

**Mission Valley Community Plan Update
Draft Program Environmental Impact Report
San Diego, California**

February 6, 2019

SCH# 2017071066

Prepared for:

City of San Diego
Planning Department
1010 Second Avenue, Suite 1200, East Tower
San Diego, CA 92101

Prepared by:

The Bodhi Group
Chen Ryan Associates
Dyett & Bhatia Urban and Regional Planners
Heritage Architecture and Planning
Proteus Consulting
RECON Environmental
Rick Engineering
Tierra Environmental



Executive Summary

This Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the proposed Mission Valley Community Plan Update and associated discretionary actions (collectively referred to throughout this PEIR as the “proposed CPU”) has been prepared by the City of San Diego (City) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statute and Guidelines (Public Resources Code [PRC], Section 21000 et seq. and California Code of Regulations [CCR], Title 14, Section 15000 et seq.) and in accordance with the City’s 2016 CEQA Significance Determination Thresholds. The City of San Diego is the lead agency responsible for ensuring that the proposed CPU complies with CEQA. The “lead agency” is defined by PRC Section 21067 as “the public agency which has the principal responsibility for carrying out or approving a project which may have a significant effect upon the environment.”

The proposed CPU includes a number of legislative actions to be considered by the City Council, but primarily is a comprehensive update of the 1985 Mission Valley Community Plan. The proposed CPU reflects citywide policies and programs developed in the 2008 City of San Diego General Plan.

A PEIR is intended to inform decision-makers and the general public of the potential significant environmental impacts of a proposed project. The PEIR also considers the availability of mitigation measures to minimize significant impacts and evaluates reasonable alternatives to the proposed CPU that may reduce or avoid one or more significant environmental effects.

ES.I Proposed Project

ES.I.1 PLANNING AREA

The Mission Valley Community Plan area is located in the geographic center of the City of San Diego. The CPU area is surrounded by several other Community Plan areas: Old Town San Diego, Uptown, Greater Northern Park, Normal Heights, Kensington-Talmadge, College Area, Navajo, Tierrasanta, Kearny Mesa, Serra Mesa, Linda Vista, and Mission Bay Park.

The CPU area encompasses roughly 3,216 acres of land. The CPU area is urbanized and generally characterized as a mix of commercial and residential uses, with significant recreational and open space acreage. The CPU area is generally bounded by Friars Road and the northern slopes of the valley on the north, the eastern banks of the San Diego River on the east, the southern slopes of the valley on the south, and Interstate (I-) 5 on the west.

The San Diego River, which runs westward through Mission Valley, is a significant asset and defining feature of the community. The valley sits at the crossroads of the regional freeway system, enjoying access from I-5, I-8, I-15, I-805 and State Route (SR-) 163.

ES.1.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed CPU is a comprehensive update to the Mission Valley Community Plan, adopted in 1985. The adopted Community Plan has undergone over 20 amendments in the intervening years and was last amended in 2013. The proposed CPU provides detailed, community-specific policy direction to guide development in Mission Valley and brings the Community Plan up to date by analyzing current land use, development, and environmental characteristics; evaluating changes in demographics; understanding the demand for housing and commercial development; working with community members to establish a vision and objectives; evaluating the “fit” of current Community Plan policies to achieve community goals and regulatory requirements; and ensuring policies and recommendations remain in harmony with the General Plan, citywide, and regional policies.

The proposed CPU’s implementation requires adoption of the proposed Mission Valley Community Plan, and other associated discretionary actions, including amendments to the General Plan to incorporate the proposed CPU as a component of the General Plan Land Use Element, amendments to the San Diego Municipal Code and Official Zoning Map to be consistent with the proposed CPU, amendments to existing development agreements; and updates and amendments to other plans and regulatory documents including but not limited to, SANDAG’s Regional Plan, the City’s Pedestrian Master Plan, the City’s Bicycle Master Plan, the City’s Traffic Signal Communications Master Plan, and the Urban Water Management Plan.

The intent of the proposed CPU is for Mission Valley be a vibrant community, renowned for its walk- and bike-ability, accessibility to interstates and transit, recreational and employment opportunities, and a concentration of diverse food and unique shopping. New and creative housing opportunities are envisioned to be a defining feature of a future Mission Valley. Existing sites are re-envisioned to better integrate housing into the area, with a balance between housing, employment, and shopping opportunities. The community’s San Diego River Trail and pedestrian paseos will join with green streets and community parks. New connections and a strengthened grid will improve vehicular mobility, and present and future trolley lines will support easy commuting and transit-oriented development.

