

Attachment A

Environmental Checklist

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST	1
Aesthetics	6
Agriculture and Forest Resources	9
Air Quality.....	11
Biological Resources.....	13
Cultural Resources	16
Energy	18
Geology and Soils	19
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	23
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	24
Hydrology and Water Quality	27
Land Use and Planning.....	30
Mineral Resources.....	31
Noise	32
Population and Housing	34
Public Services.....	35
Recreation	37
Transportation.....	38
Tribal Cultural Resources	40
Utilities and Service Systems.....	42
Wildfire	46
Mandatory Findings of Significance	48
REFERENCES	50

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BMP	Best Management Practices
CAAQS	California Ambient Air Quality Standards
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CBC	California Code of Regulations
CERP	Community Emissions Reduction Program
Coronado Bridge	San Diego–Coronado Bridge
CWA	Clean Water Act
District	San Diego Unified Port District
DOC	California Department of Conservation
Driscoll's	Driscoll's Wharf
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
HPD	Harbor Police Department
MCAS	Maritime Clean Air Strategy
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
PM ₁₀	particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 10 micrometers or less
PM _{2.5}	particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less
PMP	Port Master Plan
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SCIC	South Coastal Information Center
SDAB	San Diego Air Basin
SDAPCD	San Diego Air Pollution Control District
SDFRD	San Diego Fire Rescue Department
SDHP	San Diego Harbor Police
SDPD	San Diego Police Department
SR	State Route
SRA	State Responsibility Area
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
VHFHSZ	very high fire hazard severity zones
VMT	vehicle miles traveled

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION

1. **Project Title:** Shelter Island Commercial Fishing Wharf Project
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** San Diego Unified Port District (District)
3165 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92101
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Lily Tsukayama, (619) 686-8199
4. **Project Location:** The project site is within the existing Driscoll's Wharf leasehold, located on District property, at 4918 North Harbor Drive in San Diego, California. The leasehold encompasses 2.9 acres of landside area, and 5.7 acres of water-side area. The project site also includes an additional approximately 0.7-acre area where the floating wave attenuator is proposed. The proposed demolition activities would occur within the waterside area of the leasehold, as well as approximately 0.4-acre of the landside of the leasehold. Figure 1 of the NOP provides a project vicinity map.
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** San Diego Unified Port District (District)
3165 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92101

Driscoll Marina, Ltd, dba Driscoll's Wharf
4918 North Harbor Drive
San Diego, CA 92106
6. **Port Master Plan Designation:** Commercial Fishing (land), Promenade (land), Commercial Fishing Berthing (water), and Navy Small Craft Berthing (water)
8. **Description of Project:**

The proposed project is the modernization of the existing commercial fishing marina at the existing Driscoll's Wharf (Driscoll's) leasehold area. Proposed actions would include a tenant (Driscoll Marina Ltd.) sponsored demolition component, which is a condition of the lease, and a San Diego Unified Port District (District) sponsored waterside development component. The demolition component would remove Piers 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8; demolish Building E and a small hazardous material storage shed; and remove all soil, groundwater, and sediment contaminants from the leased premises. The District proposes to reconstruct and operate Piers 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, which would also include new gangways, headwalks connecting piers, and a floating wave attenuator to the east of the existing leasehold. Coastal Development Permits (CDPs) are required to implement the proposed project.

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:

The project site is within and adjacent to the San Diego Bay in a commercialized area of the waterfront. Commercial land uses to the northwest of the project site include restaurants, yacht sales, and office land uses. Water uses to the west consist of marinas. Military land uses to the north, east, and southeast of the project site include Naval Base Point Loma Harbor Drive Annex. San Diego Bay is southeast of the project site. A vessel navigation corridor is located southwest of the project site. Land uses north of the project site across North Harbor Drive include hotel, residential, and commercial land uses. The nearest residence is approximately 950 feet northwest of the project site and is separated from the project site by North Harbor Drive and commercial uses.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement)

The District is the primary approval authority for the project. District discretionary approvals would include the following:

- ▶ Adoption of the Environmental Impact Report
- ▶ Adoption of Findings of Fact
- ▶ Adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- ▶ Approval of Coastal Development Permit for Demolition
- ▶ Approval of Coastal Development Permit for Construction
- ▶ Approval of the project

Additional subsequent approvals and other permits that may be required from local, regional, state, and federal agencies include, but are not limited to the following:

- ▶ U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) – Individual or Nationwide Permit, per the Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 Permit (33 U.S. Code Section 1341) and Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 Permit
- ▶ San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) – Stormwater Construction General Permit and CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification
- ▶ San Diego County Air Pollution Control District – Permits for diesel generators
- ▶ City of San Diego – Issuance of ministerial permits (e.g., demolition and grading)

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

No California Native American tribes have requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. Where checked below, the topic with a potentially significant impact will be addressed in an environmental impact report.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forest Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards / Hazardous Materials |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier **EIR** or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


12/19/24

Signature Date

Lesley Nishihira

Printed Name

Assistant Vice President, Planning

Title

San Diego Unified Port District

Agency

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from "Earlier Analyses," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
9. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

AESTHETICS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. Aesthetics.				
Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 21099 (where aesthetic impacts shall not be considered significant for qualifying residential, mixed-use residential, and employment centers), would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Less-than-significant impact. Within the District’s jurisdiction, the District Port Master Plan (PMP) designates vista areas, which are defined as “points of natural beauty, photo vantage points, and other panoramas” (District 2024a). The PMP is intended to guide development within vista areas to preserve and enhance these areas of scenic and visual importance (District 2024a).

The project site is within Planning District 1 (Shelter Island) of the PMP, which contains seven vista areas:

1. A vista area located along the southwestern tip of the island, adjacent to the Japanese Friendship Bell and Public Art “Pearl of the Pacific” attractions, providing scenic vistas of San Diego Bay to the south, and is located approximately 1.2 miles southwest of the project site;
2. A vista area from the Shelter Island Pier, providing scenic vistas of San Diego Bay to the southeast, and is located approximately 0.83 miles southwest of the project site;
3. A vista area located along the northeastern tip of the island, adjacent to Shoreline Park and the restaurant Bali Hai, providing scenic vistas of San Diego Bay to the east, and is located approximately 0.2 miles southwest of the project site;
4. A vista area from the eastern terminus of Kellogg Street, providing scenic vistas of the inlet into the Shelter Island Yacht Basin and the southwestern tip of Shelter Island to the east, and is located approximately 1.32 miles southwest of the project site;
5. A vista area from the conjunction of Talbot Street and Anchorage Lane, providing scenic vistas of the Shelter Island Yacht Basin to the south, and is located approximately 0.58 miles southwest of the project site;

6. A vista area from a surface parking lot on the southwestern corner of Shelter Island Drive and Anchorage Lane, providing scenic vistas of the Shelter Island Yacht Basin, and is located approximately 0.36 miles southwest of the project site; and
7. A vista area from the eastern boundary of the Point Loma Marina and Driscoll Wharf (the project site), providing scenic vistas of the America's Cup Harbor, which includes a portion of the project site (District 2024a: Figure 4).

All of these vista areas provide views of the San Diego Bay, the Shelter Island Yacht Basin, or the southwestern tip of Shelter Island, and only one includes views of the project site. The vista area with a view of the project site is the vista area at the eastern boundary of the Point Loma Marina, within the project site, and northeasterly of America's Cup Harbor. This vista area provides a viewshed that includes the project site, as shown in Figure 4 of the PMP (District 2024a).

Within the Final Draft Port Master Plan Update (PMPU), the project site is within the Shelter Island Planning District. As shown in Final Draft PMPU Figure PD1.4, Coastal Access Views and Pathways, there are a total of 10 scenic vista areas within this planning district: Kellogg Beach, Yokohama Friendship Bell, Shelter Island Pier, Shelter Island Drive, Shelter Island Boat Launch, Shelter Island Roundabout, two views associated with America's Cup Harbor, Point Loma Marina Park, Shelter Island Drive (entry segment), a view of the Shelter Island Yacht Basin, and a view of the La Playa Trail (District 2023a). Three of these scenic vista areas have viewsheds that overlap with the project site: two views of America's Cup Harbor, within the East Shelter Island Subdistrict, and one view associated with the Point Loma Marina Park (District 2023a: Figure PD1.4). In addition, the Final Draft PMPU includes five view corridor extensions down the following roadways and towards the bay within the Shelter Island Planning District: Bessemer Street, Nichols Street, McCall Street, Dickens Street, and Garrison Street. The project site is not located within any of the five view corridor extensions.

Existing views from the vista area [in the existing PMP] within the project site feature open water views of America's Cup Harbor punctuated by marine vessels moored to existing piers, an existing jib crane located on the offloading pier (Pier 4); and commercial fishing vessel loading and unloading activities.

