approval of its Subarea Plan and associated Implementing Agreement, the city will be responsible for monitoring all impacts to sensitive upland habitats and numerous species covered by the Plan. Prior to that approval, the city is constrained by the interim allowance of “take” of coastal sage scrub habitat, and, where relevant, by species-specific permitting. Future development within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area must comply with the constraints, goals, and objectives of the city’s final Subarea Plan.

Impacts to sensitive wetland habitats, although addressed in the Subarea Plan, will still continue to require permits from all relevant regulatory agencies, including ACOE, RWQCB, CDFG and California Coastal Commission.

The direct loss of any federal- or state-listed species would be significant. The direct loss of any non-listed, sensitive species may be significant depending upon the number of individuals impacted. As noted above for impacts to sensitive uplands, impacts to species covered by the city’s final Subarea Plan must comply with the constraints, goals, and objectives of that Plan.

Indirect Impacts

Indirect impacts to sensitive resources could arise from the development of areas immediately adjacent to sensitive resources. Indirect impacts to sensitive wetland resources could arise from changes in hydrology, erosion, sediment accretion, and influxes of nutrients and contaminants. The southern coastal salt marsh, freshwater and brackish marsh, shallow water/mudflats, and eelgrass beds would be extremely susceptible to changes in hydrology such as reduced watersheds and freshwater intrusion from urban runoff. These habitats would also be extremely vulnerable to increases in the discharge of urban runoff contaminants (e.g., petroleum products, hydrocarbons, litter, organic wastes, nutrients, hazardous chemicals, pesticides, fertilizers) coupled with increases
3.7 Biological Resources

in freshwater runoff. Sensitive species, especially sensitive animals, would be susceptible to increases in the discharge of contaminants which would adversely interfere with the normal physiology of these species. Additional indirect impacts to sensitive species would arise from increased predation from domestic pets, human intrusion, and light and noise levels which would interfere with the normal physiology of these species. All of these indirect impacts would be considered significant.

3.7.3 Mitigation Measures

Mitigation for significant indirect impacts relative to potential siltation/sedimentation, erosion, water quality degradation, and construction noise is discussed in Sections 3.3.3 and 3.5.3 of this PEIR, respectively.

3.7.3.1 Prior to approval of project plans for projects that would affect biological resources, a detailed biological study shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate. The study shall include detailed surveys, especially focused surveys for sensitive species, and formal wetland delineations where appropriate. The preferred mitigation for impacts to sensitive biological resources would be avoidance, but if avoidance is infeasible, the next preferable mitigation would be minimization of impacts with appropriate resource-specific mitigation.

Because of the federal policy of “no net loss” of wetlands and special aquatic sites, impacts to these habitats would require habitat creation at a replacement ratio of at least 1:1. Enhancement of degraded wetlands and exotic species removal may also qualify as appropriate mitigation depending upon the quantity, quality and sensitivty of habitat impacted. Impacts to wetland habitats that are occupied by sensitive species, especially listed species, would require mitigation at a higher replacement ratio. Because wetlands and special aquatic sites, as well as the open water of San Diego Bay, are regulated by the ACOE, a Section 404 Permit from this agency would be required. In addition, a Section 401 certification or waiver from the RWQCB, a coastal zone management consistency statement from the Coastal Commission, and a Streambed/Lake Alteration Agreement from CDFG would also likely be required.

Until the City of Chula Vista’s Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement are approved, impacts to federally listed species and/or their habitat could be permitted through a Section 10a or Section 7 consultation. Impacts to state-listed species and/or their habitat would
require a California Endangered Species Act Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) from the CDFG. With the approval of the Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement, impacts to listed species and/or their habitat that were in compliance with the city’s Subarea Plan would be covered under the state Fish and Game Code Section 2835. Appropriate mitigation for significant direct impacts to any sensitive species would be habitat creation/preservation. The NWR would present the most appropriate location for habitat creation, enhancement and preservation because of the high amount of disturbed habitat within its boundaries.

Additional significant indirect impacts would require specific mitigation measures that would reduce these impacts to below a level of significance, including, but not limited to, project-level predator control measures, lighting plans, and appropriate buffers, fencing, and signage to reduce unauthorized human and domestic pet intrusions.

3.7.4 Analysis of Significance

With implementation of recommended mitigation measures discussed above, impacts to biological resources associated with future development or redevelopment activities within and adjacent to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance.
3.8 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Public services and utilities information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of the public services, utilities, and facilities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.8.1 Existing Conditions

This section addresses the potential impacts of future redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area on existing public services, utilities, and facilities including: gas and electric; police protection; fire protection; solid waste; water, sewer, and storm drain systems; and public schools.

Gas and Electric Service

Gas and electric service to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is provided by SDG&E. Primary utilities include an overhead 12,000 volt distribution line and an underground gas line along F Street, and an overhead 12,000 volt distribution line extending west from E Street. The City of Chula Vista has adopted a policy for the conservation of energy which incorporates principles such as conservation-oriented planning, the use of alternative energy sources, and the use of energy-efficient appliances, equipment, and building materials.

Police Protection

Under agreement with SDUPD, police protection within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is provided by the City of Chula Vista Police Department, located at 276 Fourth Avenue. The city's emergency response standards are to respond to 84 percent of Priority I calls (life-threatening) within 7 minutes, while maintaining an average response time of 4.5 minutes to all Priority I calls; and to respond to 62 percent of Priority II calls (serious, non-routine with a probability of injury) within 7 minutes, while maintaining an average response time of 7 minutes to all Priority II calls.
The current average response time to Priority I calls in the expanded redevelopment area ranges from 3 to 6 minutes (pers. comm., Kelsey 1998). The average response time to Priority II calls ranges from 6 to 7 minutes. Generally, the average police response time to portions of the expanded redevelopment area currently exceeds the threshold for Priority I emergencies and meets the threshold for Priority II emergencies.

**Fire Protection**

The expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is served by Chula Vista Fire Department Station No. 1, located at 477 F Street. The city’s emergency response standard is to respond to 85 percent of all calls within 7 minutes or less. The current average response time to the expanded redevelopment area is approximately four minutes (pers. comm., Kelsey 1998), which meets the city’s fire response standard.

Fire protection for boats within the marina is provided by SDUPD Harbor Police and the Coast Guard. The Harbor Police currently maintains a fire/police vessel at Shelter Island which is dedicated to serving the South Bay area on a 24-hour basis.

**Solid Waste Removal**

The City of Chula Vista contracts solid waste disposal service within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to Pacific Waste Services (PWS), formerly Laidlaw Waste Systems. PWS currently utilizes 35 waste collection vehicles which can process 7,500 tons of refuse per month to serve the Chula Vista area. Solid waste from the expanded redevelopment area is disposed at the Otay Landfill on Maxwell Road. The Otay Landfill is owned and operated by Otay Landfill, Inc., a subsidiary of Allied Waste Industries. The currently permitted remaining life span of this landfill is 15 years (pers. comm., Kaiser 1998). Allied Waste Industries is presently developing plans to expand the Otay Landfill in the near future to extend its life span beyond the currently permitted 15 years.

**Water**

Water service to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is provided by the Sweetwater Authority. Approximately 60 percent of the Authority’s system is supplied by gravity from the Sweetwater Filtration Plant. The remainder is distributed by pumped pressure zones at higher elevations. About 60 percent of the city’s water supply is from surface runoff and collection at the
Sweetwater Reservoir. The additional 40 percent is supplied by the San Diego County Water Authority’s aqueduct system (pers. comm., Collins 1998).

Transmission and distribution pipelines deliver water to the City of Chula Vista with a normal operating pressure range of 40 to 90 pounds per square inch (psi). Daily and seasonal peak flow requirements, including fire flows, are augmented by operational storage reservoirs located throughout the city. Total operational storage for the Sweetwater Authority is a maximum of approximately 32 million gallons, with an average daily demand of about 15 million gallons allocated to the city (pers. comm., Collins 1998).

Water is locally distributed within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area via underground pipes of various sizes. The existing water pressure in this area (90 to 100 psi) is higher than the normal operating range due to gravity flow and its location at the lower elevation of the distribution system.

Sewer

The SDUPD owns the portion of the sewer system within the Tidelands and pays the City of Chula Vista to maintain it. The City of Chula Vista owns and maintains the sanitary sewer system within the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area, which connects to the City of San Diego Metropolitan Waste Water District (METRO). The city is allotted 19.34 million gallons per day (mgd) of sewage treatment capacity within the METRO (pers. comm., Davies 1998). The existing average daily wastewater volume for Chula Vista is 11.63 mgd, which leaves an available capacity of 7.71 mgd.

Storm Drains

The storm drain system for the Tidelands is owned and maintained by the SDUPD and storm drains within the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area are owned and maintained by the City of Chula Vista (pers. comm., Hardesty 1998). A variety of storm drains, ranging in size from 6 to 48 inches in diameter, convey surface runoff from the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to San Diego Bay and the tidal mud flats to the south.

Public Schools

The expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is served by the following schools: Feaster, Mueller, and Vista Square elementary schools (Chula Vista Elementary School District); and Chula Vista Jr.
High School and Chula Vista High School (Sweetwater Union High School District). All of these schools are currently experiencing severe overcrowding (pers. comm., Cox 1998).

Currently, an additional elementary school is under construction and is scheduled to open during the summer of 1998. A second elementary school is planned for construction and scheduled to open during the summer of 1999. Three additional elementary schools are planned for construction over the next five to seven years.

3.8.2 Impacts

Based on applicable thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in a significant impact to public services and utilities if they would:

- Increase demand for fire, police and medical services in excess of emergency response standards or exacerbate currently deficient response times;
- Increase demand for water and wastewater services in excess of the existing capacity of distribution/conveyance systems and/or treatment facilities;
- Generate substantial amounts of solid waste which decrease the total life expectancy of local landfills below current projections; or
- Encourage activities which result in the use of substantial amounts of fuel, water or energy.

Gas and Electric Service

Without site-specific development plans, it is not possible to quantify the gas and electricity demand from future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area; nevertheless, based on standard consumption rate estimates, adequate capacity is available to service projected buildup in accordance with current plans. Existing utilities would be extended or upgraded to provide service to future development on vacant or underutilized parcels. Work in and around utility lines, if not performed in accordance with standard procedures of the respective utility companies, could result in potential service interruptions which would be considered a significant impact.
3.8 Public Services and Utilities

Police Protection

Because police response times to the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area currently exceed the thresholds for Priority I calls, future development of the vacant and underutilized parcels would exacerbate this problem and would be considered a significant impact.