The proposed CPU envisions the following major changes related to the community’s vision for specific portions of the CPU area:

- **Western Mission Valley.** To acquire a residential and park focus with complementing office and retail uses.
- **South of I-8.** To be enhanced through higher quality building materials, new opportunities for regional retail development, and restoration of the landscape.

- **The Stadium Site.** Redevelopment to occur through a future Specific Plan or Campus Master Plan.¹
- **Central Mission Valley.** To become an active, mixed-use urban hub and central business district.
- **Eastern Mission Valley.** To support higher density residential development with enhanced multi-modal connectivity.

ES.2 Project Objectives

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15124(b), the following objectives have been identified to outline the underlying purpose for the proposed CPU. These objectives assisted the City as the lead agency in developing a reasonable range of alternatives to evaluate in this Draft PEIR and will ultimately aid in preparing findings and overriding considerations, if necessary. The primary objectives for the proposed CPU are to:

- Establish a sustainable, walkable community with enriched pedestrian spaces including linear parks and nodes of pedestrian-scale, visually stimulating development that support a mix of uses;
- Establish a strengthened grid system that supports local and regional roadway network efficiency, with a finer grain of streets that provide a second layer of neighborhood mobility more suitable to pedestrian and daily community trips;
- Accommodate new roadway connections within developed areas or areas planned for development for improved connectivity and adequate emergency access and response;
- Provide housing and employment opportunities in close proximity to transit;
- Meet the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) goals;
- Create a branching park and pedestrian pathway system with the San Diego River as the backbone and organizing framework;
- Establish usable public spaces that provide amenities for recreation and relaxation for community enjoyment;
- Encourage architecture that is distinctive and memorable, with attention paid to building quality, materials, details, and amenities that give back to the community; and
- Enhance and maintain the hillsides that form the edges of the valley.

1. The proposed CPU assumed that 4,800 dwelling units, two million square feet of office space, 300,000 square feet of retail space, 38.1 acres of active park, and 4.9 acres of open space would be developed on the Stadium site. The future Specific Plan for the Stadium site will provide more site-specific development details.

ES.3 Areas of Controversy

Environmental impacts classified as significant and unavoidable that may generate controversy have been identified in the resource topics of air quality; historical, cultural, and tribal resources; hydrology and water quality; noise; public services and facilities; public utilities and infrastructure; and transportation inasmuch as they may be controversial to the general public, agencies, or stakeholders. Table ES-1 lists significant and unavoidable impacts, summarizes the results of the impact analysis, and lists applicable mitigation measures.

ES.4 Project Alternatives

To fully evaluate the environmental effects of proposed projects, CEQA mandates that alternatives to the proposed CPU be analyzed. Section 15126.6 of the State CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of “a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” and the evaluation of the comparative merits of the alternatives. The alternatives discussion is intended to “focus on alternatives to the project or its location which are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project,” even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives.

Alternatives to the proposed CPU are evaluated in Chapter 6 of this PEIR. The evaluations analyze the ability of each alternative to further reduce or avoid the significant environmental effects of the proposed CPU. Each major issue area included in the impact analysis of this PEIR has been given consideration in the alternatives analysis. This PEIR evaluates three alternatives to the project: the No Project Alternative (continuation of the adopted Community Plan), Alternative 1: No new roadway extensions of Street “J” or Fenton Parkway over the San Diego River, and Alternative 2: Via Las Cumbres 2-Lane Roadway connection over the San Diego River.

ES.1.3 NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The purpose of evaluating the No Project Alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the potential impacts of approving the proposed CPU with the potential impacts of not approving the proposed CPU. The No Project Alternative analysis represents what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the proposed CPU were not approved.

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing 1985 Mission Valley Community Plan would continue to guide development and would include land use designations as they apply today, including all amendments to the Community Plan from its original adoption in 1985 to its most recent update in 2013. The plan includes goals and actions to improve the transportation system, encourage mixed-use development on large sites, guide urban form and physical development that protects and is responsive to the physical environment, and encourage the development of neighborhood facilities that fulfill the daily needs of local residents.