During construction, the project would result in the temporary use of large construction equipment like pile drivers that could interrupt the view from the existing on-site scenic vista. However, construction activities would be temporary, transitory, and any obstruction of portions of the scenic vista would be short in duration (limited primarily to Pier 4, which already has a jib crane and frequent commercial fishing vessels docking at the pier).

During operation, commercial fishing operations would continue similar to existing conditions and reconstructed piers would not obstruct views of open water. Because the existing deteriorated piers would be replaced with new floating boat docks and slips, the quality of the existing view would be improved. Therefore, the project would not result in an adverse effect on a scenic vista. Impacts would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Less-than-significant impact. The project site is in an area that is urban and developed with maritime-related commercial uses (e.g., recreational marinas, yacht brokers, commercial fishing). There are no scenic rock outcroppings on the project site. There are trees in the parking lot, but none are designated as scenic resources. The nearest state scenic highway that is officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is a portion of State Route (SR) 163 that travels north-south through Balboa Park, approximately 4 miles east of the project site; and the San Diego–Coronado Bridge (Coronado Bridge), which is a 1.4-mile segment on SR 75 located approximately 4 miles southeast of the project site (Caltrans 2024). Coronado Bridge spans the San Diego Bay, connecting the City of San Diego to the City of Coronado. For traveling motorists, Coronado Bridge offers views of the San Diego Bay and Downtown San Diego to the north, including high-rise residential, commercial, and urban developments. Due to the distance and intervening urban development and vegetation, the project site is not clearly visible from either scenic highway. Even during project construction, when large equipment such as cranes and pile drivers would be temporarily present within the project site, viewer sensitivity from the Coronado Bridge would be

considered low because motorists would generally focus on the roadway and would have limited and momentary distant views of the project site. Following construction, the project site would be returned to a similar condition as the existing setting. Therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway and impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- c) **In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage points.) If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?**

Less-than-significant impact. The project site is in an urbanized area that is developed entirely with maritime-related commercial uses. The existing water and land use designations include Commercial Fishing Berthing and Navy Small Craft Berthing (water), and Promenade and Commercial Fishing (land), in the PMP (District 2024a). Within the Final Draft PMPU, the project site has a water and land use designation of Commercial Fishing Berthing (water) and Commercial Fishing (land), respectively (District 2024b).

The project would not expand the existing use of the project site or expand existing commercial fishing operations. In addition, the project would not require changes to existing land use designations under the current PMP or under the Final Draft PMPU. The PMP establishes general development standards for each land and water use designations, and for the Shelter Island Planning District identifies a maximum height of 41 feet above mean lower low water (approximately 26 feet above ground level). In addition, the PMP states that buildings in the Shelter Island Planning District should have low-profile silhouettes to maintain an inviting pedestrian scale, and that the location of all structures on the site should enhance the waterfront by accentuating the land-water interface. The project would not construct any new buildings landside, and would replace the waterside facilities with similar waterside facilities. The project would not conflict with policies identified in the PMP for preserving visual access and vista areas. Further, the project would not conflict with policies identified in the Final Draft PMPU that protect views and physical access and require public access within view corridor extensions and scenic vista areas, and along pathways to be maintained. Therefore, the project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality and impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- d) **Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?**

Less-than-significant impact. The project site is used as a wharf for commercial fishing boat mooring. Landside existing uses include surface parking, office buildings, outdoor storage areas, and other facilities associated with the commercial fishing industry; and waterside uses include piers and docks used to moor commercial fishing vessels. Existing light sources onsite include outdoor security lighting, lighting on commercial fishing vessels, onsite vehicles traveling to and from the project site, as well as spillover lighting from streetlamps, existing buildings adjacent to the project site, and vehicles from nearby roadways.

Construction work during night-time hours (between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.) is not proposed. Additional temporary light sources may be required to illuminate work areas; however, this lighting would be directed onsite and would be of similar intensity to existing light sources throughout the project site and adjacent land uses. Following construction, the project site would be returned to a similar condition as the existing setting. The project proposes the installation of four new light poles, 14 feet in height at each concrete platform. Each slip would include the installation of a marina utility power pedestal, three feet in height, equipped with a low glare light that comes on in the evening. The proposed lighting would be similar in intensity and scale as the existing onsite lighting. Therefore, the project would not create substantial new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area. Impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. Agriculture and Forest Resources.				
<p>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997, as updated) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</p> <p>Would the project:</p>				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

No impact. According to the California Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, the project site is classified as Urban and Built-Up Land, and Water (DOC 2024a). There are no lands classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Statewide Importance within the project site or adjacent area. Project construction and operation would be contained within the existing leasehold. Therefore, the project would not convert Important Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use and there would be no impact. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?

No impact. The use designations for the project site are Commercial Fishing (land), Promenade (land), Commercial Fishing Berthing (water), and Navy Small Craft Berthing (water). The existing zoning/land use does not allow for agricultural use and no agricultural operations exist on the project site or adjacent areas. No Williamson Act contracts apply to the project site (DOC 2024b). Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and no impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

No impact. The use designations for the project site are Commercial Fishing (land), Promenade (land), Commercial Fishing Berthing (water), and Navy Small Craft Berthing (water). The project site is not zoned for forestland, timberland, or zoned Timberland Production. Further, there is no timberland present on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning/land use for forest land or timberland, and no impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No impact. There is no forest land or timberland resources on or adjacent to the project site, which is in an urbanized portion of the City of San Diego. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

No impact. As discussed above, no agricultural, forest land, or timberland resources exist on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in changes to the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. No impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

AIR QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. Air Quality.				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Less-than-significant impact. The San Diego Air Basin (SDAB) is currently designated as a “nonattainment” area with respect to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for ozone, and the CAAQS for particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM₁₀) and particulate matter with an aerodynamic resistance diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM_{2.5}). Air quality planning for San Diego County is under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD). The San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) outlines SDAPCD’s plans and control measures designed to attain and maintain the state standards, while San Diego’s portions of the SIP are designed to attain and maintain federal standards. The most recent state plan is the 2022 RAQS, was approved by the SDAPCD board on March 9, 2023. The most recent San Diego portion of the federal SIP is the 2020 Attainment Plan, which was approved by CARB on November 19, 2020 (SDAPCD 2024). Both the RAQS and SIP rely on emissions forecasts based on demographic and economic growth projections provided by city and county general plans, as well as the PMP. Projects whose growth is included in the projections used in the formulation of the RAQS and SIP are consistent with the RAQS and SIP and would not interfere with its implementation.

The proposed project would involve the demolition of the existing fish offloading pier (Pier 4) and Piers 5 through 8 followed by their reconstruction. Additionally, the project would include the demolition of Building E, which, after demolition, would remain undeveloped land under the proposed project with no future plans for redevelopment. No change in use would occur, no increase in commercial fishing operations would result, and the number of vessel slips within Piers 5-8 would not increase over the existing condition. Moreover, additional employees would not be needed once the project is operational. Thus, the project would not include components that would induce growth or change the use of the site. Because the proposed project would not modify land uses or result in an unanticipated increase in the residential population, the project would be consistent with the RAQS and SIP and potential impacts related to a conflict with applicable air quality plans would be less than significant.

Additionally, the District’s Maritime Clean Air Strategy (MCAS) provides goals and objectives for the District’s cargo terminals and shipyards located within the working waterfront, many of which focus on decreasing air emissions

within the AB 617 Portside Community. None of the goals or objectives of the MCAS apply to the proposed project due to the type of use (commercial fishing wharf and marina) and its distant location from an AB 617 Portside Community. For the same reasons, the Community Emissions Reduction Program's (CERP's) goals and actions do not apply to the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the MCAS or CERP. Impacts would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?

Potentially significant impact. The SDAB is designated as a "nonattainment" area with respect to the NAAQS and CAAQS for ozone, and the CAAQS for PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀. The trigger levels developed by SDAPCD used as mass emission thresholds for purposes of this analysis are tied to attaining and maintaining health-based standards. Projects that exceed these thresholds would result in a cumulative, regional contribution (i.e., significant) to the nonattainment status of the SDAB and may also contribute to adverse health impacts affecting nearby sensitive receptors.

The proposed project includes demolition and construction activities that would occur over several months. Therefore, the proposed project would have the potential to exceed SDAPCD's trigger levels for one or more criteria pollutants. This issue will be discussed within the EIR.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Potentially significant impact. Sensitive receptors include land uses where exposure to pollutants could result in health-related risks to sensitive individuals, such as children or the elderly. Residential dwellings, schools, hospitals, playgrounds, and similar facilities are of primary concern because of the presence of individuals particularly sensitive to pollutants and the potential for increased and prolonged exposure of individuals to pollutants. The project is located within the Shelter Island Planning District of the PMP. The nearest sensitive receptors include personnel barracks at the Naval Base Point Loma Harbor Drive Annex. Due to its proximity to the proposed project site, construction-related emissions may expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This issue will be discussed within the EIR.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

Less-than-significant impact. Project operations would be similar to existing commercial fishing operations. No change in existing odors associated with commercial fishing would occur. Additionally, no additional odor generating uses, such as wastewater treatment facilities, sanitary landfills, composting facilities, petroleum refineries, chemical manufacturing plants, are proposed. Therefore, operation of the project would not expose a substantial number of people to any new objectionable odors.