Fire Protection

Future development of vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would not cause the average response time to be exceeded for emergency calls for fire protection (pers.comm., Kelsey 1998). In addition, implementation of standard requirements of the Chula Vista Fire Department would avoid the potential for significant fire hazards at future structures associated with development of these parcels. Standard requirements include the following:

1. Maximum fire flow shall be 5,000 gallons per minute (gpm).
2. Access for fire response vehicles shall be provided to within 150 feet of all portions of any building.
3. All driveway widths shall be a minimum of 20 feet.
4. All apartments three or more stories in height or containing more than 15 dwelling units, and every hotel three or more stories in height or containing 20 or more guest rooms, shall be provided with a fully automatic fire sprinkler system.
5. A fire alarm-evacuation system shall be provided for all public assembly and multi-residential occupancies.
6. Turn-around clearance at cul-de-sacs of fire access roads greater than 150 feet in length shall be a minimum 40-foot radius.
7. Private fire hydrants shall satisfy the requirement that any part of the ground floor of any building shall be within 150 feet of a water supply. These hydrants shall be in place and operable prior to the delivery of combustible building materials.
8. Public fire hydrants shall be required every 300 feet on public streets; however, if the location of major buildings is unknown, hydrants may be located specific to the buildings.
9. Easily readable address signs which can be seen from the street are necessary, using large, contrasting block letters and numbers.
Solid Waste Removal

Because no site-specific development or redevelopment projects are currently proposed, it is not possible to determine the extent of impacts to solid waste removal services. It is anticipated, however, that with implementation of a recycling program, the solid waste demand from buildout of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would not cause projected landfill capacity to be exceeded or significantly reduce the projected life span of solid waste disposal capacity within Chula Vista.

Water

Buildout of the vacant and underutilized parcels in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could result in a total water consumption of up to 1,000,000 gallons per day. According to the Sweetwater Authority, new or expanded facilities may be required for 'high users', such as biotechnical facilities (pers.comm., Collins 1998). Therefore, impacts on water service would be significant, if not mitigated.

Sewer

Buildout of the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area would generate approximately 0.3 mgd of waste water and buildout of the Tidelands would generate less than 0.1 mgd of waste water, which together would represent approximately five percent of the remaining available capacity in the City of Chula Vista. Therefore, the projected sewage generation from future development and redevelopment within the expanded redevelopment area would not significantly impact the city's wastewater capacity. Improvements or new facilities may be required for sewage conveyance. Design and specification of such facilities would depend on specific development proposals.

Storm Drains

Future development or redevelopment of the vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could represent an additional 160 acres of impervious surfaces (e.g., rooftops, parking lots, and other hardscape), depending upon the areas to be provided for landscaping. The resulting increase in the volume and velocity of storm water runoff ultimately discharged into San Diego Bay, Chula Vista Marina, and the tidal mud flat south of the expanded redevelopment area would exceed the capacity of the existing storm drain system. Without mitigation, this would be a significant impact (pers. comm., Hardesty 1998).
3.8 Public Services and Utilities

Public Schools

School impacts associated with residential development within the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area are addressed in the Midbayfront LCP Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment EIR. The proposed expansion area does not include residential uses. School impacts attributable to commercial or industrial development would be mitigated by payment of state-mandated impact fees.

3.8.3 Mitigation Measures

3.8.3.1 Prior to approval of utility plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, future project applicants shall coordinate with the respective utility companies to ensure that any work in and around existing utility lines (e.g., extension, relocation) is performed in accordance with standard procedures to avoid service interruptions in the area.

3.8.3.2 Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, energy resource conservation measures shall be incorporated into project building plans, as necessary, to the satisfaction of the Planning Directors of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate. Such methods shall include, but shall not be limited to, sealed doors and windows, double-pane glass, increases in wall and ceiling insulation, solar benefits, and time-controlled lighting systems.

3.8.3.3 Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, the City of Chula Vista shall ensure that adequate police service is provided to meet response times.

3.8.3.4 Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, the City of Chula Vista Fire Department shall review individual project plans and building design and include plan modifications, if necessary, to ensure conformance with standard requirements for fire safety.

3.8.3.5 Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, a recycling program shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, for any new development within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. In conjunction with a local recycling
company, this program shall identify the following measures, at a minimum: (1) provision of bins on site for the collection of recyclable materials such as glass, plastic, metal, and paper products; and (2) provision of trash compactors to reduce solid waste volume and the number of trips to the Otay Landfill.

3.8.3.6 Prior to approval of utility plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, future project applicants shall coordinate with the Sweetwater Authority to ensure that adequate water service is provided to the new development.

3.8.3.7 Prior to approval of utility plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, a detailed drainage study shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate. The study shall demonstrate that future development is conditioned such that adequate drainage facilities are designed and provided to control and convey runoff in a manner that does not exceed the downstream storm drain capacity.

3.8.3.8 Prior to issuance of a building permit for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, future project applicants shall pay school mitigation fees in accordance with state law.

3.8.4 Significance of Impact

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures listed above, impacts to public services, utilities, and facilities from future development or redevelopment in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance.
3.9 AESTHETICS

Information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), and information for the proposed expansion area is based on the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997). These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of visual quality conditions for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.9.1 Existing Conditions

Visual Character

As described in Section 2.0 of this PEIR (Environmental Setting), the visual character of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is characterized by a mixture of undeveloped land and industrial, commercial, park/recreational, and marine-related uses. The north portion of the expanded redevelopment area is dominated by the Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (NWR); the east, central, and south portions are dominated by industrial uses; and the west portion is primarily park, water-based recreation, and associated commercial uses surrounding the Chula Vista Marina. Viewsheds, scenic roadways, and plan-designated important views within the expanded redevelopment area are shown on Figure 3.9-1

Viewsheds

A viewshed is a tool for identifying views that would be affected by a proposed project. The surrounding viewshed is generally defined as the locations around the project at which viewers are likely to be affected by visual changes within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Four main viewsheds are identified for the expanded redevelopment area based upon visual prominence, number of visual receptors, and important views designated by relevant planning documents (as identified in Section 3.1 of this PEIR). These viewsheds include:

I-5, SR-54, E Street, and F Street View Corridors

These viewsheds are transportation routes where passing motorists have views of the north portion of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Views of this area are available due to the open
expanse provided by Sweetwater Marsh and the views are generally in a westward direction toward San Diego Bay. Views from I-5 are primarily available to southbound motorists looking west and south, with views of Sweetwater Marsh in the foreground, commercial and industrial uses in the midground, and the Bay in the background. These views are available for approximately ¾ of a mile from about 24th Street in National City to E Street in Chula Vista. Views from SR-54 are available in both the east and westbound directions at the I-5 overpass. Views of the expanded redevelopment area from southbound I-5 to eastbound SR-54 are not generally prominent for drivers concentrating on the banked turn to the east. From westbound SR-54 to southbound I-5, views are also brief due to the banked turn and retaining wall directly in front of the driver. As the driver starts to come out of the turn and head south, views open up near the top of the overpass. As the driver nears the bottom of the overpass and merges onto I-5, views to the north portion of the expanded redevelopment area are obscured by buildings and landscaping immediately to the west of I-5.

E and F streets are both identified as view corridors by the Chula Vista General Plan (City of Chula Vista 1995). Both streets offer views toward the Bay from approximately 5th Avenue; however, westerly views from E Street are less constrained because it is wider than F Street. E Street also terminates at the parking lot for the Sweetwater Marsh NWR, an open area without surrounding development.

Bayside Park and Marina Way Viewshed

This viewshed is comprised of the area that fronts San Diego Bay along Bayfront Park and south of the Chula Vista Marina along Marina Way. This viewshed also includes important views as identified by the City of Chula Vista Local Coastal Program (1993) and the Port Master Plan (1995) (Figure 3.9-1). Views are to the west toward the Bay, as the area is surrounded to the east by industrial and commercial uses. Some intermittent views through the park landscaping and sailboat masts are available to the south. Views are more obscured to the north than to the south due to blockage by Southbay Boatyard. Viewers at this location primarily include park-goers, pedestrians, and bicyclists.

Nature Center Viewshed

The Chula Vista Nature Center is surrounded by the Sweetwater Marsh NWR. Visitors to the Center are transported by shuttle bus from the parking lot at the foot of E Street. There is an observation tower located adjacent to the Center with views in nearly all directions. Trails extend from the
Center to the west toward the bayfront. Short-range views occur in all directions of the surrounding marsh. Long-range views to the north include the National City Shipyard, with downtown San Diego, the Coronado Bridge, and Point Loma further away. Mid-range views to the west include the Bay, while the Silver Stand within the City of Coronado occupies the long-range views. Long-range views to the south are occupied by the Southbay Boatyard, with industrial uses and the SDG&E Southbay Power Plant further away. Mid-range views to the east are of vacant land and commercial uses along Bay Boulevard, industrial uses south of F Street, and portions of I-5. I-5 and surrounding landscaping essentially blocks long-range views further to the east, but Mount Miguel is visible in the distance.

Bay Viewshed

The Bay viewshed includes views of the water west of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Boaters represent the primary viewers from this location. Views from the Bay toward the expanded redevelopment area are as follows. In the north, the Sweetwater Marsh dominates the foreground, with I-5 and commercial and industrial uses in the background. The central portion contains Bayfront Park and Chula Vista Marina in the foreground, the recreational vehicle park and marina-related commercial uses in the midground, and industrial uses in the background. In the south, tidal flats are present in the foreground and the SDG&E Southbay Power Plant dominates the background.

Scenic Roads

The Chula Vista General Plan designates two scenic roadways within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area; Marina Parkway and F Street/Lagoon Drive. Marina Parkway is the principal access to the Bayfront and, as such, establishes the initial aesthetic theme and impression of the waterfront area. An important area along this scenic roadway is at its intersection with F Street. At this intersection of two scenic roadways, and adjacent to the Bay, is a planned waterfront park. The ‘F Street Gateway’ is designated as such between 3rd Avenue and Marina Parkway in the General Plan.

3.9.2 Impacts

Based on applicable thresholds identified in Appendix G of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in a significant visual quality impact if they would:
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- block public view corridors;
- destroy prominent visual characteristics and scenic resources; or
- create an undesirable architectural and landscape design.

Because the project involves amendment of the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan to include 145 acres of additional land and timeframe extensions, the following analysis is based on the potential 'worst-case' impacts of future development of vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Worst-case analysis assumes maximum development potential in accordance with existing zoning regulations (e.g., maximum lot coverage, building heights, setbacks).

The worst-case visual quality impacts from buildout of the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area are analyzed in the 1991 Midbayfront LCP Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR; therefore, the following analysis addresses impacts to the proposed expansion area only.

Visual Character

Future development of vacant and underutilized parcels within the proposed expansion area would include buildings, landscaping, parking, and other hardscape elements associated with industrial, commercial, recreational, and marine-related uses, in accordance with the Port Master Plan (Figure 3.1-2). Such development would be consistent with the existing visual character of the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area, which is already comprised of similar uses. Site plan review is required for all new development within the proposed expansion area, which would avoid conflicts with the Port Master Plan and reduce potential visual character impacts to below a level of significance.

Viewsheds

I-5, SR-54, E Street, and F Street View Corridors

Future development within the proposed expansion area would not significantly impact these view corridors due to intervening distance, buildings and landscaping, and due to the short viewing time frame for motorists along the identified segments of these facilities. Designated development would increase the urban character of the area, but would not interfere with public views.
Bayside Park and Marina Way Viewshed

According to the Port Master Plan, business park uses are designated to the east of this viewshed. Views from this area are primarily to the west, across San Diego Bay, and future development within the proposed expansion area would not affect these views. Therefore, future development or redevelopment activities within the proposed expansion area would not significantly impact the Bayside Park and Marina Bay viewsheds.