ES.1.4 ALTERNATIVE 1

Alternative 1 differs from the proposed CPU in that it would not include the proposed Street “J” connection, which would extend from Friars Road to Hotel Circle South, or the extension of Fenton Parkway to Mission City Parkway/Camino Del Rio North. Therefore, there would be no new roadway extensions across the San Diego River. Alternative 1 would include all other policies, land use designations, and mobility improvements included in the proposed CPU. Projected buildout under Alternative 1 would be the same as the projected buildout for the proposed CPU. This alternative was developed to reduce potential impacts related to the construction of the roadway extensions across the river.

ES.1.5 ALTERNATIVE 2

Alternative 2 differs from the proposed CPU in that instead of the two-lane Street “J” connection, the north-south connection would be made 900 feet to the west via a two-lane Via Las Cumbres connection. Like the proposed CPU Street “J” connection, the extension of Via Las Cumbres would include Class II buffered bicycle lanes and a painted median from Friars Road to Levi-Cushman Street B (with additional lanes at intersections as needed) and would bridge over the San Diego River; plus enhancements to Fashion Valley Road to raise it to the 15-year flood level and widen it to a four-lane major street with Class IV cycle track, which is the same as under the proposed CPU. Differing from the proposed CPU, the profile of this alternative would be much higher, as the Via Las Cumbres extension would be elevated over the MTS trolley track, instead of converting the existing berm into a bridge over Street “J”. For this alternative, the bridge would cross the river further west than under the proposed CPU.

ES.1.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires the identification of an environmentally superior alternative among the alternatives analyzed in an EIR. The guidelines also require that if the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, then another environmentally superior alternative must be identified. Based on a comparison of the alternatives’ overall environmental impacts and their compatibility with the proposed CPU’s goals and objectives, Alternative 1 is the environmentally superior alternative for this PEIR.

While the No Project Alternative would have the least number of significant impacts, per the CEQA Guidelines, another environmentally superior alternative must be identified. Alternative 1 and the proposed CPU would each have the same number of significant impacts, while Alternative 2 would result in greater significant and unavoidable impacts. As Alternative 1 would not include the proposed CPU roadway extensions of Street “J” and Fenton Parkway across the San Diego River, it would result in the following considerations when compared to the proposed CPU:

- Less impacts to biological resources for the Street “J” and Fenton Parkway connections;
- Less potential to impact historical or cultural resources in the vicinity of the river;
- A slightly lower potential for impervious pavement and therefore flooding due to the removal of the proposed river crossings;

- Lower potential for light and glare, as it would not include new street lights along the proposed roadway connections over the San Diego River; and
- Less potential for obstruction of scenic views of the San Diego River.

While implementation of Alternative 1 would result in increased VMT compared to the proposed CPU and, like the proposed CPU, would have significant and unavoidable impacts with regards to air quality standards and conflicts with applicable air quality plans, for the reasons discussed above, Alternative 1 is the environmentally superior alternative.

ES.5 Summary of Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures that Reduce Impact

Table S-1 summarizes the results of the environmental analysis including the potentially significant environmental impacts of the proposed CPU and proposed mitigation measures to reduce or avoid these impacts. Impacts and mitigation measures are organized by issue in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Analysis. Chapter 4.0 also includes discussions of proposed policies that would reduce identified impacts. Chapter 5.0, CEQA Required Conclusions, includes an analysis of the cumulative impacts of the proposed CPU for each issue.

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, all components associated with the proposed CPU are considered in this PEIR at the program level when evaluating potential impacts on the environment, including the construction of future development and supporting facilities and utilities. Impacts are identified as direct or indirect, and short-term or long-term, and are assessed on a plan-to-ground basis. The plan-to-ground analysis addresses the changes or impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed CPU compared to existing ground conditions.