During construction activities, minor odors from the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment would be intermittent and temporary, and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. Therefore, project construction is not anticipated to result in an odor-related impact. Consequently, odor-related impacts would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. Biological Resources.				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

Potentially significant impact. The landside portion of the project site is fully developed and does not contain natural habitat suitable for special status plant species that would have the potential to be affected by project construction or operation. Project construction activities within the waterside portion of the project site would potentially cause substantial temporary noise from pile driving, increases in turbidity from sediment disturbance, and may have an

increase in overwater coverage that could affect foraging habitat. Therefore, waterside construction- and operation-related activities would have the potential to significantly impact a sensitive species and will be discussed in the EIR.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Potentially significant impact. The landside portion of the project site is entirely developed and does not contain any natural habitat. Therefore, no terrestrial sensitive natural communities or riparian habitat would be adversely affected as a result of project implementation. Eelgrass habitat, which is present within the water portion of the project site, is considered a sensitive habitat, and is managed by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). Proposed in-water construction activities would have the potential to substantially effect eelgrass from pile installation, shading from overwater floating docks, and shading from construction-related barges. This issue will be discussed in the EIR.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Potentially significant impact. The landside portion of the project site is completely developed and does not contain any natural habitat, including state or federally protected wetlands. The waterside portion of the project site is located within San Diego Bay, which is considered a Water of the United States and State. Project implementation would not result in changes in operational activities and commercial fishing activities would continue; thus, project operation would not result in increased adverse effects on a Water of the U.S. or State relative to existing conditions.

However, construction of the in-water project elements may result in temporary turbidity from the disturbance of sediment from pile installation that could affect eelgrass habitat (see IV.b above). In addition, any fill or dredging within a Water of the United States or State would require approval by the USACE and Regional Water Board, respectively. This issue will be discussed within the EIR.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Potentially significant impact. The landside portion of the project site is fully developed, does not contain natural terrestrial habitat that could function as a native wildlife nursery site, and is characterized by existing barriers to wildlife movement, including human-made structures. Moreover, it is surrounded by development and does not function as a wildlife movement corridor.

Aquatic wildlife, including fish, birds, and marine mammals, likely transit periodically through the marine environment in the project site to access foraging and resting habitat elsewhere in San Diego Bay or at sea. The project site also contains eelgrass, which is a nursery area for many commercially and recreationally important finfish and shellfish (Orth and Heck 2023). As discussed under IV a) and b), the proposed project has the potential to affect eelgrass, foraging habitat, and special-status wildlife species during construction. These impacts have the potential to substantially interfere with the movement of fish or other wildlife species or substantially impede the use of native wildlife nursery habitat and will be discussed in the EIR.

e) **Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

Potentially significant impact. The applicable local land use plans, policies, ordinances, or regulations of the District, adopted for the purpose of protecting biological resources, are the PMP, San Diego Unified Port District Code, and the District's Integrated Natural Resource Management Plan (INRMP). The project would not result in any changes in existing uses of the project site. Rather, the project would result in the demolition of Piers 4-8, Building E, and the hazardous materials storage shed, followed by the reconstruction of Piers 4-8. Commercial fishing and commercial fishing vessel berthing would continue with the proposed project.

However, because there may be significant biological resource impacts, the proposed project would potentially conflict with the San Diego Bay INRMP. Therefore, this issue will be discussed in the EIR.

f) **Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

Potentially significant impact. As discussed under IV. e), the project has the potential to conflict with the INRMP. Therefore, this issue will be discussed in the EIR.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. Cultural Resources.				
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially disturb human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Potentially significant impact. Buildings and structures located on the project site are over 50 years old and therefore may constitute a historical resource. A historical resources evaluation report will be prepared and this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

Potentially significant impact. Although the shoreline and majority of the project site above ground is underlain by artificial fill, a records search with the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) identified archaeological sites within 0.5 miles of the project site. Therefore, this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

c) Substantially disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Less-than-significant impact. There are no known cemeteries or burials on the project site or immediate area. The proposed project and surrounding area are either fully developed or in active waters, and there is no record of human remains being identified during development of the area. For these reasons, the potential for human remains to be present at the project site is extremely low. However, if human remains are discovered, California law recognizes the need to protect Native American human burials, skeletal remains, and items associated with Native American burials from vandalism and inadvertent destruction. The procedures for the treatment of Native American human remains are contained in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097.

These statutes require that, if human remains are discovered, potentially damaging ground-disturbing activities in the area of the remains shall be halted immediately, and the County coroner shall be notified immediately. If the remains are determined by the coroner to be Native American, the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) shall be notified within 24 hours and the guidelines of the NAHC shall be adhered to in the treatment and disposition of the remains. Following the coroner’s findings, the NAHC-designated Most Likely Descendant and the landowner shall determine the ultimate treatment and disposition of the remains and take appropriate steps to ensure that additional

human interments, if present, are not disturbed. The responsibilities for acting upon notification of a discovery of Native American human remains are identified in Public Resources Code Section 5097.94.

Compliance with California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and California Public Resources Code Section 5097 would provide an opportunity to avoid or minimize the disturbance of human remains, and to appropriately treat any remains that are discovered. Therefore, through compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project's demolition and construction activities would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. As such, impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

ENERGY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. Energy.				
Would the project:				
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?**

Potentially significant impact. Energy would be required to operate and maintain construction equipment and to transport construction materials. The one-time energy expenditure required to demolish and construct the existing facilities associated with the proposed project would be non-recoverable. Once operational, the proposed project would not consume any more energy than the existing condition. Therefore, while operation-related energy use would be less than significant, construction-related energy use would be potentially significant and will be discussed in the EIR.

- b) **Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency**

Potentially significant impact. State and local renewable energy and energy efficiency plans that are applicable to the proposed project include California Title 24 energy efficiency standards, the State of California Energy Action Plan, the District’s Climate Action Plan (CAP), which includes strategies to reduce GHG emissions, and SANDAG’s Regional Energy Strategy, which establishes long-term energy goals in the region through 2050, including energy efficiency, renewable energy, distributed generation, transportation fuels, land use and transportation planning, border energy issues, and the green economy. The proposed project is required to comply with these plans, to the extent applicable, all of which are aimed at increasing energy efficiency and renewable energy development. This issue will be discussed in the EIR.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. Geology and Soils.				
Would the project:				
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
- i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to California Geological Survey Special Publication 42.)

Less-than-significant impact. Fault rupture impacts are limited to areas in the immediate vicinity of an earthquake fault line. According to the DOC, the project site is not located on or adjacent to an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone area (DOC 2022). The nearest fault is the Rose Canyon Fault Zone, the closest segment of which is named the Spanish Bight Fault, located 2 miles east of the project site (DOC 2022). Therefore, due to this distance, surface rupture from an earthquake is not anticipated to occur onsite. Construction and operation of the project would therefore not exacerbate the existing risk of fault rupture to the surrounding area. Further, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo fault zone. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

Less-than-significant impact. The project site is located in southern California, which is known to be a seismically active area. The Spanish Bight Fault is located 2 miles east of the project site, and the landside portion of the project could be subjected to seismically induced ground shaking. However, the project does not include landside construction; instead, it would involve the demolition of Building E and a hazardous materials storage shed. The only components to be constructed on the project site would be within the waterside portion of the project site. However, adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking would be managed through project design and the use of piled foundations for the proposed docks and supporting structures. The project would include modular concrete floating docks, anchored in place by prestressed concrete piles installed vertically through loose near-surface sandy bay deposits up to or in the underlying competent Bay Point Formation. The proposed docks would connect to the guide piles by freely sliding collars which restrain lateral movement but permit vertical displacement to accommodate water level changes. Therefore, the proposed dock system would be fully isolated from ground motion and the piles would have sufficient flexibility to deform laterally such that significant lateral loads would not transfer into the proposed dock system. Further, competent formational materials are known to exist at relatively shallow depths at the site and pile foundations would reduce seismically induced geotechnical hazards. Therefore, the project's potential to cause direct or indirect adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant, and no further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

The project's construction work would adhere to the California Building Code (CBC [California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2]), Chapter 16, Structural Design, which contains provisions for earthquake safety based on factors including occupancy type, soil and rock type, and probable strength of ground motion. Regulatory compliance with the CBC regarding seismic safety design requirements would ensure that project construction activities conform to current building codes and engineering practices. This would minimize the project's potential to cause direct or indirect adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking. This impact is less than significant, and no further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

Less-than-significant impact. Liquefaction is a phenomenon that occurs when the seismic ground shaking of relatively loose, granular soils that are saturated or submerged cause soils to "liquefy" and temporarily behave as a dense fluid; this can lead to substantial damage to structures, causing them to sink, tilt, or both during seismic shaking. According to the Final Draft PMPU Program EIR (District 2024c), based on the granular nature of subsurface materials, the shallow depth to groundwater, and proximity to San Diego Bay and the Pacific Ocean, the entire Final Draft PMPU

area (including the project site) has a high potential for liquefaction (District 2023b: Figure 4.5-9). The landside portion of the project site is therefore considered to be in a high potential liquefaction-prone area, due to shallow groundwater, major drainages, and hydraulic fills (District 2023b: Figure 4.5-9).