Nature Center Viewshed

Immediate foreground views of the marsh areas surround the Chula Vista Nature Center would not be significantly impacted by future development within the proposed expansion area because, although such development would increase the urban character of areas to the southwest, they would not be within the viewshed of visitors at the Nature Center.

Bay Viewshed

Future development within the proposed expansion area, pursuant to the Port Master Plan, would alter the visual character of the bayfront as viewed from the Bay; however, such development would be similar to the B.F. Goodrich industrial facilities in the background. Therefore, buildout of planned uses within the proposed expansion area would not significantly impact the Bay viewshed.

Scenic Roads

As designated by the city’s LCP and Port Master Plan, future development within the proposed expansion area would occur adjacent to Marina Parkway. A mixture of industrial business park, commercial recreation, and marine-related industrial uses would be in close proximity to this scenic roadway. Specific visual quality impacts of such development would be intensification of the existing urban character; however, views from this scenic road segment would not be significantly impacted because similar uses currently exist and designated development would represent an extension of such uses.
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3.9.3 Mitigation Measures

Future worst-case development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are not expected to result in significant viewshed and visual quality impacts, and implementation of the following standard design review procedures of the city and SDUPD would ensure that future projects avoid potential impacts:

3.9.3.1 Prior to approval of project plans for subsequent development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, the City of Chula Vista or the SDUPD, as appropriate, shall review individual project plans and building design. Design review shall include plan/architectural modifications, if necessary, to protect viewsheds and visual quality in and around the Tidelands.

3.9.4 Analysis of Significance

Implementation of the recommended mitigation measure outlined above would avoid significant viewshed and visual quality impacts associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area during the design review phase.
3.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Although included in the project, the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area is not addressed in this section because it is largely built-out and the proposed action would not alter land uses in that area, which could otherwise result in significant impacts to cultural resources. Cultural resources information for the Bayfront Redevelopment Area is based on studies prepared by RECON for the Bayfront Specific Plan EIR (City of Chula Vista 1985) and Appendix D of the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1991). Information for the proposed expansion area is based on the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997) and on additional research at the archives at San Diego State University and the Chula Vista Historical Society. These documents are available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contain more detailed discussion of the cultural resources in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

3.10.1 Existing Conditions

Prehistoric Resources

The prehistory of the San Diego region can be summarized within three major periods of occupation: Paleoindian, Early Archaic, and Late Archaic (or Late Prehistoric). These are often more specifically identified as the San Dieguito Complex (ca. 10,000 to 7000 years before present [B.P.]), La Jolla/Pauma Complex (ca. 7000 to 2000 B.P.) and the Late Prehistoric Complex (2000 B.P. to historic contact).

Previous cultural resource surveys have reportedly addressed the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area, but no surveys have been conducted for the proposed expansion area. The previous survey investigations have identified one dual component (historic and prehistoric materials) and four prehistoric archaeological sites within the existing redevelopment area (City of Chula Vista 1985; Brian F. Smith and Associates 1989). Some of these sites, or portions of these sites have been subject to evaluation for importance under CEQA. Loci B, C and D of dual component site CA-SDI-6025 and loci A and B of CA-SDI-5512 were evaluated in the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991) and were found to be non-significant. Site CA-SDI-4958 was subject to excavation in the late 1970s (Bull 1977) and, at the time of preparation of the Bayfront Specific Plan EIR (City of Chula Vista 1985), was to be placed in open space. It was recommended that the two other sites CA-SDI-3 and SDM-W-2241 be evaluated through excavation; however, these sites are outside the existing redevelopment area.
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No prehistoric resources have been identified within the proposed expansion area, which is covered by fill.

As discussed in Section 3.2.1 of this PEIR, the soils and geologic units underlying the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area consist of previously-placed fill soils, bay deposits, and natural soils of the Bay Point Formation. Fill soils underlie the majority of the expanded redevelopment area to a depth of less than 10 feet below existing grade and typically consist of sand with shell fragments and varying amounts of silt. Bay deposits underlie the fill soils and range in thickness from 15 to 30 feet. The upper 3 to 5 feet of the bay deposits generally consist of silty clays and clayey silts, with abundant organic material. This extremely soft and compressible upper layer is generally underlain by silty sands. Underlying the bay deposits are natural soils of the Bay Point Formation (dated at approximately 120,000 years ago).

The sea level and coastal configuration in the San Diego region has changed through time. It is unlikely that significant cultural material would exist under the fill in the proposed expansion area. Within the past 6,000 years, the majority of this portion of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area probably consisted of a tidal mud flat with some associated salt marsh (Gallegos and Kyle 1988). Although this would have been a potentially important resource area, little evidence of these early activities would be expected to survive. Evidence of subsistence and habitation activity along the waterfront has been generally documented on slightly elevated areas.

Historic Period Resources

The history of San Diego County between the late 1700s and the present reflects Spanish, Mexican, and American occupation and land use. Spanish colonization of southern California began in 1769, with establishment of the first outpost in San Diego. The Spanish period (1769-1821) represented a time of European exploration and settlement. The Mexican period (1821-1848) retained many of the Spanish institutions and laws. But in 1834 the mission system was secularized. After secularization, large tracts of land were granted to individuals and families, and a rancho system was established. The Mexican period ended when Mexico ceded California to the United States after the Mexican-American War (1846-1848). Very early in the American period (1848-present), gold was discovered in California. The great influx of Americans and Europeans that resulted, quickly overshadowed many of the Spanish and Mexican cultural traditions and eliminated many remaining vestiges of Native American culture. The homestead system encouraged American settlement beyond the coastal plain. A continued increase in population has brought growth and wealth to
southern California. Tourism, agriculture, education and the military are some of the major social and economic components of the region today.

The City of Chula Vista resulted from active recruitment of settlers by the San Diego Land and Town Company in 1886. The ability to settle the area of the former Rancho La Nacion was provided by the construction of the Sweetwater Dam. The resulting reservoir provided a year-round source of water for domestic and agricultural use. The development occurred on the mesa above the Bayfront. In 1889, the National City Record announced “Chula Vista is divided into five acre tracts. Wide avenues intersect at reasonable distances. The beautiful mesa is laced with a network of water pipes from the Sweetwater System.” Historical documents establish a history of lemon and orange groves in the city beginning in the late 1880s. For example, in 1890, 490 acres of land were reported to be under cultivation for lemons and oranges; in 1896, 1,400 acres were under cultivation for the same crops (Chula Vista Hist. Soc. 1993). Again, irrigation water which allowed the growth of agriculture in the area did not come from groundwater, but rather from the Sweetwater Reservoir. The Sweetwater Reservoir was supplemented with the addition of the Otay Reservoir in the early 20th century which provided an additional water source for the area.

The original zoning for Chula Vista indicated that land west of Broadway was to be used for industrial purposes (Phillips 1968). The historical record of use of the Chula Vista Bayfront prior to approximately 1914 indicates no agricultural uses. The only activity, besides the Chula Vista Yacht Club (founded in 1898), was the Hercules Powder Company (now Hercules Chemical) facility on what is today the Sweetwater Marsh NWR and Chula Vista Nature Center. The gunpowder and chemical manufacturing plant extracted potash (potassium nitrate) and acetone from kelp harvested from nearby coastal waters. A pier, approximately 1,700 feet in length, connected the chemical complex to the Bay. The pier was used to unload raw materials (kelp) from a fleet of three, specially-designed kelp-harvesting vessels (Chula Vista Hist. Soc. 1993). An investigation of aerial photographs from 1928 shows the large facility with numerous buildings and a railroad spur connecting the site to the main line traveling north to San Diego.

It was reported that after World War I the Hercules Powder Company plant was taken over by San Diego Oil Products, who converted the facility to the largest cottonseed warehouse in the United States at the time (Phillips 1968). The remnants of the complex appear in aerial photos taken in 1945, 1953, 1964. The remains of the facility were razed during creation of the Sweetwater NWR in 1988.
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South of G Street, a small airport operated from 1922 until the outbreak of World War II. The airport was constructed by Roland Tyce and included a small aircraft manufacturing facility which Tyce also owned and operated. The airfield and Tyce’s manufacturing operation continued until the late 1930’s (Chula Vista Hist. Soc. 1993).

On the north side of G Street, a sewage treatment plant was constructed in 1926. Septic tanks were introduced in 1910. The sewage treatment plants, an “Imhoff plant”, was reported to perform primary treatment. The plant’s liquid effluent was piped into the Bay. An upgrade to increase capacity of the overloaded original plant was completed in 1947. The City of Chula Vista sewage system was connected to the City of San Diego system in the 1950’s (Chula Vista hist. Soc. 1993).

Examination of aerial photographs dating from 1928 and 1945 indicate agricultural activity continued to be practiced principally along the upland mesas extending to the north to the banks of the Sweetwater River and south to Telegraph Creek. Agricultural uses in the Bayfront area (i.e., west of Broadway), did not occur until additional irrigation water became available as part of the war effort for World War II.

B.F. Goodrich Aerospace/Air Structures Group (formerly the Rohr Corporation) was initially located in downtown San Diego and began operations in Chula Vista in 1940 in a three-story building at 8th and J streets. The City of Chula Vista owned an option on 10 acres of land on the Bayfront which was planned for expansion of Tyce’s airport. The city decided it needed the industrial development and employment that Rohr would bring, and sold the land to Rohr for a manufacturing plant. On February 1, 1941, Rohr moved into its first building. In June of 1941, Rohr completed a second manufacturing building and an office building. By 1969, Rohr occupied 47 buildings along the Chula Vista Bayfront (City of Chula Vista 1986).

The artificial fill upon which a portion of the B.F. Goodrich facilities and the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area lies was completed by the Navy as part of a continuous dredging operation within San Diego Bay between 1957 and 1968. Approximately 200 acres were created by the dredge and fill operations. In 1969, the “D Street Fill” was placed in the north portion of the Bayfront which extends west from D Street.

Archival Research and Inventory Results

Previous cultural resource studies have identified two historic period sites within the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area (City of Chula Vista 1985; Brian F. Smith and Associates 1989).
Both date to the American period, as does the historic component of CA-SDI-6025 (see above). Site CA-SDI-13,073H consists of the rail line and route known under several names, including the Coronado Railroad and the San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railroad (Laylander 1993). The other site, a historic dump (CA-SDI-8873H), was investigated by Caltrans (DeCosta 1981) and was determined to be ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (Snyder 1982).

Limited archival research was conducted as part of the current study in an effort to provide more information on the pier formerly associated with the Hercules Powder Company. The 1904, 1:62500-scale topographic map of San Diego (USGS 1904) shows the pier extending westward from the north portion of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area into the Bay. Although precise construction and demolition dates have not been documented, the pier was not present on a 1872 map of the area (Wheeler 1872) and it does not appear on a 1930 map of the area (USGS 1930). Research indicates the pier was a wooden structure that also served as home to the Chula Vista Yacht Club. In addition, it was reportedly used for unloading emergency supplies brought to Chula Vista when the population was cut off from adjacent communities during the 1916 flood (John Rojas, Chula Vista Historical Society, 1998).

