Print From

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #: 2020120099

Project Title: Single Use Plastic Reduction Ordinance

Lead Agency: City of San Diego

Contact Name: Tara Ash-Reynolds

Email: tashreynolds@sandiego.gov Phone Number: 619-533-6492

Project Location: City of San Diego, San Diego County

City *County*

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

San Diego City Council approval of an ordinance that would amend the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) to restrict the use of polystyrene products throughout the City. The proposed ordinance will ban the distribution of egg cartons, food service ware, or food trays that are made, in whole or in part, from polystyrene foam. Items that are made, in whole or in part, from polystyrene foam that is not wholly encapsulated or encased within a non-polystyrene foam material will also be banned from distribution. Products that are made, in whole or in part, from polystyrene foam will be prohibited from distribution in or at City facilities. The proposed ordinance will allow the distribution of prepared food that is packaged in food service ware or that uses food trays made, in whole or in part, from polystyrene foam, if the prepared food is packaged outside of the City and is provided to the consumer as originally packaged. The proposed ordinance would limit the distribution of utensils, including straws, for takeout orders of prepared food, and will only allow the provision of utensils upon the request of the person ordering the prepared food.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

The Draft PEIR concludes that the proposed project would result in significant environmental impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions. All other impacts analyzed in this Draft PEIR were found to be less than significant.

The Draft PEIR evaluated potential mitigation measure options to address significant greenhouse gas emissions impacts; however, these potential mitigation measures were determined to be infeasible due to economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors. Furthermore, the City is already pursuing actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions associated with its operations, and it is currently not feasible for the City to pursue additional reductions beyond its Climate Action Plan program.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

The City previously considered the enactment of the Single Use Plastic Reduction Ordinance and prepared a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption. The process for approval of the proposed ordinance was challenged in court indicating that it had potentially unanalyzed impacts. The resulting settlement agreement specified the preparation of an EIR. The project's Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on December 4, 2020 for a 30-day public review and comment period, and a public scoping meeting was held on December 16, 2020. The NOP, Initial Study (IS) Checklist, and comment letters received on the NOP are provided as Appendix A to this EIR. Issues of controversy that were raised during the NOP scoping period include concerns related to aesthetics, air quality, cultural arts, environmental justice, greenhouse gases, hydrology and water quality, recreation, solid waste and litter, and alternatives; as well as life-cycle analyses for air quality, biological resources, energy, forestry resources, greenhouse gases, and hydrology and water quality. The California Resources Agency found that life-cycle analyses were not warranted for project-specific CEQA analysis in most situations, for a variety of reasons, including lack of control over some sources and the possibility of double-counting emissions. Because the origin of the raw materials purchased is not known, manufacturing information for those raw materials is also not known, and specific suppliers are variable, calculation of life cycle emissions would be speculative. Thus, a life-cycle analysis is not warranted or appropriate for this project.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

No responsible or trustee agencies.