Landside structures within the project site include Building A, Building C-D, and Building E, all located north of the waterside area (see Figure 2-3 in Section 2, "Project Description"). The project proposes to demolish Building E and the existing hazardous materials storage shed. After demolition of Building E is completed, the cleared area would then be used as a construction laydown area for waterside demolition activities. The demolition of Building E and the hazardous materials storage shed would not result in exacerbating, worsening, or otherwise substantially affecting the existing liquefaction risk of the project site. In addition, no buildings are proposed as part of the project. Waterside construction activities would include the demolition and replacement of Piers 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and construction of a floating wave attenuator which would involve pile driving. The waterside project components would have the potential to exacerbate the existing risk of seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. However, the project site lies within the zone of marginal shoreline that has been changed by dredging and filling. The bay deposit soils that underlie the project site down to the Bay Point Formation are well-known and, although susceptible to seismically-induced liquefaction, the entire basin is deemed suitable for construction of marine-based facilities, similar to the project. The project includes the installation of piles to support the proposed docks. Typical methods for pile installation include jetting and driving, either with a vibratory hammer or impact hammer. Given the project's proximity to existing slopes that are underlain by loose sandy soils, the use of a vibratory hammer could liquefy portions of the underlying soils which could potentially impact the stability of the nearby slopes. The use of an impact hammer would lessen the potential for liquefaction. To further reduce the potential for vibration-induced liquefaction and lateral ground movement, jetting of the concrete piles through bay deposit soils up to or in the Bay Point Formation, with final penetration being achieved by driving, would be considered. Therefore, the project's potential to cause direct or indirect adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury, or death involving liquefaction would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

iv) Landslides?

No impact. Landslide susceptibility is typically determined based on local terrain conditions and sometimes the volume of rainfall. According to DOC, the project site is not located within or adjacent to a landslide hazard area (DOC 2022). There are no steep slopes or sharp gradients on or adjacent to the project site, and both overwater and landside construction improvements would have no potential to impact any existing risk of landslides. Project construction and operation would have no impact, and no further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Less-than-significant impact. For the landside component of construction activities, a total of 0.4 acre would be disturbed. Construction of the project would be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs), consistent with the District's Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan (JRMP), to contain soil on the project site during stormwater runoff events. BMPs can include, but are not limited to, scheduling construction activity during dry weather, when possible; preservation of natural features, vegetation, soil, and buffers around surface waters; drainage swales or lined ditches to control stormwater flow; mulching or hydroseeding to stabilize disturbed soils; erosion control to protect slopes; protection of storm drain inlets (gravel bags or catch basin inserts); perimeter sediment control (perimeter silt fence, fiber rolls); sediment traps or sediment basins to retain sediment onsite; stabilized construction exists; and wind erosion control. Operation and maintenance of the project would not require additional soil disturbance and would not result in erosion or loss of topsoil. Adherence to District required BMPs would reduce potential project construction-related soil erosion impacts to a less-than-significant impact. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- c) **Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?**

Less-than-significant impact. The project site is not located in areas prone to landsliding and does not have steep gradients or slopes that might otherwise trigger lateral spreading or collapse. Subsidence typically occurs when groundwater is over-pumped in agricultural areas, and the project site is not zoned for agricultural land uses, does not involve the operation of agricultural lands, and does not involve groundwater pumping. However, the project is located within a liquefaction hazard area. However, as described in Section 3.7 (iii), the project site lies within the zone of marginal shoreline that has been changed by dredging and filling. The bay deposit soils that underlie the project site down to the Bay Point Formation are well-known and, although susceptible to seismically-induced liquefaction, the entire basin is deemed suitable for construction of marine-based facilities, similar to the project. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- d) **Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994, as updated), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?**

No impact. Expansive soils properties have the ability to expand and contract (swell/shrink) based on moisture levels and can cause fatigue and cracks in structure foundations resulting in structural damage over time. Expansive soils are typically rich in clay minerals which have the capacity to absorb water and expand. As a result, proper engineering and construction techniques are required to minimize problems associated with expansive soils.

The project site is situated on artificial engineered fill that overlies late Holocene marine deposits, as shown in Figure 4.5-1, Geology Planning District 1 – Shelter Island, of the Final Draft PMPU Program EIR (District 2024c). Therefore, the project site would not be located on expansive soils and project implementation would not create substantial direct or indirect risks to life and property related to expansive soils. No impact would occur, and no further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

- e) **Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

No impact. The project site would include the continued operation of existing underground utilities, including electricity, water, and sewer. The project does not propose to redevelop these utility lines or construct septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems. No impact would occur, and no further analysis in the EIR is warranted.

- f) **Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

Less-than-significant impact. Paleontological resources are the remains or traces of prehistoric plant and animal life (e.g., fossil teeth and bones) exclusive of human remains. The project site is situated on artificial engineered fill, which overlies Holocene marine deposits (District 2023b). This underlying formation has a low paleontological sensitivity. Given that construction activities would predominantly be in-water, and the only landside component would be the demolition of Building E and the hazardous materials storage shed, both of which would not involve disturbance of the underlying formation, it is unlikely that paleontological resources would be encountered. Following construction, the project site would be returned to a similar condition as the existing setting. The project would not introduce new activities during operation that would have potential to disturb native soils. Therefore, the project would not destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. Impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions.				
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?**

Potentially significant impact. GHG emissions would result from construction activities associated with the proposed project, and thus there is the potential for the project to generate GHG emissions that would be considered significant. Once operational, the proposed project would generate GHG emissions similar to or less than the existing condition. Therefore, GHG emissions associated with construction will be quantified (to the extent feasible) and analyzed in the EIR.

- b) **Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Potentially significant impact. The project would result in construction-related GHG emissions. Once operational, the proposed project would generate GHG emissions similar to or less than the existing condition. Therefore, the EIR will analyze if construction-related GHG emissions would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted to reduce GHG emissions.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less-than-significant impact. Construction of the project would involve the use of hazardous materials such as fuels, lubricants, and solvents for construction equipment operation and maintenance. These materials would be properly stored, handled, used, and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations and laws, which include Resource Conservation and Recovery Act; U.S. DOT Hazardous Materials Regulations; California Health and Safety Code; and San Diego County Code, Title 6, Division 8. In addition, Occupational Safety and Health Administration provides specific standards for maintaining safe and healthy working conditions pertaining to hazardous materials in 29 CFR

1910 Subpart H. Project construction may also require the disposal of creosote-treated wood waste, which is regulated by Division 20, Chapter 6.5, and Title 22, Division 4.5 of the California Health and Safety Code. A licensed contractor would be responsible for the removal, transportation, and disposal of the removed piles in accordance with these regulations. Any accidental release of hazardous materials due to spills or leaks would be cleaned up in the normal course of business, consistent with the above-mentioned regulations. Compliance with the above-listed regulations would ensure the safe transport, use, and disposal of hazardous materials, such that construction-related hazardous materials impacts would be less than significant.

Following completion of construction, the project would continue commercial fishing operations currently operating onsite, and would not increase the project site's operational activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not increase the use of hazardous materials on the site. The transport, use, and disposal of any hazardous materials would continue to occur in compliance with the above-mentioned regulations. As such, operational impacts related to the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Potentially significant impact. The proposed project would include construction work above and adjacent to the San Diego Bay and would disturb sediment that may be contaminated from historical uses. Therefore, this issue will be discussed in the EIR.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Less-than-significant impact. Nearby schools include Cabrillo Elementary (0.6 miles from the project site) and High Tech Elementary, Middle, High and Graduate Schools (0.6 miles from the project site). No schools are within 0.25 miles of the project site. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Potentially significant impact. The California Environmental Protection Agency lists the following data resources that provide information regarding facilities or sites identified in California Government Code 65962.5 (commonly referred to as the "Cortese List"):

- ▶ List of Hazardous Waste and Substances sites from the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database,
- ▶ List of Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST) sites from the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database,
- ▶ List of solid waste disposal sites identified by SWRCB with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit,
- ▶ List of "active" Cease and Desist Actions (CDO) and CAO from the SWRCB, and
- ▶ List of hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code, identified by DTSC.