A partial historic building inventory exists for the City of Chula Vista. To date, no historic buildings appear to have been identified in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

**Cultural Resource Evaluation**

A total of five cultural resource sites have been identified within the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area (Table 3.10.1).

**3.10.2 Impacts**

Future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in significant impacts to cultural resources if such impacts meet the thresholds identified in Appendix K of the state CEQA Guidelines and in the California Public Resources Code 5024.1 (which established the California Register of Historic Places). The impacts to cultural resources from buildout of the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area are analyzed in the 1991 Midbayfront LCP Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR; therefore, the following analysis addresses impacts to the proposed expansion area only.
### Table 3.10-1
Known Cultural Resources Within the Expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permanent Trinomial (CA-SDI-)</th>
<th>Museum of Man Designation (SDM-W-)</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4958</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Habitation site (Gunpowder Point)</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Evaluated by Bull 1977; proposed for open space in 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5512</td>
<td>1653</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lithics and shell</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Investigated by Leach and Pettus 1979; Evaluated by Smith 1989; Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sparse lithics and shell</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Evaluated by Smith 1989; Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6025</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lithics and shell</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>UnEvaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lithics and shell mixed with historic material</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Evaluated by Smith 1989; Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Primarily historic materials mixed with prehistoric lithics</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Evaluated by Smith 1989; Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Primarily historic materials mixed with prehistoric lithics</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Evaluated by Smith 1989; Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8873H</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paradise Marsh Dump</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Evaluated by DeCosta 1981; Snyder 1982; Non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,073H</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>Existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include Town Centre I Redevelopment Area or former redevelopment area north of C Street

Current impact assessment is focused on two vacant parcels and a portion of another within the proposed expansion area. Based on previous investigations which applied the criteria provided in Appendix K of the state CEQA Guidelines, future development of these areas would not result in a significant impact to known cultural resources.

#### 3.10.3 Mitigation Measures

Future development or redevelopment activities within the proposed expansion area are not expected to result in significant impacts to cultural resources, and implementation of the following standard
grading monitoring procedures of the city and SDUPD would ensure that future projects avoid potential impacts:

3.10.3.1 If in the unlikely event that buried cultural material is discovered during excavations below the fill, work in that area shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the importance of the find. If the cultural resource is determined to be significant, a testing program shall be approved and implemented, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.

3.10.4 Analysis of Significance

No significant impacts to cultural resources have been identified for the proposed expansion area. Future development or redevelopment activities in the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area could potentially affect two resources which have yet to be evaluated for importance. With implementation of mitigation measures recommended in the 1991 Midbayfront LCP Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR, impacts to these resources (if found to be significant) would be reduced to below a level of significance.
3.11 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Hazardous materials information for the proposed expansion area is based on a Phase I Site Assessment prepared by Ninyo & Moore Geotechnical and Environmental Sciences Consultants for SDUPD's Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Mater Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997). This document is available for public review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and contains more detailed discussion of hazardous materials conditions for the proposed expansion area.

3.11.1 Existing Conditions

Industrial properties within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area generate, use, treat, store, transport, and dispose substances that are classified as either 'hazardous wastes' or 'hazardous materials' by the California Department of Health Services (CDHS). As defined in Section 25117 of the California Public Resources Code Division 30, Waste Management, "Hazardous waste means either of the following:

(1) A waste, or combination of wastes, which because of its quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics may either:
   a. Cause, or significantly contribute to an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness; or
   b. Pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health or environment when improperly treated, stored, transported, or disposed of, or otherwise managed; or

(2) A waste which meets any of the criteria for the identification of a hazardous waste adopted by the department pursuant to Section 25141."

A hazardous material is any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the work place or the environment.

Based on the Phase I Site Assessment for the proposed expansion area; there have been reported leaking underground storage tanks and associated releases of hazardous substances. The existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area has not undergone a comprehensive Phase I Site Assessment, but portions have been sampled for groundwater contamination from industrial activities. Please refer to Section 3.3 (Drainage/Water Quality) of this FEIR for information regarding existing groundwater
quality in the expanded redevelopment area, which is influenced in part by the release of hazardous materials related to past and present (potentially) industrial activities onsite.

3.11.2 Impacts

According to Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines, the project would result in a significant impact if it would create a potential public health hazard or involve the use, production, or disposal of materials which pose a hazard to people or animal or plant populations in the area affected.

Hazardous wastes generated from commercial and industrial uses within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could include alcohols, bases, solvents, medical, and petroleum products. If a research and development facility were developed in the expanded redevelopment area, radioactive waste could be generated and stored. Certain types of manufacturing facilities would also require large quantities of treated water. Treatment would typically be conducted on site, and wastewater generated from the treatment process would be disposed to the sewer system. Cooling and heating systems may be required for manufacturing operations. Depending on the size and type of heating and/or cooling systems, air discharge controls could be required. These facilities would also generally require emergency back-up generators and associated storage of petroleum products. The specific types and quantities of hazardous wastes generated and stored would depend on the specific manufacturing process.

Future development of commercial and industrial uses within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would include facilities that typically use and store hazardous materials, such as compressed gases, alcohols, bases, solvents, and petroleum products. Depending on the type of facility and manufacturing operation, acutely hazardous materials could also be used and stored. Acutely hazardous materials are those substances that, if human exposure should occur, may likely result in death, disabling personal injury, or serious illness.

The generation and use of hazardous wastes and materials in manufacturing or research and development processes would require the removal of hazardous wastes for treatment or disposal and the transport of hazardous substances to and from the site.

The following list of activities would be regulated as they apply to future, as well as existing, commercial and industrial facilities in the expanded redevelopment area:
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- **Hazardous Materials Storage** - A health permit for the storage of hazardous materials is required from the County of San Diego Department of Health (DOH). As part of this permit, a hazardous materials business plan is required to document the facility and site contact, emergency response plan, employee training, emergency equipment, site maps, and hazardous materials inventory (please refer to Mitigation Measure 3.3.3.6). Acutely hazardous materials are also required to be registered with the County DOH.

- **Hazardous Waste Generation** - An EPA identification number is required from the CDHS for the generation of hazardous waste. Hazardous wastes are typically required to be removed from the site 90 days from the time of generation.

- **Medical Waste Storage and Treatment** - A health permit for the storage and treatment of medical waste is required from the County DOH.

- **Industrial Wastewater, Treatment and Disposal** - A permit for the treatment and disposal of wastewater is required from the City of San Diego Industrial Waste Department. The City of Chula Vista Engineering Department approves the permit issued by the City of San Diego Industrial Waste Department and may have additional requirements.

- **Storm Water Discharge** - A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit is required from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, including a stormwater pollution prevention plan and monitoring/sampling plan (please refer to Mitigation Measure 3.3.3.3). The SDUPD also requires a detailed stormwater management plan with specific restrictions and conditions.

- **Radioactive Materials and Waste Storage** - A radioactive materials license is required from the Health and Welfare Agency of the CDHS for the use and storage of radioactive materials and waste.

- **Operation of Heating/Cooling Systems** - A permit for air discharge from these facilities may be required from the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District.

- **Injury and Illness Prevention** - An injury and illness prevention plan is required from the California Occupational Health and Safety Administration.
The use of hazardous materials associated with the operation of future commercial and industrial uses within the expanded redevelopment area will be subject to regulatory requirements of the County DOH, the RWQCB, APCD, and state and federal EPA. Compliance with the regulatory standards of these agencies would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. If not mitigated, public exposure to hazardous materials could occur through handling of potentially contaminated soil by construction workers, public contact with potentially contaminated surface or groundwaters (e.g., leaking underground storage tanks, urban runoff pollution), and exposure to volatile emissions from heating/cooling systems.

3.11.3 Mitigation Measures

Please refer to Section 3.3.3 of this PEIR for applicable mitigation measures related to water quality impacts due to potential contamination from hazardous materials.

3.11.3.1 Prior to development of any property formerly occupied by or adjacent to existing industrial facilities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, a detailed Phase I Environmental Site Assessment shall be approved by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, to evaluate the potential for soil and groundwater contamination. Based on the results of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, soil and possibly groundwater sampling may be warranted.

3.11.3.2 Prior to development of the approximate 15-acre parcel bounded by J Street and Marina Parkway, within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, a Phase II evaluation of possible soil and groundwater contamination shall be conducted in the drainage channel, adjacent to all storm water culverts and discharge pipes, and approved by the SDUPD.

3.11.3.3 Asbestos and lead-based paint surveys of existing buildings located within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area shall be conducted prior to any renovation or demolition activities, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.

3.11.3.4 Prior to issuance of a grading permit for any property within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area where the results of a Phase I, Phase II, and/or asbestos evaluation indicate the potential for hazardous materials at levels requiring mitigation, all remedial measures identified in these studies shall be shown on the face of final grading plans and/or incorporated into contractor specifications prior to award of construction contracts, to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate.
3.11 Hazardous Materials

3.11.3.5 During and after grading and construction, random periodic field inspections shall be conducted by the city, SDUPD, or designated monitor to verify implementation of remedial measures in accordance with approved plans and permits. If observed conditions and/or grading/construction activities vary significantly from those documented in approved plans and permits, such activities shall be halted temporarily or diverted away from affected areas and the city or SDUPD notified immediately to determine appropriate mitigation.

3.11.4 Significance of Impact

With implementation of the mitigation measures listed above and based on compliance with applicable statutes and regulations that apply to any commercial or industrial facility, potential impacts arising from the generation, utilization, treatment, storage, or transport of hazardous materials associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance.
4.0 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

4.1 CEQA GUIDELINES

In considering the appropriateness of a proposed project, CEQA mandates that alternatives to its implementation be discussed. Section 15126(d) of the state CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of “a range of reasonable alternatives to a project or to the location of a project, which would feasiably attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project.” Section 15126(d)(5) further states that “the range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by the ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.” Thus, the following discussion focuses on those alternatives that are capable of eliminating significant environmental impacts or reducing them to below a level of significance, even if they would impede the attainment of some of the project objectives, or would be more costly.

According to Section 15126(d)(5)(A) of the state CEQA Guidelines, among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are: 1) site suitability; 2) economic viability; 3) availability of infrastructure; 4) general plan consistency; 5) other plans or regulatory limitations; 6) jurisdictional boundaries; and 7) whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or the site is already owned by the proponent).

In accordance with Section 15126(d)(2) of the state CEQA Guidelines, each of the project alternatives provided below contains a brief description of the rationale for its selection. In addition, alternatives are identified that were considered by the City of Chula Vista, but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process, along with a brief explanation of the reasons underlying the determination of infeasibility.