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
4.1 Air Quality			
4.1-1 Would the proposed CPU conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	The proposed CPU would increase residential, commercial, and retail development potential within the CPU area, which would result in greater density. Buildout of the proposed land uses would increase future emissions and therefore would conflict with implementation of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and could have a potentially significant impact on regional air quality. Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1 would reduce any potential significant impact of the proposed CPU; however, as the effectiveness of this measure cannot be guaranteed at this time, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-1 as described in 4.1-1 Air Quality	Significant and unavoidable
4.1-2 Would the proposed CPU result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	The exact number and timing of individual development projects that could occur as a result of implementation of the proposed CPU are unknown at this time. Subsequent discretionary development projects would need to analyze specific construction-related criteria air pollutant impacts to ensure that emissions remain below the San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) thresholds. However, under the proposed CPU, ministerial projects that would not be subject to CEQA would also occur. Due to the potential for significant growth in the CPU area, future development could exceed the SDAPCD screening thresholds; therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Operational emissions associated with buildout of the proposed CPU would be greater for all pollutants when compared to the adopted land uses and assumptions used to develop the RAQS. Although the City's process for the evaluation of discretionary projects includes environmental review and documentation pursuant to CEQA, there could be projects that would not be able to reduce emissions below the thresholds. Ministerial projects would not be subject to further CEQA review. Therefore, this impact would be significant and unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure MM-AQ-2 as described in 4.1-1 Air Quality	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
4.1-3 Would the proposed CPU expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, including toxins?	Implementation of the proposed CPU would not result in any carbon monoxide (CO) hotspots. Exposure of sensitive receptors to diesel particulate matter (DPM) from construction projects would be less than significant as construction activities would occur intermittently and at various locations over the lifetime of the proposed CPU, and DPM is highly dispersive. The proposed CPU policies, implementing actions, and design guidelines support infill, mixed-use, higher density, and transit-oriented development that would benefit regional air quality. Implementation of the proposed CPU would be consistent with the goals of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) handbook and would minimize exposure of sensitive receptors to mobile source emissions. The proposed CPU would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.1-4 Would the proposed CPU create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	While specific developments within the CPU area are not known at this program level of analysis, proposed land uses would not encourage, or support, uses that would be associated with significant odor generation. As odor generation is generally confined to the immediate vicinity of the source, implementation of the proposed CPU would not create operational-related objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. New and existing facilities are required to comply with SDAPCD Rule 51 to prevent nuisances to sensitive land uses. Therefore, impacts related to objectionable odors would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.2 Biological Resources			
4.2-1 Would the proposed CPU result in a substantial adverse impact, either directly or through habitat	The CPU area contains sensitive upland vegetation communities including coastal sage scrub and disturbed coastal sage scrub (Tier II) and chaparral (Tier IIIA), as well as sensitive plants San Diego ambrosia (<i>Ambrosia pumila</i>) and decumbent goldenbush (<i>Isocoma menziesii</i>). A majority of the sensitive habitats within the CPU area are	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in the MSCP or other local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?	located within the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and would not be subject to potential impacts associated with future development as limited development is permissible within the MHPA. Future site-specific environmental review and associated compliance with the City's Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations, Biology Guidelines, and the provisions of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan including Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code are ensured through the requirement for discretionary review for future projects within the designated Community Plan Implementation Overlay Zones (CPIOZ) identified within the CPU area. Potential indirect impacts to sensitive habitats and wildlife species within MHPA would be protected through required implementation of MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Impacts to sensitive species would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
4.2-2 Would the proposed CPU result in a substantial adverse impact on any Tier I Habitats, Tier II Habitats, Tier IIIA Habitats, or Tier IIIB Habitats, as identified in the Biology Guidelines of the Land Development Manual, or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS?	Compliance with the established development standards contained in the City's ESL Regulations, Biology Guidelines, MSCP Subarea Plan, and MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines would ensure that impacts to sensitive vegetation communities and sensitive plants would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
4.2-3 Would the proposed CPU result in a substantial adverse impact on wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, riparian, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	Future development projects would be reviewed on a project-by-project basis to determine if impacts to wetlands would occur. If impacts would occur, projects would be regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) according to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) in accordance with Section 401 of the CWA, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) under Section 1600 of California Fish and Game Code, and the City in accordance with the Biology Guidelines, the ESL Regulations, and the MSCP Subarea Plan. With implementation of the existing regulatory framework and the proposed supplemental development regulations of the San Diego River CPIOZ, impacts to riparian habitats and wetlands would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.2-4 Would the proposed CPU interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, including linkages identified in the MSCP Subarea Plan, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	The San Diego River is part of a major wildlife corridor system that allows for wildlife species movement between the Pacific Ocean and inland canyon systems and other major off-site habitat areas. The San Diego River corridor is designated as MHPA, which provides protections from future development. The proposed CPU would not change land uses that would allow development within the San Diego River corridor that could impede wildlife corridors or nursery sites, therefore no impact to wildlife corridors would occur. To avoid impacts on migratory or nesting birds, pre-construction nest survey would be required if construction would occur in potential or known habitat during the typical bird breeding season to ensure that impacts to nesting birds or their eggs, chicks, or nests would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