Because the proposed project would include ground and sediment disturbance, the EIR will include review of all of these databases and provide a discussion of the project's potential to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment by disturbing an existing potential hazardous materials site. Therefore, this issue will be discussed in the EIR.

- e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?**

Less-than-significant impact. The project site is approximately 1.5 miles from the San Diego International Airport (SDIA) and 1 mile from the Naval Air Station North Island (NASNI). The project site is located within the Airport Influence Area in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans for the SDIA and NASNI. However, the proposed project would not construct any buildings or facilities that would increase the potential for airport and aircraft related hazards to occur. For instance, there would be no reflective materials used, such as mirrored architectural features or extensive use of glass that may have high reflectivity. In addition, the project does not propose constructing any tall structures that may interfere with the flight path of aircraft. Moreover, the distance between the project site and either the SDIA or the NASNI is too far to hear any excessive noise from project construction activities like pile driving. Therefore, impacts associated with creating a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- f) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

Less-than-significant impact. The San Diego County Office of Emergency Services adopted its Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) in September 2022. Highways in proximity to the project site include I-5, I-15, and SR 75, which are identified in the EOP as primary evacuation routes in San Diego County (County of San Diego 2022). Project construction includes demolition of Building E and a small hazardous materials shed. In addition, Piers 4 through 8 would be demolished and reconstructed to modern standards. In addition, a wave attenuator will be installed in the water east of the leasehold. No construction would require closing roads or access to the area and there would be no encroachment into any evacuation routes. Therefore, emergency access to and from the project site along Harbor Drive and on designated evacuation routes would be maintained during project construction. Because project implementation would not expand the existing use of the site, the project would not result in permanent changes to emergency access following construction. Thus, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Impacts would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- g) **Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?**

No Impact. State law requires that all local jurisdictions identify very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ) within their areas of responsibility (California Government Code Section 51175–51189). Inclusion within these zones is based on vegetation density, slope severity, and other relevant factors that contribute to fire severity. The project site is within a local responsibility area and is designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) as a non-VHFHSZ (CAL FIRE 2024). The nearest lands classified as VHFHSZ are several miles east of the project site (CAL FIRE 2024). Furthermore, the project site is in a developed urban area on and adjacent to the San Diego Bay. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fire. No impact would occur and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. Hydrology and Water Quality.				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality?

Potentially significant impact. The project proposes features that would involve in-water construction and disturbance to the bay floor. Disturbance of the bay floor would cause sediment to be temporarily resuspended, thereby increasing turbidity and potentially lowering levels of dissolved oxygen, increasing salinity, increasing concentrations of suspended solids, and possibly releasing contaminants present in the sediment into the water column. This issue will be discussed in the EIR.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

Less-than-significant impact. Construction activities would occur within the project site located within and adjacent to San Diego Bay. The project would not result in a net increase in impervious surfaces, such that the surface area for percolation of stormwater would be reduced. Furthermore, groundwater at the project site is saline from saltwater intrusion and is not used as a groundwater supply source.

The project would not require landside excavation and would not have the potential to encounter groundwater such that dewatering would be required. Furthermore, construction-related water use would represent a small demand on local and regional water supplies that could be accommodated by the existing water service provider. The project would not generate a permanent increase in water demand compared to existing conditions. Consequently, the project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. Impacts would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

i) Result in substantial on- or offsite erosion or siltation;

Less-than-significant impact. The project site is entirely paved with no areas of exposed soil. Construction activities would include demolition of Building E and a small hazardous materials storage shed. In addition, Piers 4 through 8 would occur over water. Therefore, the project would have limited disturbance of landside soils, namely the grading of topsoil where the currently Building E is located. All soil disturbance would comply with the District's Stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs), which would include minimizing stormwater runoff from the graded site. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in on- or off-site erosion or siltation. Impacts would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

No impact. The project would not increase impervious surface area and would not include any project features that would increase the rate or amount of surface runoff. On the contrary, Building E would be demolished, which would lead to an increase in pervious surface area and contribute to stormwater percolation. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to result in on- or off-site flooding. No impact would occur and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

No impact. The project would not substantially increase runoff to the existing storm drainage system. As described under X. i) and ii), the project would lead to an increase in pervious surface area and facilitate additional stormwater percolation once Building E is removed. Therefore, no impact would occur and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?

Potentially significant impact. As described under X. i), ii), and iii), proposed construction on land would be limited to demolition of Building E and the small hazardous materials shed. Once Building E is demolished, the land underneath would be graded and BMPs would be incorporated, consistent with the District's JRMP. Moreover, the temporary

presence of the construction-related equipment would not impede or redirect flood flows. As such, there would be no potential to impede or redirect flood flows.

However, although the project would not impede or redirect flood flows, the EIR will analyze whether the proposed project would have the potential to exacerbate risks from future sea level rise.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

Less-than-significant impact. The waterside portion of the project site is within Flood Zone AE and is subject to flooding during the 100-year storm event (FEMA 2024). In addition, the project site is within a tsunami hazard area, as delineated on the Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning for San Diego County (CalEMA, CGS, and USC 2009). Because the project site is situated on and adjacent to the San Diego Bay, it could also be susceptible to seiche. The project would include the replacement of in-water structures, demolition of Building E, and removal of a small hazardous materials shed. As such, the proposed project would reduce potential sources of pollutants onsite. Therefore, the project would not have potential to risk release of pollutants during a flood hazard event such as a tsunami or seiche. Impacts would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

Potentially significant impact. The water quality control plans that apply to the project site are the San Diego Basin Plan and the Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries: Part 1 Sediment Quality Objectives.

The proposed project does not propose any increase or expansion of the existing operations and therefore project operations would not conflict with or otherwise obstruct the Basin Plan or the Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries: Part 1 Sediment Quality Objectives.

In addition, the project proponent(s) would be required to comply with permit conditions imposed by USACE and the RWQCB during construction. Specifically, permits required include the CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification issued by the RWQCB and the Section 10 Rivers and Harbors Permit issued by the USACE. These permits will provide specific conditions to ensure the proposed project does not violate the Clean Water Act, Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act, and does not hinder implementation of or otherwise conflict with the RWQCB's Basin Plan and Water Quality Control Plan for Enclosed Bays and Estuaries. However, this issue will be discussed in the EIR because mitigation measures may be necessary to ensure no conflict would occur.

The groundwater basin, Coastal Plain of San Diego, is considered a low priority groundwater basin and is not overdrafted. As discussed in X. b), the project would not have potential to decrease groundwater supplies, impair groundwater quality, or affect groundwater recharge. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

LAND USE AND PLANNING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. Land Use and Planning.				
Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a) Physically divide an established community?

No impact. The project involves the demolition of Piers 4 through 8, Building E, and a small hazardous materials storage shed. Reconstruction of Piers 4 through 8 would also occur. All project construction would occur within the existing project leasehold with the exception of a floating wave attenuator, which would be located in the bay immediately east of the leasehold. Project construction would not expand the physical landside boundaries of the fishing wharf and marina or expand into any adjacent communities. The project would not result in the construction of any physical barriers or require any road closures that would disrupt access within the surrounding community. No impact would occur and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Potentially significant impact. Several land and water use plans and regulations apply to the project site. Although not anticipated to conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, the EIR will include a conflict analysis with at least the following laws and plans: California Coastal Act, PMP, Final Draft PMPU, California Coastal Commission Sea Level Rise Policy Guidance, SDIA Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), NASNI ALUCP, and San Diego Bay INRMP.

MINERAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. Mineral Resources.				
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?**

No impact. According to the City of San Diego’s General Plan Conservation Element, the project site is located within an area designated as Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 1, indicating that no significant mineral deposits are present (City of San Diego 2024a: Figure CE-6; 2024b: 5-2). The existing project site is in a highly developed and urbanized area with marine-related land uses including commercial fishing berthing (water) and commercial fishing (land) that are incompatible with and preclude mineral extraction. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resources and no impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- b) **Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?**

No impact. According to the City of San Diego’s General Plan Conservation Element, the project site is not designated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. The project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resources and therefore no impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

NOISE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII.Noise.				
Would the project result in:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, or a substantial temporary or permanent increase in noise levels above existing ambient levels that could result in an adverse effect on humans?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, or a substantial temporary or permanent increase in noise levels above existing ambient levels that could result in an adverse effect on humans?**

Potentially significant impact. Construction activities associated with the project would result in a temporary increase in noise. Operational noise would be similar to the existing condition because commercial fishing and vessel berthing would continue with the project. Therefore, operational noise would be less than significant and noise associated with construction will be quantified and discussed in the EIR.