In developing the alternatives to be addressed in this section, consideration was given regarding their ability to meet most of the basic objectives of the project. These objectives are summarized below from Section 1.1 of this PEIR:

- extend the time periods within which the Redevelopment Agency may commence eminent domain proceedings, incur debt, undertake redevelopment activities, and collect tax
increment revenue (inclusion of the Tidelands into the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan does not give the Agency eminent domain authority over Port Tidelands);

• modify tax increment revenue and bonded debt financial limits;

• incorporate the Tidelands into the Bayfront Redevelopment Area to allow the Agency to employ economic redevelopment tools to assist the SDUPD in their efforts to remove impediments to development, provide financial options to help correct incompatible and nonconforming land uses, and combine resources to aide in the redesign of obsolete buildings (the SDUPD retains sole jurisdiction over the Tidelands and maintains the final authority for land use planning and management of the Port Tidelands); and

• permit vacant and underutilized land in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to be developed with uses that attract visitors to, and produce income and jobs for, the region.

4.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

As described in Section 3.1 of this PEIR (Land Use and Planning), the Chula Vista General Plan, SDUPD Master Plan, and Bayfront Specific Plan consider a wide range of land uses for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. The location, size, and configuration of these land uses, and their relationship to each other, are designed to meet one of the primary project objectives, which is to encourage vacant and underutilized land in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to be developed with uses that attract visitors to, and produce income and jobs for, the region. Alternative types of land uses were not considered because they would not satisfy this objective. In addition, although not the sole cause of its rejection, a general plan amendment, master plan amendment, and/or specific plan amendment would be required for approval of alternative land use designations.

Another project alternative that was considered but rejected involves the evaluation of a reduced buildout intensity for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to avoid or reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with future 'worst-case' development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in this PEIR. With implementation of recommended mitigation measures identified in this PEIR, potential environmental impacts associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance. A reduction in development intensities throughout the expanded
Bayfront Redevelopment Area may reduce certain environmental impacts, but would not change the determination regarding significance of impacts and therefore would not serve the purpose of an alternatives analysis. Without site-specific development information, however, it is not possible at this time to determine the extent to which buildout intensities should be decreased to either avoid the worst-case environmental impacts, reduce them to below a level of significance, or eliminate the need for mitigation, as identified in this PEIR. Any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of this document, as reinforced in Section 15145 the state CEQA Guidelines.

A modified project alternative was also considered which would avoid or reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in this PEIR, while maintaining the buildout development potential of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Such an alternative would generally involve limiting development in and adjacent to environmentally-constrained areas and increasing densities in less constrained areas. Environmental issues that would benefit from such an alternative typically include land use, soils/geology, drainage/hydrology, noise-sensitive areas, and biological, visual/scenic, and cultural resources. As with the reduced project alternative discussed above, this alternative was rejected because the absence of site-specific development information does not allow evaluation of project redesign measures to either avoid the worst-case environmental impacts, reduce them to below a level of significance, or vitiate the need for mitigation, as identified in this PEIR. Any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of this document.

Regarding alternative locations, the state CEQA Guidelines mandates that “only those that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the proposed project need be considered for inclusion in this analysis. If the Lead Agency concludes that no feasible alternative locations exist, [this PEIR] must disclose the reasons for this conclusion.” An analysis of offsite alternative locations for the project is not a feasible or practical endeavor due to the unique location of the Bayfront Redevelopment Area and proposed expansion area (i.e., SDUPD property). In particular, the unique and special characteristics of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that underlie its fundamental recognition by the Agency as a prime location for redevelopment activities cannot be achieved elsewhere. The blight targeted for removal is specific to the proposed project location. Therefore, any attempt to undertake such analysis would be speculative and outside the scope of this document.
4.3 NO DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVE

The No Development alternative is often considered the environmentally superior alternative due to the absence of environmental impacts as compared to the proposed project. This alternative assumes that all existing development, including abandoned buildings and blighted areas, would be retained and not redeveloped. Vacant or underutilized parcels would also remain in their current condition. To prevent future development or redevelopment within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, this alternative would require a general plan amendment, master plan amendment, and/or specific plan amendment to redesignate and rezone vacant parcels for open space uses, with possible acquisition of some or all of these properties by the City Redevelopment Agency. In the event that the No Development Alternative is chosen, the SDUPD would retain sole control of the Port Tidelands.

While this alternative would eliminate the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in this PEIR, it would not fulfill any of the project objectives. This alternative is infeasible because it would allow conditions of blight to remain and it would be inconsistent with approved land use and zoning designations.

4.4 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

As defined in Section 15126(d)(4) of the state CEQA Guidelines, evaluation of the No Project alternative contemplates “what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.” The No Project alternative is similar to the proposed project in that existing land use and zoning designations within the Bayfront Redevelopment Area and proposed expansion area (i.e., SDUPD property) would remain. Since the significant environmental impacts associated with future worst-case development of vacant or underutilized parcels, as described in this PEIR, would be similar for the proposed project and No Project alternative, no additional analysis is required.
5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Section 15130(a) of the state CEQA Guidelines requires that the cumulative effects of a project be discussed when they are significant. Cumulative effects are two or more effects which, when taken individually are not significant but when considered together, are compounded or increase other impacts to a level of significance. The cumulative impact is the change in the environment which results from the related incremental impact of the project when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity.

According to Section 15130 of the state CEQA Guidelines, the discussion of cumulative effects “...need not provide as great a detail as is provided of the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness.” The evaluation of cumulative impacts is required by Section 15130 to be based on either: “(A) a list of past present, and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the agency, or (B) a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document which is designed to evaluate regional or area-wide conditions. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the lead agency.” In addition, reasonable mitigation measures should be discussed; however, CEQA acknowledges that “with some projects, the only feasible mitigation for cumulative impacts may involve the adoption of ordinances or regulations rather than the imposition of conditions on a project-by-project basis.”

The following is an assessment of cumulative effects associated with project buildout combined with buildout of the project vicinity for the issues evaluated in Section 3.0 of this PEIR: land use and planning, geophysical, water, air quality, noise, transportation/circulation, biology, public services/utilities, aesthetics, and cultural resources. The cumulative impact study area is different for each issue and is described under each topic below.

Land Use and Planning

The cumulative impact study area for this issue includes the immediate vicinity surrounding the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, within the cities of Chula Vista and National City. Buildout of the expanded redevelopment area and adjacent parcels would not result in significant cumulative land use conflicts because such development would be reviewed by the City of Chula
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Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, to ensure consistency between planned and/or existing land uses and to ensure compliance with the Chula Vista General Plan, Port Master Plan, and Bayfront Specific Plan of the city’s LCP. In addition, buildout of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be buffered from surrounding urban areas by I-5 on the east, the SDG&E South Bay Power Plant on the south, and Sweetwater Marsh NWR on the north.

Geophysical

The cumulative impact study area for this issue includes the immediate vicinity surrounding the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Future development of vacant parcels within the expanded redevelopment area would not combine with adjacent projects to result in significant cumulative geophysical and seismic constraints with implementation of standard remedial grading measures and seismic design parameters, including the removal of excess organic material, excavation/recompaction of fill, and specially-reinforced building footings.

Drainage/Water Quality

The cumulative impact study area for this issue includes the upstream Sweetwater River drainage basin and the San Diego Bay tidal flats adjacent to the west, which are the downstream drainage areas for the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Storm water drainage flows from future development of vacant parcels within the expanded redevelopment area would combine with that from development within the upstream Sweetwater drainage basin. These combined drainage flows could result in a potential increase in erosive runoff velocities (over what would occur without project buildout), leading to significant cumulative hydrologic impacts associated with scouring effects at downstream drainage outlets. Such potential cumulative hydrologic impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 3.3.3 of this PEIR, such as placement of rip-rap and other runoff control measures at impacted drainage outlets.

Urban runoff contaminants and runoff from unprotected graded areas associated with future development of vacant parcels within the expanded redevelopment area, combined with that from development within the upstream Sweetwater drainage basin, would result in significant cumulative water quality impacts in San Diego Bay. Such potential cumulative water quality impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 3.3.3 of this PEIR, such as erosion control and storm water pollution prevention plans.
Future development of properties within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be required to comply with regulations of the Regional Water Quality Control Board for point-source and non-point emissions. Regulatory restrictions would reduce cumulative impacts of the project to a less than significant level.

**Air Quality**

The cumulative impact study area for this issue is the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB). Future development within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area and SDAB would result in an increase in long-term emissions from mobile and stationary sources and short-term emissions from construction activities and equipment. APCD and SANDAG projections have taken these emissions into account; therefore, long-term air quality impacts would not be cumulatively significant. Site-specific mitigation presented in Section 3.4.3 of this PEIR would reduce to below a level of significance the contribution of short-term air quality impacts from future construction activities within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Such mitigation would include the issuance of APCD permits for temporary stationary sources and dust reduction measures.

**Noise**

For construction activities, the cumulative noise impact study area includes the immediate vicinity surrounding the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. The cumulative noise impact related to simultaneous construction activities within both the expanded redevelopment area and adjacent parcels would be avoided via mandatory adherence to the city’s nuisance noise policy, which limits construction to weekday hours.

The cumulative impact study area for increased traffic noise levels includes all circulation facilities where traffic generated by future development within the expanded redevelopment area would impact noise-sensitive locations. The potential exists for project buildout traffic to result in significant cumulative noise impacts, in conjunction with traffic noise levels contributed by other projects outside the expanded redevelopment area, at noise-sensitive locations. This potential cumulative traffic noise impact could be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures identified in Section 3.5.3 of this PEIR, such as noise attenuation barriers, buffers, and limiting hours of operation.
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Transportation/Circulation

Traffic generated by future development of vacant parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, when combined with that of projects outside this area, could result in significant cumulative traffic impacts at affected circulation facilities. As presented in Section 3.6.3 of this PEIR, implementation of mitigation measures, including road widening, lane restriping, and intersection reconfiguration, would reduce the potential cumulative traffic impacts to below a level of significance.

Biology

The cumulative impact study area for this issue includes the Sweetwater Marsh NWR. The focus of this analysis is on potential indirect effects on marsh habitat and wildlife from human intrusion, lighting, sedimentation, siltation, and water quality degradation from urban runoff pollution. Direct loss of habitat is not allowed within the NWR; therefore, a cumulative analysis of direct effects on biological resources is not warranted. The indirect biological impacts associated with future development of vacant parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area could combine with that of developments surrounding the NWR (but outside the expanded redevelopment area) and with projects in the upstream Sweetwater drainage basin (which would contribute to urban runoff pollution and sedimentation/siltation). Such cumulative indirect biological impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures identified in Sections 3.7.3 and 3.3.3 of this PEIR, such as fencing, buffers, lighting controls, and erosion control and storm water pollution prevention plans.

Public Services/Utilities

For public services, utilities, and facilities that currently exceed standards (i.e., police protection and storm drain capacity), future development of vacant parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would result in significant cumulative impacts in conjunction with other projects in the following service areas: Chula Vista Police Department beats which provide law enforcement service to the expanded redevelopment area and District 7 storm drain system which is maintained and operated by the SDUPD. For the remainder of the services, utilities, and facilities evaluated in Section 3.8 of this PEIR, the contribution of demand from project buildout would be incremental but not cumulatively significant. Mitigation for significant cumulative impacts include
upgrading the services or facilities to meet the needs of future projects, incorporating energy- conserving measures in building construction, and implementation of a recycling program.

Aesthetics

The area considered for cumulative aesthetic impacts includes the locations surrounding the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area that share the same viewsheds and scenic roads. Development within these combined viewsheds would contribute to cumulative significant aesthetic impacts with respect to potential obstruction of views through the Sweetwater Marsh NWR toward San Diego Bay and potential conflicts with the visual community character and architectural and signage guidelines. As identified in Section 3.9.3 of this PEIR, mitigation for these potentially significant cumulative aesthetic impacts includes design review by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, to ensure developments comply with pertinent visual quality standards and goals to preserve and enhance the scenic resources of the area.

Cultural Resources

The cumulative impact study area for this issue includes a one-mile radius around the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, which is the area typically evaluated when conducting cultural resources record searches for a project. Any loss of cultural resources in the region, from projects within or outside the expanded redevelopment area, would represent a significant cumulative impact. If future development within the expanded redevelopment area is unable to avoid the one historic site and one prehistoric site identified in Section 3.10 of this PEIR, and evaluation of these two sites confirms their significance, documentation/data recovery shall be performed to the satisfaction of the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate. This mitigation would reduce cumulative impacts of project buildout to below a level of significance.

Hazardous Materials

The cumulative impact study area for this issue includes the La Nacion and Telegraph hydraulic subareas (HSAs) which are the groundwater basins that underlie the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Potential groundwater contamination due to releases of hazardous materials from future commercial or industrial operations onsite could combine with that of other documented releases outside the expanded redevelopment area and contribute to significant cumulative impacts on the quality of groundwater within the affected HSAs. As identified in Section 3.11.3 of this
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PEIR, mitigation for these potentially significant cumulative groundwater impacts includes implementation of remedial measures identified in Phase I, Phase II, and/or asbestos evaluations and mandatory compliance with clean-up and abatement requirements in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations.
6.0 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS FOR BOTH THE TOWN CENTRE I REDEVELOPMENT AREA AND EXPANDED BAYFRONT REDEVELOPMENT AREA

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that environmental documents evaluate whether a proposed project would induce direct or indirect growth of population, housing, construction, or economic development (Public Resources Code Section 21100; CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(g)). This includes a discussion of the ways in which the project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

Appendix G(k) of the state CEQA Guidelines states that “a project will normally have a significant effect on the environment if it will [cause] substantial growth or concentration of population.” If it is determined under CEQA that a particular project would induce growth, then the indirect and secondary effects of that growth must also be assessed. Indirect effects are the environmental impacts associated with growth within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, such as noise impacts along surrounding roads resulting from the increase in traffic generated by the project. Secondary effects include environmental impacts associated with growth outside the expanded redevelopment area which are directly related to the increase in population resulting from the project, such as construction of new housing to accommodate the work force attracted by the project. Because population and economic growth typically produce a varied range of secondary effects which occur simultaneously, attempts to label growth as categorically beneficial or adverse are subjective. Section 15126(g) of the state CEQA Guidelines notes that growth in any area should not be assumed as necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

The proposed project would foster new development or redevelopment activities within the Town Centre I and expanded Bayfront Redevelopment areas in accordance with current land use and zoning designations. Such future development and redevelopment has been planned by the City of Chula Vista and SDUPD. The proposed redevelopment plan amendments are intended to attract businesses that would produce income and jobs for the region, and encourage development or redevelopment of vacant and/or underutilized land with uses that are responsive to market conditions in accordance with economic plans. This new development or redevelopment would increase the tax base and allow the city to utilize the tax increment that would accrue under redevelopment law.
Due to the lack of vacant and/or underutilized parcels within the Town Centre I Redevelopment Area, this area is limited to potential future redevelopment activities, which would not be considered growth-inducing. Redevelopment efforts in this area are targeted at rehabilitation of blighted areas and improved economic and aesthetic qualities. Therefore, the activities typically considered under CEQA to be growth-inducing effects (i.e., those that remove obstacles to population growth, such as the extension of roadways or utilities into or through undeveloped areas or urban reserves) would not occur with the proposed amendment of the Town Centre I Redevelopment Plan, nor would the secondary effects otherwise associated with such growth.

Because the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area has not developed as envisioned by current plans, the proposed project would encourage growth and accelerate the pace of new development in this area. This growth would generate new jobs and revenue, but would not result in significant growth-inducing effects elsewhere for the reasons outlined below. In addition, the indirect effects of this growth within the expanded redevelopment area have been evaluated in this PEIR and found to be not significant.

Buildout of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would include the addition of residential units that would slightly increase the local population. This new housing would not represent a substantial growth or concentration of population, however, as such growth is anticipated by adopted land use plans. In addition, with surrounding urban areas largely built out, the slight increase in population anticipated for the expanded redevelopment area would not stimulate additional housing or support uses on undeveloped properties within the adjacent portions of the cities of Chula Vista and National City.

Any new development within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would increase the demand for community services and facilities. As evaluated in Section 3.8 of this PEIR, demands on gas/electric, police protection, fire protection, and solid waste disposal services, as well as storm drain and local school facilities, due to buildout of the expanded redevelopment area would be avoided or reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of standard construction measures (energy conservation and fire department requirements), recycling programs, and drainage plans, and payment of mitigation fees. In addition, new developments within the expanded redevelopment area would not involve the extension of roads and utilities (e.g., electric, gas, water, and sewer lines) into undeveloped areas or urban reserves.
6.0 Growth Inducing Impacts

The secondary effects associated with future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded redevelopment area could include environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of new development outside the expanded redevelopment area as a result of an increase in the number of jobs created by project buildout. Buildout of the expanded redevelopment area would not result in secondary effects, however, because the new jobs to be generated by project buildout are expected to be filled by the existing labor pool within the region. Furthermore, as discussed above, limited developable land is available in the surrounding urban areas to accommodate additional development.

In summary, the project is intended to facilitate economic growth within both redevelopment areas, but would not be growth inducing in the context of CEQA within the City of Chula Vista, the South Bay area, or the region. The addition of approximately 145 acres of Tidelands along the Chula Vista waterfront to the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area is not expected to induce additional growth outside the expanded redevelopment area. The proposed expansion area is surrounded by San Diego Bay and the existing redevelopment area. Adding this property would facilitate growth within the expanded redevelopment area by attracting new projects, would increase the benefits of the tax increment, and could result in a more cohesive development of the entire expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Future development or redevelopment activities along the bayfront would not directly or indirectly induce unplanned growth east of I-5.
6.0 Growth Inducing Impacts
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7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

The analysis in Section 3.0 of this PEIR has led to the determination that the potential impacts associated with future development of vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures for the following issues: land use and planning, geophysical, water, air quality, noise, transportation/circulation, biology, public services and utilities, aesthetics, cultural resources, and hazardous materials. These are the issues that the City of Chula Vista determined in their environmental initial study of the project could be significantly impacted based on a worst-case analysis of future development or redevelopment activities within the expanded redevelopment area. The city further determined during the environmental initial study that project buildout would not result in significant impacts with respect to the remaining issues identified in Appendix F of the state CEQA Guidelines. These issues are paleontological resources, light or glare generation, and agricultural conversion. The rationale for the conclusion of no significant impact for these issues is provided below.

7.1 PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Because the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area is primarily underlain by fill material, as described in Section 3.2 of this PEIR, the potential for impacts to paleontological resources from grading associated with future development of vacant and underutilized parcels is low, and therefore not considered to be significant.

7.2 LIGHT OR GLARE GENERATION

Daytime glare from future residential, industrial, and commercial structures within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area would be produced by sunlight reflecting off walls, windows and other reflective surfaces. Such surface glare would be minimized by varying the orientation of buildings; avoiding the use of long, uninterrupted expanses of walls; using uniform texture, relief and/or varied building materials, as well as wood siding as much as feasible; massing of buildings to incorporate pedestrian-scale architectural elements, such as clustered, multiple planter walls around major building forms to create horizontal shadow lines. Additional shading on building surfaces would be provided by landscape screening, as it matures in height and spread. The central portion of the expanded redevelopment area is developed and adjacent to other urban areas within
7.0 Environmental Effects Found Not To Be Significant

Chula Vista. As indicated in Section 3.7.3 of this PEIR, future development in the north portion of the expanded redevelopment area, adjacent to the Sweetwater Marsh NWR, would be evaluated during the design review phase by the City of Chula Vista or SDUPD, as appropriate, for nighttime lighting impacts to adjacent biological habitat. Appropriate mitigation, such as shielding of light, shall be implemented to reduce potential lighting impacts to below a level of significance.

7.3 AGRICULTURAL CONVERSION

As identified in the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (KEA Environmental 1997) and Midbayfront Local Coastal Plan Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment FEIR (KEA Environmental 1991), portions of the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Area have been previously farmed. These former agricultural areas were generally located in the north portion of the redevelopment area, in the vicinity of the Sweetwater Marsh NWR west of I-5. Previous agricultural production included seedless cucumbers, tomatoes, lettuce, cabbage and strawberries. None of the vacant and underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area are currently in agricultural production, nor are such uses designated for agriculture by the controlling land use documents.

In addition, none of the lands within the expanded redevelopment area are designated as important farmlands by the California Department of Conservation, and none of the onsite soils are mapped by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Resource Conservation District, as prime agricultural lands. Only one of the onsite soil types (Huerhuero loam) is considered suitable for crop production (USDA 1973). Due to the low agricultural potential of the expanded redevelopment area, future development of vacant parcels according to adopted land use regulations would not result in a significant impact to agricultural resources.
8.0 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

8.1 THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT-TERM Uses OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

The proposed project would facilitate future development or redevelopment of vacant or underutilized parcels within the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area with permanent uses. These areas have been disturbed by previous agricultural or grading activities (predominantly the result of man-made fill that occurred over 30 years ago) and are not currently providing, nor are they expected to provide, long-term biological value or agricultural productivity. The primary reasons for this conclusion are that the majority of these parcels are isolated from adjacent marsh habitat within the Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). The areas that are not fragmented are heavily disturbed or are currently subject to periodic disturbances (e.g., discing, human intrusions), which precludes re-establishment of upland marsh habitats. In addition, for the reasons outlined in Section 7.3 of this PEIR, the agricultural potential of these isolated parcels is low. Since the natural environmental has already been modified to a point where these parcels would not provide long-term productivity, their maintenance and enhancement is not warranted.

The proposed project is consistent with the long-term planning goals of the City of Chula Vista and SDUPD and would correct constraining provisions of the existing Bayfront Redevelopment Plan by incorporating additional land which would allow the Redevelopment Agency to assist in correcting existing physical and economic blight conditions in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area. Therefore, future development and redevelopment activities within this area would enhance the long-term economic benefits of the Chula Vista waterfront by attracting businesses that produce income and jobs, as well as creating a recreational and visitor-serving destination hub. As such, the short- and long-term uses of the expanded redevelopment area, as facilitated by the proposed amendment to the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan and the Chula Vista Industrial-Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment, would outweigh the environmental impacts associated with project buildout (all potential impacts would be reduced to below a level of significance with implementation of mitigation measures identified in this PEIR).
8.2 ANY SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE WHICH WOULD BE INVOLVED SHOULD THE PROPOSED ACTION BE IMPLEMENTED

Pursuant to Section 15126(f) of the state CEQA Guidelines, EIRs must also analyze the extent to which a project would commit non-renewable resources to uses that future generations will probably be unable to reverse. Irretrievable commitments of natural resources and energy supplies must be evaluated to assure that present consumption is justified. With respect to buildout of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area, vacant and underutilized parcels would be irreversibly converted to urban uses.