- b) **Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

Potentially significant impact. Vibration assessments are generally separated into two distinct analyses: one that is concerned about the receiving land uses perception and associated level of annoyance to vibration-inducing activities, and the second which is concerned with the possibility of vibration-inducing activities to cause structural damage to nearby structures. Project construction would involve the use of ground vibration-intensive activities, such as impact and/or vibratory pile driving. Once operational, the project would not generate any excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels and levels would be similar to the existing condition. Therefore, construction activities that may result in vibration impacts will be analyzed in the EIR.

- c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Potentially significant impact. The SDIA and NASNI are the closest public and private airports, and their runways are both located approximately 1.5 miles and 1 mile, respectively, from the project site. Therefore, because these airports are within 2 miles of the project site, this issue will be discussed in the EIR.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Population and Housing.				
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?**

Less-than-significant impact. The growth inducing potential of a project would typically be considered significant if it fosters growth or a concentration of population in excess of what is assumed in applicable land use plans. Significant growth impacts could also occur if a project provides infrastructure or service capacity to accommodate levels of growth beyond levels currently permitted by local or regional plans or policies.

The project involves the demolition of two landside structures, construction of a floating wave attenuator, and removal and replacement of the existing piers to support ongoing commercial fishing operations within the project site. The project does not propose new homes or businesses that would directly induce population growth. In addition, the project does not include the expansion of existing infrastructure, including changes to existing fishing operations, that would indirectly induce population growth. Construction activities are anticipated to occur over a 48-month period, with a minimal number of construction workers present on the project site during the construction period. Construction workers are anticipated to commute from the surrounding area and would not likely require temporary local housing. Thus, the project would not induce substantial unplanned growth and impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- b) **Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

No impact. The land use designation for the project site is Commercial Fishing (land), Promenade (land), Commercial Fishing Berthing (water), and Navy Small Craft Berthing (water). Further, residential uses are not allowed within District property. Therefore, the project would not displace any existing people or housing, or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

PUBLIC SERVICES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. Public Services.				
Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:**

Fire protection?

Less-than-significant impact. The San Diego Harbor Police (SDHP) and City of San Diego Fire Rescue Department (SDFRD) provide marine firefighting and firefighting services to the project site. The closest fire station is SDFRD Fire Station 22 at 1055 Catalina Blvd, San Diego, CA 92106, approximately 1.3 miles west of the project site. The project involves the demolition of Building E and a hazardous materials shed, the removal and replacement of Piers 4 through 8 within the leasehold, as well as the construction of a floating wave attenuator. The project construction period would involve a minimal number of workers over a 48-month period and would not result in a permanent population growth that would have the potential to affect performance objectives for SDFRD or the SDHP.

Project construction staging will occur within the project site, in the parking areas adjacent to Building E. Following the demolition of Building E, construction staging would continue to be contained within the leasehold, including the newly-cleared area, and would not require any road closures. In addition, project construction would result in negligible vehicle trips on surrounding roadways associated with worker commutes and haul trips (refer to Section 4.17 "Transportation," for more information). Therefore, project construction would not contribute to substantial congestion on surrounding roadways that would affect response times for SDHP or SDFRD.

The project would not result in an expansion of existing uses on the site, an increase in operations, or additional employees after construction is completed. Therefore, project operations would not affect response times for the

SDHP and SDFRD. Based on the above discussion, the project would not require the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

Police protection?

Less-than-significant impact. The Port of San Diego Harbor Police Department (HPD) and the City of San Diego Police Department (SDPD) provide law enforcement services to the project site. The closest police station is the HPD Headquarters at 3380 North Harbor Drive, approximately 1.6 miles east of the project site.

As previously discussed in Section 3.14 "Population and Housing," the project would not create permanent population growth. The project would not expand existing uses or increase the number of employees on site. Project construction staging would be located within the project site. Pedestrian access would be temporarily closed during construction and rerouted. Since project construction does not require closure of nearby roads and would not contribute to substantial congestion on surrounding roadways, the project is not anticipated to hinder police response such that responses times for the HPD or SDPD would be affected. The project would not require the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

Schools?

No impact. The nearest schools to the project site are Cabrillo Elementary School approximately 0.6 mile west, and High Tech Elementary, Middle, High and Graduate Schools approximately 0.6 mile north. The project would not result in an expansion of the existing use of the site (i.e., an increase in commercial fishing operations), or additional employees, other than those needed during construction. Jobs generated during construction would be drawn from the local workforce which is served by existing school facilities, and would not result in an increased demand. As discussed in 3.14 "Population and Housing," the project would not result in permanent population growth. The project does not include residential uses that would increase the demand for school facilities or increase existing student to teacher ratios. Furthermore, project activities would be contained within the existing leasehold and would not encroach onto any school property. No impact would occur and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

Parks?

No impact. Refer to Section 3.16, "Recreation," for additional information. As previously discussed, the project would not result in permanent population growth that would generate additional demand for parks. Project construction would not require the closure of nearby parks and project operation would not encroach on park property. Therefore, the project would not require the provision of new or physically altered parks. No impact would occur and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

Other public facilities?

No impact. As discussed in Section 3.14, "Population and Housing," the project would not result in permanent population growth. Therefore, the project would not increase the demand for existing public facilities. Furthermore, project operations are not anticipated to expand nor include additional employees. Therefore, the project would not require the provision of new or physically altered public facilities. No impact would occur and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

RECREATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Recreation.				
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

Less-than-significant impact. An increase in the use of existing parks and recreational facilities typically results from an increase in the number of housing units or residences in the surrounding area. The project would not involve the construction of housing units or residences. As discussed in 3.14 "Population and Housing," the construction workers for the project are anticipated to commute from the surrounding area and would not likely require temporary local housing and would not contribute to permanent population growth. The demand for short-term construction jobs would be met by the local work force, and it is anticipated that no outside labor would be needed. Further, the project would operate within the leasehold, would not expand existing operations, and would not increase the number of employees after construction. Thus, the project would not contribute to a permanent increase in population that would increase the use of existing recreational facilities including Point Loma Marina Park located approximately 600 feet northwest of the leasehold. Project activities would be contained within the existing leasehold and would not require closure of any parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- b) **Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No impact. The project involves the demolition of Building E and a hazardous materials storage shed, removal and replacement of Piers 4 through 8, and construction of a floating wave attenuator. The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might result in an adverse physical effect on the environment. Therefore, no impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

TRANSPORTATION

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. Transportation.				
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities?

Potentially significant impact. Implementation of the project is not anticipated to generate a substantial number of vehicle and truck traffic that could affect the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian access. Vehicular access to the project site would be provided by public roadway connections to the project site from North Harbor Drive. No new public streets are proposed to be constructed as part of the proposed project. Once construction activities are completed, the project site would be returned to a similar condition as the existing setting and would resemble the appearance and scale of existing conditions onsite. Nevertheless, during construction the project may have the potential to result in a temporary increase and redistribution of vehicle trips that could conflict with applicable plans, ordinances, and policies related to public transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. This impact is potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3(b), which pertains to vehicle miles travelled?

Potentially significant impact. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 was added December 28, 2018, to address the new method of determining significance for transportation impacts. The new method requires that analysis is based on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) instead of congestion (such as level of service). A "VMT" is one vehicle traveling on a roadway for one mile. Regardless of how many people are traveling in the vehicle, each vehicle traveling on a roadway generates one VMT for each mile it travels. Therefore, VMT is an indicator of the amount of driving generated by a proposed project. The project proposes both landside and waterside components. The landside component proposes the demolition of Building E and the hazardous materials storage shed. The waterside component proposes the demolition and reconstruction of Piers 4 through 8 and associated docks, gangways, headwalks, as well as the construction of a floating wave attenuator, to address deficiencies related to the age and condition of structures, and to allow commercial fishing operations to continue within the marina. After construction is complete, operations at the project site would be similar to the existing operations/setting and would generally resemble the appearance and scale of existing conditions onsite once operational, construction activities may result in a temporary increase in VMT

relating to construction worker trips to and from the project site as well as delivery trips for construction equipment and the hauling of construction and demolition debris offsite.

Along with the transportation analysis to determine the proposed project's consistency with transportation guidelines, circulation-related programs, plans, and policies, a VMT analysis will be prepared to address the proposed project's potential to substantially increase VMT using the California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA to inform the VMT analysis methodology and significance thresholds as applicable. The project site is located within a VMT efficient area; thus, it is not anticipated to have a significant VMT related impact, regardless of the results of the trip generation assessment. However, a VMT impact analysis will be included in the proposed project's Transportation Impact Study, regardless of whether it can be screened out due to small project size exemption. This impact is potentially significant and will be further analyzed in the EIR.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Less-than-significant impact. A significant impact may occur if a project includes new roadway design or introduces a new land use or features to an area with specific transportation requirements and characteristics that have not been previously experienced in that area, or if project site access was designed in such a way as to create hazardous conditions compared to existing conditions. The project would demolish two landside structures (Building E and the hazardous materials storage shed) and demolish and replace the existing waterside structures in order to address deficiencies related to the age and condition of structures, and to allow commercial fishing operations to continue within the marina. Construction activities would occur within the leasehold boundaries of the project site, and no unusual or hazardous design features would be constructed as a result of project implementation. Site deliveries and the staging of all construction equipment would be organized in the most efficient manner possible onsite to reduce any temporary impacts to the neighborhood and surrounding traffic. Construction activities would not encroach into the right-of-way along North Harbor Drive or into the parking lots of adjacent buildings due to the fencing that separates project site parking and adjacent use parking. Further, the project site would be returned to a similar condition as the existing setting and would resemble the appearance and scale of existing conditions onsite once operational. For these reasons, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to design features or incompatible uses. This impact would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less-than-significant impact. A significant impact may occur if a project's design would not provide emergency access or impede the ability of emergency vehicles to access the project site and serve the surrounding uses. Emergency access to the project site is provided via Nixie Way. As discussed, construction activities would occur within the leasehold boundaries of the project site. This would not substantially interfere with emergency response or evacuation. The project would not cause permanent alterations to vehicular circulation routes and patterns. The project would not include hazardous design features that could otherwise impede emergency access. For these reasons, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access. This impact would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources.				
<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p>				
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

AB 52, signed by the California Governor in September of 2014, established a class of resources under CEQA: "tribal cultural resources," defined in PRC Section 21074. Pursuant to PRC Sections 21080.3.1, 21080.3.2, and 21082.3, lead agencies undertaking CEQA review must, upon written request of a California Native American Tribe, begin consultation before the release of an EIR, negative declaration, or mitigated negative declaration. The District has not received any written requests for consultation from a California Native American Tribe.

A records search at SCIC was conducted for the project site and areas within a 0.25-mile radius to determine if tribal cultural resources are present within the project site. No tribal cultural resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the CRHR were identified during the records search.

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- a) **Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?**

No impact. The SCIC records search resulted in the identification of no tribal cultural resources that are listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources, within the project site. Therefore, there would be no impact. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?

No impact. No California Native American tribes have requested to be informed of projects by the District; therefore, there is no trigger to begin consultation under AB 52, resulting in no resources identified as tribal cultural resources under Public Resources Code Section 21074. Therefore, there would be no impact. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. Utilities and Service Systems.				
Would the project:				
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Fail to comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

Less-than-significant impact. A significant impact may occur if a project would increase demands on infrastructure to such a degree that the construction and relocation of facilities currently serving the project site would be required and have the potential to cause significant environmental impacts.

The project includes landside and waterside components. The landside component proposes the demolition of Building E and a hazardous materials storage shed. The waterside component proposes the demolition and reconstruction of Piers 4 through 8 and associated docks, gangways, headwalks, and the construction of a floating wave attenuator, to address deficiencies related to the age and condition of structures, and to allow commercial fishing operations to continue within the marina. Existing utilities onsite include water, wastewater, and electricity. These utilities serve the existing buildings and piers onsite. Building E and the hazardous materials storage shed would be demolished as part of the project and would not be replaced or redeveloped. No other buildings or

landside structures would be demolished or otherwise altered. Therefore, the project's landside use of water, wastewater, and electricity would ultimately decrease compared to existing conditions. Therefore, the project's landside use of existing utilities would not require the relocation or construction of new utility facilities.

In terms of waterside use of utilities, electrical connections to the piers would be removed as part of demolition of the existing piers and associated structures (i.e., docks, gangways, and headways); however, these piers and associated structures would be reconstructed similar to existing conditions onsite. Project implementation would not result in a change in demand on municipal systems. Therefore, the project would not increase demands on existing infrastructure such that new facilities would be required. Therefore, project implementation would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. This impact would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

b) Have insufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

Less-than-significant impact. As previously discussed in XIX a), the project includes landside and waterside components. Utility connections to the project site serve the landside buildings, one of which (Building E) would be demolished and not replaced or redeveloped. Therefore, the project's water usage would ultimately decrease compared to existing conditions. No other buildings would be demolished or otherwise altered. The waterside component would involve replacement of water lines on the new piers, similar to existing conditions onsite. Once operational, the project would operate similar to existing conditions and would not increase water demand compared to existing conditions. Therefore, sufficient water supplies would be available for the project. This impact would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

Less-than-significant impact. As previously discussed in Section XIX a), utility connections to the project site serve the landside buildings and piers. The minimal wastewater generated from project construction would not exceed the requirements of any wastewater treatment facilities. As part of the project, Building E and the hazardous materials storage shed would be demolished and not replaced or redeveloped. Therefore, the project's wastewater usage would ultimately decrease compared to existing conditions. The project would not generate a permanent increase in demand for wastewater treatment compared to existing conditions. Therefore, since an increase in wastewater treatment is not anticipated from this project, this impact would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Less-than-significant impact. The project would require removal or demolition of existing structures and disposal of the subsequent debris. Non-hazardous construction trash and debris would be sent to approved recycling facilities in accordance with the City's Recycling Ordinance and Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris Deposit Ordinance, which requires recycling of a minimum of 65 percent of the construction waste. Remaining non-hazardous construction trash and debris would be handled through the existing current trash hauler, and disposed at local landfills located outside the coastal zone. These landfills are anticipated to include Republic Services Sycamore and Otay Landfills in San Diego County, California.

Removal of the existing Piers 4 through 8 is anticipated to remove approximately six 14-inch creosote-treated timber piles. In conformance with California Department of Toxic Substances Control standards, the timber piles would be managed and manifested as hazardous waste and transported to a Class I hazardous waste landfill for disposal. If

other hazardous waste is generated, it would be transported under a waste manifest to an authorized hazardous waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facility.

No changes in operational generation of solid waste are anticipated. Operational solid waste generation would continue to comply with applicable statutes and regulations defined in Section 3.19.2(e) below, including AB 939 and AB 341 to support statewide goals of diverting solid waste from landfills. It is anticipated that local recycling facilities and landfills have adequate capacity to accommodate the solid waste that would be temporarily generated from construction activities. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

e) Fail to comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Less-than-significant impact. The following statutes and regulations related to solid waste are applicable to local jurisdictions and solid waste collectors:

- ▶ AB 939 (1989) California Integrated Waste Management Act: Requires all California cities, counties, and approved regional solid waste management agencies to divert 25 percent of their solid waste by 1995 and 50 percent by 2000. AB 939 established the California Integrated Waste Management Board, which later became CalRecycle.
- ▶ AB 341 (2012) Mandatory Recycling: Increases California's waste diversion goal from 50 percent to 75 percent by 2020. AB 341 also includes mandatory commercial recycling to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. All commercial businesses that generate more than four cubic yards or more of solid waste per week are required to have a recycling program in place.
- ▶ AB 1594 (2014) Green Material Disposal: Effective January 1, 2020, jurisdictions can no longer count green material used as alternative daily cover (ADC) at landfills toward their recycling goals. Jurisdictions are required to develop plans to divert green material from landfills.
- ▶ Senate Bill (SB) 1383 (2016) Short-Lived Climate Pollutants – Organic Waste Methane Emissions Reductions: Requires a 50 percent reduction in the level of the statewide disposal of organic waste from the 2014 level by 2020 and a 75 percent reduction by 2025. SB 1383 also requires at least 20 percent of currently disposed edible food be recovered for human consumption by 2025. Jurisdictions, haulers, and generators are required to implement programs to comply with the law by January 1, 2022.
- ▶ Port of San Diego Climate Action Plan (District 2013): Part of the District's approved Climate Action Plan, which identifies measures to increase the diversion of solid waste from landfill disposal.
- ▶ City of San Diego Recycling Ordinance: Provides recycling requirements for City-serviced multi-family residences, privately serviced businesses, commercial/institutional facilities, apartments, condominiums and permitted special events.
- ▶ City of San Diego C&D Debris Deposit Ordinance: Requires construction, demolition, and remodeling projects needing building, combination (i.e., permits for structural modifications to existing structures), and demolition permits pay a refundable deposit and divert at least 65 percent of their debris by recycling, reusing, or donating usable materials.
- ▶ City of San Diego Zero Waste Plan (City of San Diego 2015): Part of the City's approved Climate Action Plan, which sets goals of achieving 75 percent diversion of solid waste by 2020, 90 percent diversion of solid waste by 2035, and zero solid waste by 2040.