In addition to permanent landform alteration, future development of these parcels would result in long-term, irretrievable commitments of non-renewable resources in connection with grading and construction operations. Natural resources utilization would include incremental demands on lumber and forest products, sand and gravel, asphalt, petrochemicals and other construction materials. The resultant consumption of fossil fuels would incrementally reduce existing supplies of fuel oil, natural gas and gasoline. An incremental increase in energy demand would also occur during post-construction activities including lighting, heating and cooling of buildings.

Long-term, irretrievable commitments of natural resources and energy supplies would continue throughout the life of the project. These incremental commitments of non-renewable resources are neither unusual nor unexpected and must therefore be weighed against the benefits of the proposed action. The primary benefits of the proposed action would be to:

- extend the time periods within which the Redevelopment Agency may commence eminent domain proceedings, incur debt, undertake redevelopment activities, and collect tax increment revenue (inclusion of the Tidelands into the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan does not give the Agency eminent domain authority over Port Tidelands);

- modify tax increment revenue and bonded debt financial limits;

- incorporate the Tidelands into the Bayfront Redevelopment Area to allow the Agency to employ economic redevelopment tools to assist the SDUPD in their efforts to remove impediments to development, provide financial options to help correct incompatible and nonconforming land uses, and combine resources to aide in the redesign of obsolete
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buildings (the SDUPD retains sole jurisdiction over the Tidelands and maintains the final authority for land use planning and management of the Port Tidelands); and

- permit vacant and underutilized land in the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area to be developed with uses that attract visitors to, and produce income and jobs for, the region.

These project benefits would offset (to below a level of significance) the incremental loss of non-renewable resources associated with buildout of the expanded Bayfront Redevelopment Area.
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9.0 LIST OF PREPARERS OF/CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS PEIR

This PEIR was prepared by KEA Environmental under the direction of the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Chula Vista. KEA project managers were Mike Gonzales and Tom Larkin. The following individuals participated in the preparation of this PEIR:

City of Chula Vista
Redevelopment Agency
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
    Joseph Monaco
    Pamela Buchan

KEA Environmental, Inc.
1420 Kettner Boulevard, Suite 620
San Diego, CA 92101
    Tom Larkin
    Mike Gonzales
    Don Scoles
    Shawn Shamlou
    Rebecca Apple
    James P. Kurtz
    John Messina
    Paula Jacks
    Angela Johnson
    Nancy Monson

Rosenow Spevacek Group Inc.
540 North Golden Circle, Suite 305
Santa Ana, CA 92705-3914
    Kathleen Rosenow
    James C. Simon
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11.0 INDIVIDUALS AND AGENCIES CONTACTED

City of Chula Vista
Dennis Davies, Civil Engineer, Engineering Department, personal communication with Don Scoles on February 5, 1998.
John Hardesty, Permits Engineer, Public Works Department, personal communication with Don Scoles on March 3, 1998.

San Diego Unified Port District
Bill Chopyk, Manager of Planning Services, personal communication with Don Scoles on January 28, 1998.

Chula Vista Elementary School District
Dr. Cheryl Cox, Administrator, Student Placement, Chula Vista Elementary School District, personal communication with Nancy Monson on February 11, 1998.

Chula Vista Police and Fire
Herb Kelsey, Communications Manager, Police and Fire Department, personal communication with Nancy Monson on February 11, 1998.

Pacific Waste Services
Mike Kaiser, Site Engineer, Otay Landfill, personal communication with Nancy Monson on February 11, 1998.

San Diego Gas and Electric Company
Al Krueger, Planner, personal communication with Don Scoles on February 25, 1998.

Sweetwater Authority
Russ Collins, Associate Engineer, personal communication with Don Scoles on March 2, 1998.
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APPENDIX A

LIST OF ACRONYMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACOE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT</td>
<td>average daily traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>City of Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMSL</td>
<td>above mean sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCD</td>
<td>San Diego Air Pollution Control District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFG</td>
<td>California Department of Fish and Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFD</td>
<td>Community Facilities District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEL</td>
<td>Community Noise Equivalent Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNPS</td>
<td>California Native Plant Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dB</td>
<td>decibel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 7</td>
<td>Chula Vista Bayfront Planning District of the Port Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Federal Highways Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gpm</td>
<td>gallons per minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCM</td>
<td>Highway Capacity Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSAs</td>
<td>Telegraph Hydraulic Subareas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5</td>
<td>Interstate 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOA</td>
<td>Katz, Okitsu &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCP</td>
<td>Local Coastal Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>level of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METRO</td>
<td>City of San Diego Metropolitan Waste Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mgd</td>
<td>million gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMRP</td>
<td>mitigation monitoring and reporting program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
mph  miles per hour
MSCP  Multiple Species Conservation Program
MTDB  Metropolitan Transit Development Board

NAAQS  national ambient air quality standards
NAC  noise abatement criteria
NCCP  Natural Communities Conservation Program
NO$_2$  nitrogen dioxide
NOP  Notice of Preparation
NO$_X$  oxides of nitrogen
NPDES  National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NWR  Sweetwater Marsh National Wildlife Refuge

O$_3$  ozone
OPR  Office of Planning and Research

PEIR  Program EIR
PM$_{10}$  particulates of equal to or less than 10 microns in size
PM$_{2.5}$  fine particulate matter equal to or less than 2.5 microns in size
PWS  Pacific Waste Services

RAQS  regional air quality strategies
RSA  regionally significant arterials
RTIP  Regional Transportation Improvement Program
RWQCB  California Regional Water Quality Control Boards

SANDAG  San Diego Association of Governments
SD&AE  San Diego and Arizona Eastern
SDAB  San Diego Air Basin
SDG&E  San Diego Gas and Electric Company
SDUPD  San Diego Unified Port District
SIP  State Implementation Plan
SO$_2$  sulfur dioxide
SWPPP  Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB  State Water Resources Control Board

TCE  trichloroethene
TDM  transportation demand management strategies
TDS  Total Dissolved Solids
USFWS  U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

VOCs  volatile organic compounds
APPENDIX B

NOTICE OF PREPARATION
NOTICE OF PREPARATION
of a Draft Environmental Impact Report

The City of Chula Vista will be the Lead Agency and will prepare a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the project identified below. We need to know your views or the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to your agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency may need to use the PEIR prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project. The project description, location, and a list of potential environmental effects are contained in the attached materials.

Due to the time limits mandated by state law, your response must be sent no later than 30 days after receipt of this Notice. Please send your response to Mr. Joseph Monaco at the address shown above. Please indicate the relationship of your agency to the project (Responsible Agency, federal agency with permit or approval authority, Trustee Agency, Reviewing Agency, or other) and identify a contact person at your agency.

Project Title: Town Centre I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment

Date: 1/16/98  Signature: 
Title: ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTS MANAGER
Telephone: (619) 691-5016

PLEASE NOTE: If you wish to receive future notices regarding this project, you must notify the City of Chula Vista by submitting a written response or by calling (619) 691-5016. Please indicate your name and mailing address.

Reference: California Administrative Code, Title 14 (CEQA Guidelines), Sections 15082(a), 15103, 15375
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Pursuant to California Community Redevelopment Law, the City of Chula Vista Redevelopment Agency is proposing an amendment to the adopted Town Centre I and Bayfront Redevelopment plans. Both plans would be amended to: (1) extend the time periods within which the Redevelopment Agency may commence eminent domain proceedings, incur debt, undertake redevelopment activities, and collect tax increment revenue; and (2) modify tax increment revenue and bonded debt financial limits and update other provisions of the plans, as necessary. In addition, the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan is being amended to increase the size of the existing Redevelopment Area by incorporating approximately 145 acres of additional territory. If adopted, the amended plans will supersede and replace the existing plans, and will guide all future redevelopment activities, projects, and programs in the respective redevelopment project areas. The amendment, however, will not affect the existing plans’ obligations or indebtedness.

The proposed amendment to the adopted Town Centre I Redevelopment Plan would not physically change the boundaries of the redevelopment area, but would extend the time frame for redevelopment activity. Although this action would not typically be considered growth-inducing, as defined in Section 15126(g) of the state CEQA Guidelines, it may result in growth-inducing impacts, both within and surrounding the redevelopment area. Because the proposed Bayfront Redevelopment Plan amendment would involve the incorporation of additional land area, potential impacts on the environment may arise from this action. As such, analysis of these impacts will be included in the PEIR.

The existing Town Centre I Redevelopment Plan was originally adopted by the Chula Vista City Council by Ordinance No. 1691 on July 6, 1976, and the Bayfront Redevelopment Plan by Ordinance No. 1541 on July 16, 1974. Both plans have subsequently been amended on four separate occasions. These amendments primarily involved merging the financial provisions of both plans and extending the time limits on collection of tax increment and bonded indebtedness. The currently proposed amendment would correct constraining provisions of the existing redevelopment plans that inhibit the ability of the Redevelopment Agency to implement them. Furthermore, by incorporating the proposed additional territory into the Bayfront Redevelopment Area, the project would allow the Redevelopment Agency to correct existing physical and economic blight conditions in that area.

PROJECT LOCATION

Both the Town Centre I and Bayfront redevelopment areas are located in the City of Chula Vista, in southwestern San Diego, California (Figure 1). Figure 2 shows the respective redevelopment areas. Primary existing land uses within the approximate 139-acre Town Centre I Redevelopment Area include commercial, public, and residential. Primary existing land uses within the approximate 637-acre Bayfront Redevelopment Area include industrial and commercial. The proposed additional area would incorporate the Port District properties to the “Combined U.S. Pre-head and Bulkhead Line” in the San Diego Bay (Figure 2). This area encompasses approximately 398 acres and, if approved, the project would increase the total size of the Bayfront Redevelopment Area to 1,035 acres.
PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

The project does not propose changes to adopted land uses for the Town Centre I and Bayfront redevelopment areas as designated by the Chula Vista General Plan, the respective specific plans, Midbayfront Local Coastal Program (LCP) Resubmittal No. 8, and Port District Master Plan. Adopted land uses within the Port District properties which would be incorporated into the Bayfront Redevelopment Area, however, are not consistent with the General Plan and Bayfront Specific Plan. By incorporating this additional territory, the Redevelopment Agency can implement a thorough economic redevelopment program to remove impediments to development, correct incompatible and nonconforming land uses, and redesign obsolete buildings within the Bayfront Redevelopment Area.

POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Portions of the Bayfront Redevelopment Area have undergone previous environmental review. The existing redevelopment area was evaluated by the City of Chula Vista in the Bayfront Specific Plan EIR (January, 1985) and in the Midbayfront Local Coastal Program Resubmittal No. 8 Amendment EIR (July, 1991). Approximately 67 acres of the proposed additional area was evaluated by the Port District in the Chula Vista Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR (September, 1997). In accordance with Section 15063(f) of the state CEQA Guidelines, these previous environmental documents have been reviewed by the City of Chula Vista and serve as the Initial Study for the currently proposed project. Based on this preliminary environmental review, the City of Chula Vista has determined that a PEIR is required for the proposed project because the previous EIRs identified significant environmental impacts.

The Town Centre I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment PEIR will include a comprehensive analysis of the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project for the following issue areas: land use and planning, geophysical, water, air quality, noise, transportation/circulation, biology, public services/utilities, aesthetics, cultural resources, and population/growth inducement. Pursuant to Section 15063(b)(C) of the state CEQA Guidelines, several of these issues have been adequately examined by the previous EIRs listed above. For these issues, the PEIR will incorporate by reference the results of the previous environmental analyses in accordance with Section 15150 of the state CEQA Guidelines. The PEIR will also address the mandatory sections required by CEQA, including executive summary, purpose and scope, project description, project alternatives, and cumulative impacts. A mitigation monitoring and reporting program, candidate CEQA Findings, technical appendices, and notices will also be prepared for the PEIR.
January 22, 1998

Mr. Joseph Monaco  
Environmental Projects Manager  
City of Chula Vista  
Community Development Dept.  
276 Fourth Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 92101

RE: Town Centre I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment

Dear Mr. Monaco:

This letter is in response to the “Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report” dated January 16, 1998. Franklin Croft Management, Inc. manages two properties that are near both redevelopment areas and has no objections to the Program Environmental Impact Report.

We wish to receive future notices regarding project. Please keep our office on the mailing list for future notices.

Sincerely,

FRANKLIN CROFT MANAGEMENT, INC.

Lisa McDunn
Dear Sue, I have been a resident of Chula Vista since 1937 when my husband was hired by Sweetwater School District and required to live in District. Altho at the time we owned a house in San Diego on Lincoln St. We never were at all unhappy about this.

The greatest tragedy of Chula Vista has been the Absolutely Utter transformation of Chula Vista's lovely downtown area into a Junk Mess. The major retirement centers of Chula Vista are in this area - and where can they buy clothing, shoes, furniture, linens, soap and all these things? A nice hardware store is a Real Necessity. Instead we have shops of Messy Little Junk Shops, that grew

Please please give us back someplace to buy the things we need. No More Dental Etc shops or Residential Areas. Unless they furnish Parking Places for their customers. Al Mar-Join Lakes-Church St. are absolutely destroyed by their use of our Parking Spaces.

Love, Erula M. Brattmiller
Thousands of Senior Citizens like to come to 
Senior Citizen Facilities - Also we have been 
Exceptionally Disappointed by All the Quite 
Trashy Businesses Across from the Library 
Let's have this Again Be One of Those 
Vistas Loveliest Places to Live - As many 
Houses, Apartments Church Retirement - 4th Ave 
Retirement Center & Oh Beautiful Forge 
Dr. Blank Manor - With No Place to Shop 
Make this the Beautiful Useful Lovely Place 
it was 30 Years Ago and We'll All Love You.
February 5, 1998

Mr. Joseph Monaco  
CITY OF CHULA VISTA  
Community Development Department  
276 Fourth Avenue  
Chula Vista, California 91910

RE: NOTICE OF PREPARATION (NOP) of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for Town Centre I/ Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment

Dear Mr. Monaco:

Port District staff reviewed the aforementioned NOP and have the following comments and concerns relative to the Bayfront Redevelopment Area:

1. COMMENT: The “Proposed Additional Area” of the Bayfront Redevelopment Area includes Port District Tidelands which were granted to the San Diego Unified Port District (SDUPD) by the State of California to hold in public trust for the benefit of the People of California. Thus, the SDUPD maintains all land management authority and powers over this land. The Port has its own adopted master plan and land use authority.

2. CONCERN: The last sentence under paragraph “PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS” implies that the Redevelopment Agency can “correct incompatible and nonconforming land uses, and redesign obsolete buildings within the Bayfront Redevelopment Area”. The SDUPD strongly opposes this language and hereby requests that it be deleted as it is in direct conflict with item #1 above.

3. COMMENT: Section 30711 of the California Coastal Act requires that the City incorporate as part of its Local Coastal Program (LCP) the SDUPD Port Master Plan. Thus, all provisions of the Port Master Plan become the prevailing authority over land-use and land management policy for the lands under the Port’s administrative control. A Port Master Plan amendment for the Chula Vista Bayfront is currently pending certification by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). Once certified, the amendment becomes the overriding land-use policy document for the Chula Vista Bayfront.
February 5, 1998
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4. CONCERN: An EIR was recently adopted on October 7, 1997, by the Board of Port Commissioners for the development of the Chula Vista Bayfront area. Yet, a new Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) is being prepared by the City for the same area. We strongly recommend that the City of Chula Vista incorporate the facts and findings of the “Chula Vista Industrial-Business Park Expansion and Port Master Plan Amendment EIR” (SCH#96101030) into the City’s PEIR.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the NOP. We appreciate mutual efforts that keep us informed of development plans in the San Diego Bay and its environs. Please be assured that the Board of Port Commissioners are aware of the City’s redevelopment intentions in the Chula Vista Bayfront area. Please feel free to contact me or Bill Chopyk, Manager of Planning Services, at (619) 686-6469 should you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

DAN E. WILKENS
Senior Director,
Strategic Planning Services

DEW/WBC/jla
Attachment

cc: BPC
    Larry Killeen
    Wayne Lindquist
    Tom Morgan
    Ralph Hicks
    Jeff Gabriel
    Bill Chopyk

wbc1/Chula Vista NOP.doc
February 12, 1998

Mr. Joseph Monaco
Community Development Department
276 Fourth Avenue
Chula Vista, CA
91912-2328

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report
Town Centre I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment

Dear Mr. Monaco:

Sweetwater Authority has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the above project. We appreciate being notified of the project and being given an opportunity to comment on our concerns to be addressed in the PEIR. The majority of the redevelopment area is within the Sweetwater Authority service area and overlies the groundwater basin utilized by Sweetwater Authority (see enclosed map).

As you are aware, Sweetwater Authority is a water purveyor in the South Bay area of San Diego County serving a population of 165,000 in the City of National City, the western portion of the City of Chula Vista, and Bonita. The Authority operates Sweetwater Reservoir and Loveland Reservoir to store water for its customers, and utilizes the Sweetwater River to transfer water from Loveland Reservoir to Sweetwater Reservoir. Sweetwater Authority’s current and future water resources include the use of alluvial groundwater in the Lower Sweetwater River and the San Diego Formation groundwater extracted in the Authority’s service area. Eventually, the Otay River Valley groundwater resources will also be utilized by Sweetwater Authority in partnership with other water purveyors. All of these water resources are within the influence of the sites proposed for redevelopment. These projects are shown on the attached map.

We understand that the subject proposal includes amendments to the adopted Town Centre I and Bayfront Redevelopment plans, and that both plans would be amended to “1) extend the time periods within which the Redevelopment agency may commence eminent domain proceedings, incur debt, undertake redevelopment activities, and collect tax increment revenue; 2) modify tax increment revenue and bonded debt financial limits and update other provisions of the plan as necessary”. In addition, the Bayfront redevelopment plan is being amended to increase the size of the existing redevelopment area by incorporating approximately 145 acres of additional land.

The NOP states that some of the itemized environmental issues have been adequately examined by previous EIRs and will be incorporated by reference in the PEIR. We request that issues
related to public services/utilities and water quality, and impacts to water supply be addressed in
the PEIR or a focused EIR.

Public Services/Utilities: The redevelopment proposals may require additional or increased
capacity water lines to the redevelopment areas. We would like the PEIR to address any
potential environmental impacts of additional water lines and water service to the redevelopment
area. This analysis could expedite the Authority’s ability to provide water service to the
redevelopment areas.

Water Quality: With respect to the Bayfront proposal, the Authority would have concerns
about the increase of the land in the Bayfront proposal. We request the option to review any
proposed or past uses which could impact the water quality in the groundwater basin. The
Authority is spending $25 million on developing the lower Sweetwater River basin water
resources. These resources, including the Authority’s demineralization project, phases I and II,
and salt water intrusion barriers in phase II of the project, will eventually provide 40% of the
Authority’s water supply. In addition, further use of the basin is contemplated by San Diego
County Water Authority.

We understand that a separate action is the proposal to the Regional Water Quality Control Board
(RWQCB) to downgrade the beneficial use grade of Basin 9.12 west of I-5 between the
Sweetwater River and “I” Street in order to facilitate redevelopment plans. This request is
related to the redevelopment of the Rohr site, which is partially included in the Bayfront
Redevelopment area. Basin 9.12 is currently designated in the RWQCB Basin Plan as beneficial
use, and as such, is designated for drinking water use. Because the basin proposal is for the
purpose of facilitating redevelopment, we believe that the proposed amendment should be
discussed in the environmental analysis.

Through our meeting with Chula Vista Redevelopment staff and the project consultant on
September 16, 1997, we understand that the basis for the request for redesignation of the basin is
the high Total Dissolved Solids (TDS). This was estimated by the consultant to be
approximately 3,000 parts per million (ppm) which is a level considered to be exempted from the
“sources of drinking water” designation in the State Water Board Resolution 88-63. However,
other monitoring indicates that the TDS in the area are variable due to heterogeneity within the
formation. In addition, according to the RWQCB staff, downgrading of the basin would allow
less stringent clean up measures of the existing industrial uses and allow contaminants to remain
at higher levels. This less stringent cleanup could be unfavorable for utilization of the basin as a
water supply, even rendering the basin unusable for drinking water. Sweetwater Authority’s
approved demineralization plant will treat groundwater with high levels of TDS through a
reverse osmosis process. This reverse osmosis process would not remove contaminants that could be left in the basin from less than stringent cleanup efforts.

The Authority is supportive of the RWQCB efforts to clean up the lower basin. As we stated at our meeting, the Authority will opposes any downgrading of the basin unless it is proven that this downgrade would not affect the cleanup of the basin. We believe that an organized monitoring and testing program should analyze and identify contaminants left in the formation by Rohr Industries and others. Sweetwater Authority will be coordinating with the RWQCB on this issue. Although we understand that the proposed downgrade of the basin is a separate approval from the Town Centre I/Bayfront Redevelopment Plan Amendment, we feel that this related proposal should be mentioned in the environmental document. The Authority would be interested in learning how the basin redesignation will facilitate redevelopment. Would it allow injection of waste material from proposed industries? Would it allow less stringent cleanup of the basin?

If you would like to arrange a meeting with Sweetwater Authority, we would be happy to further discuss our concerns with you. Please contact Ms. Troy Murphree at 422-8395, extension 632 to arrange a meeting, or if you have any questions.

Very truly yours,

SWEETWATER AUTHORITY

Richard A Reynolds
General Manager

RAR:TM

pc:  Mr. David Barker, Regional Water Quality Control Board
     Ms. Ruth Kolb, Port of San Diego
     Mr. Larry Purcell, San Diego County Water Authority
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