The project would not conflict with or cause a local jurisdiction or service provider to conflict with any federal, state, or local solid waste regulations, including AB 939 (California Integrated Waste Management Act), AB 341 (Mandatory Recycling), AB 1594 (Green Material Disposal), or SB 1383 (Short-Lived Climate Pollutants: Organic). The project proposes to modernize the wharf and marina to be capable of supporting modern commercial fishing operations and accommodating a range of commercial fishing vessels. The project would include the demolition of Building E and a small hazardous material storage shed, as well as the demolition and reconstruction of Piers 4 through 8,

including their associated structures (i.e., docks, gangways, and headwalks), and the construction of a floating wave attenuator. Waste generated from construction activities would be required to comply with the City Recycling Ordinance and the City's C&D Debris Deposit Ordinance. The demolition of Building E, and subsequently not rebuilding of Building E, would ultimately result in decreasing the generation of solid waste onsite and would thus serve to comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. The project, once operational, would resemble the appearance and scale of existing conditions. Therefore, no significant increases in operational generation of solid waste would occur.

In addition, hazardous wastes would be separated, classified, and disposed of at an appropriate landfill that accepts hazardous waste. The disposal of hazardous wastes would be conducted in accordance with applicable regulations and laws, including the Federal Toxic Substances Control Act, RCRA and Hazardous Solid Waste Act Amendments, Environmental Health Standards for the Management of Hazardous Waste (CCR Title 22, Division 4.5, Section 66001 et seq.), California Labor Code (Division 5, Parts 1 and 7), and San Diego County Code (Title 6, Division 8) (see Section 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Waste, for additional information). No changes in operational generation of hazardous wastes are anticipated.

Based on the discussion above, project construction and operation would comply with all federal, state, and local management regulations related to solid waste. Impacts would be less than significant and further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

WILDFIRE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Wildfire.				
If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No impact. State law requires that all local jurisdictions identify very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZ) within their areas of responsibility (California Government Code Section 51175–51189). Inclusion within these zones is based on vegetation density, slope severity, and other relevant factors that contribute to fire severity. The project site is within a local responsibility area, not a state responsibility area (SRA) and is designated by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) as a non-VHFHSZ (CAL FIRE 2024). The nearest lands classified as VHFHSZ are several 3 Shelter Island Commercial Fishing Wharf IS Checklist_102824.docx

miles east of the project site (CAL FIRE 2024). Furthermore, the project site is in a developed urban area on and adjacent to the San Diego Bay. Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

No impact. As previously discussed, the project site is not located within an SRA or VHFHSZ; therefore, no impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- c) **Require the installation of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?**

No impact. The project site is not located within an SRA or VHFHSZ; therefore, no impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

- d) **Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?**

No impact. The project site is not located within an SRA or VHFHSZ; therefore, no impact would occur. Further discussion in the EIR is not warranted.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

- a) **Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

Potentially significant impact. As discussed in Section 3.4, Biological Resources, project construction has potential to result in direct and indirect effects on eelgrass habitat and aquatic wildlife if they were to be present in the project site, which would be a potentially significant impact. As such, this issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

As part of the project, in-water work is proposed to occur in the Bay, which would cause potential impacts on fish and marine mammal species. Although the shoreline and majority of the Project site above ground is underlain by artificial fill, the SCIC records search results revealed archaeological sites within a half mile of the project site. Further, buildings and structures located on the project site are at least 50 years old and therefore may constitute a historical resource. A historical resources evaluation report is currently being conducted. As such, this issue will be further evaluated in the EIR.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)**

Potentially significant impact. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 requires a discussion of the cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental effect is “cumulatively considerable,” meaning that the project’s incremental effects are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects.

As determined by this Initial Study, there may be potentially significant effects related to air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, GHG emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use and planning, noise, and transportation. Therefore, the project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts related to these resources will be discussed in the EIR.

Although the project would result in a less than significant impact on aesthetics, agriculture and forest resources, geology and soils, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, tribal cultural resources, utilities and service systems, or wildfire, the proposed project may have the potential to result in cumulative impacts related to these resource areas. Analysis of the project’s cumulative effects will be discussed in the EIR.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Potentially significant impact. Based on the analysis above, the proposed project has the potential to result in significant impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, GHG emissions, hazards/hazardous materials, hydrology/water quality, land use and planning, noise, and transportation. As such, the project has the potential to result in environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, this issue area will be discussed in the EIR.

REFERENCES

- California Department of Conservation. 2022. Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation. Available: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/>. Accessed October 16, 2024.
- . 2024a. California Important Farmland Finder. Available: maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciff/. Accessed October 8, 2024.
- . 2024b. Williamson Act Enrollment Finder. Available: <https://gis.conservation.ca.gov/portal/home/item.html?id=18f7488c0a9d4d299f5e9c33b312f312>. Accessed October 8, 2024.
- California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2024. Fire Hazard Severity Zones in State Responsibility Area. Available: <https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/03beab8511814e79a0e4eabf0d3e7247/>. Accessed November 22, 2024.
- California Department of Transportation. 2024. California State Scenic Highway System Map. Available: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=465dfd3d807c46cc8e8057116f1aaca>. Accessed October 16, 2024.
- California Emergency Management Agency, California Geologic Survey, and University of Southern California. 2009 (June 1). *Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning, County of San Diego, City of San Diego*. Available: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps/san-diego>. Accessed October 8, 2024.
- CalEMA, CGS, and USC. See California Emergency Management Agency, California Geologic Survey, and University of Southern California.
- CAL FIRE. See California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection.
- Caltrans. See California Department of Transportation.
- City of San Diego. 2015. City of San Diego Zero Waste Plan. Available: <https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/environmental-services/pdf/recycling/ZWPlan.pdf>. Accessed November 22, 2024.
- . 2024a July. "Mineral Production." In *City of San Diego General Plan Conservation Element*, CE-79 through CE-83. Available: <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/work/general-plan>. Accessed October 13, 2024.
- . 2024b July. "5.2 Mineral Resources." In *City of San Diego General Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report*. Page 5-2 through 5-3. Available: <https://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/documents/peir>. Accessed: October 14, 2024.
- County of San Diego. 2022. *Emergency Operations Plan. Annex Q – Evacuation*. Available: https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/oes/emergency_management/plans/op-area-plan/2022/EOP2022_Annex%20Q.pdf. Accessed October 16, 2024.
- District. See San Diego Unified Port District.
- DOC. See California Department of Conservation.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2024. FEMA Flood Map Service Center. Available: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>. Accessed October 16, 2024.
- FEMA. See Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- Orth, R.J., Heck Jr., K.L. 2023. The Dynamics of Seagrass Ecosystems: History, Past Accomplishments, and Future Prospects. *Estuaries and Coasts* 46, 1653-1676. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-023-01252-4>. Accessed: December 2, 2024.

San Diego Air Pollution Control District. 2024. 2020 Plan for Attaining the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone in San Diego County. Available: [https://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdapcd/documents/grants/planning/Att%20A%20\(Attainment%20Plan\)_ws.pdf](https://www.sdapcd.org/content/dam/sdapcd/documents/grants/planning/Att%20A%20(Attainment%20Plan)_ws.pdf). Accessed December 9, 2024.

SDAPCD. See San Diego Air Pollution Control District.

San Diego Unified Port District. 2013. Port of San Diego Climate Action Plan. Available: <https://pantheonstorage.blob.core.windows.net/environment/Port-of-San-Diego-Climate-Action-Plan.pdf>. Accessed November 26, 2024.

———. 2023a (December). Port Master Plan Update. Available: https://pantheonstorage.blob.core.windows.net/waterfront-development/Final-Draft-PMPU-Approved-by-BPC-2_28_2024.pdf. Accessed October 21, 2024.

———. 2023b. Port Master Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report. Volume 2. Available: <https://pantheonstorage.blob.core.windows.net/waterfront-development/Final-Environmental-Impact-Report-EIR-for-Final-Draft-Port-Master-Plan-Update-February-2024-Volume-2-of-4-Part-2-of-3.pdf>. Accessed October 16, 2024.

———. 2024a (September). Port Master Plan. Available: <https://pantheonstorage.blob.core.windows.net/waterfront-development/Port-Master-Plan.pdf>. Accessed November 22, 2024.

———. 2024b (February). Port Master Plan Update. Available: https://pantheonstorage.blob.core.windows.net/waterfront-development/Final-Draft-PMPU-Approved-by-BPC-2_28_2024.pdf. Accessed November 13, 2024.

———. 2024c. Port Master Plan Update Final Environmental Impact Report. Volume 2. Available: pantheonstorage.blob.core.windows.net/waterfront-development/Final-Environmental-Impact-Report-EIR-for-Final-Draft-Port-Master-Plan-Update-February-2024-Volume-2-of-4-Part-2-of-3.pdf. Accessed November 13, 2024.