4.2-5 Would the proposed CPU result in a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan, either within the MSCP plan area or in the surrounding region?	The proposed CPU would be generally consistent with existing MHPA preserve areas as existing preserve would remain planned as open space. Minor development within MHPA, such as footings for new pedestrian bridges are a consistent use within the MHPA. Projects that could affect the MHPA would be required to comply with MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Implementation of the proposed CPU would not result in a conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan or local policy protecting biological resources. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.3 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity			
4.3-1 Would the proposed CPU expose people or structures to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards?	While the CPU area would be subject to seismic events, potential hazards associated with ground shaking and seismically induced hazards such as ground failure, liquefaction, or landslides would be reduced through implementation of site-specific geotechnical requirements through the City of San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) and the California Building Code (CBC). Adherence to the SDMC, CBC, and other regulatory requirements would reduce impacts related to geologic hazards to an acceptable level of risk and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.3-2 Would the proposed CPU result in substantial increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site?	SDMC Section 142.0146 requires grading work to incorporate erosion and siltation control measures in accordance with Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 4 (Landscape Regulations) and the standards established in the Land Development Manual. Conformance to such mandated City grading requirements would ensure that grading and construction operations for future projects located within the proposed CPU would avoid significant soil erosion impacts.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
	Furthermore, any development involving clearing, grading, or excavation that causes soil disturbance of 1 or more acres, or any project involving less than 1 acre that is part of a larger development plan, is subject to NPDES General Construction Storm Water Permit provisions. Additionally, any development of significant size within the City would be required to prepare and comply with an approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that would consider the full range of erosion control BMPs, including any additional site-specific and seasonal conditions. Thus, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.		
4.3-3 Would the proposed CPU 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 an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	The majority of the CPU is mapped on soils with high potential for liquefaction. While the potential for geologic or soil instability exists in the CPU area, site-specific geotechnical investigations required for future projects would identify any such potential hazards, and provide recommendations to reduce the potential hazards to an acceptable level of risk. Proposed CPU policies and Implementing Actions that address other geologic and seismic hazards would serve to further reduce potential impacts. With adherence to existing SDMC, CBC, and other regulations, and implementation of the proposed CPU, potential impacts associated with expansive soils should be reduced to an acceptable level of risk and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.3-4 Would the proposed CPU be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994)?	Expansive soils can be found in the CPU area surrounding the San Diego River. While the potential for expansive soils exists in the CPU area, site-specific geotechnical investigations required for future projects should identify expansive soils and recommend measures to mitigate potential impacts. Through compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, potential impacts from expansive soils will be reduced and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
4.4 Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy			
4.4-1 Would the proposed project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions would be greater for the proposed CPU compared to the adopted Community Plan. The increase in emissions would be due to the increased density that would be allowed under the proposed CPU. However, this increase would be a direct result of the implementation of CAP Strategies and the General Plan's City of Villages Strategy. Increasing residential and commercial density along transit corridors and within a TPA would support the City in achieving its GHG emissions reduction targets under the CAP. Therefore, impacts associated with GHG emissions would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.4-2 Would the proposed project conflict with the City's Climate Action Plan or another applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	The City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) establishes five primary strategies for achieving the citywide CAP goals. The proposed CPU contains policies and design guidelines that are consistent with the CAP and its five primary strategies. The CAP's Monitoring and Reporting Program Measure 1.4 calls for City staff to annually evaluate City policies, plans (including the CAP), and codes as needed to ensure that reduction targets outlined by the CAP are met. The City can therefore amend land use plans or regulations to support more GHG reduction strategies. The proposed CPU would be consistent with and would implement the CAP. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.4-3 Would the proposed project develop land uses and patterns that would cause the wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary consumption of energy or the construction of	Since the proposed project is the adoption of a community plan and does not specifically address any particular development project(s), impacts to energy resources are addressed based on the projected buildout of the proposed CPU. Generally, projected population growth will result in increased development intensity and result in impacts to energy supply. The proposed CPU identifies a number of sustainable design policies that support energy-efficient development and encourage the implementation of sustainable building practices.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
new or retrofitted buildings that would have excessive energy requirements for daily operation?	There are no features of the proposed CPU that would support the excessive use of fuel or other forms of energy during the construction of future projects, nor would it create unnecessary energy waste. Future development implemented under the proposed CPU would be required to meet the mandatory energy requirements of CALGreen and the California Energy Code (Title 24, Part 6 of the CCR) in effect at the time of development. Therefore, long-term operational energy impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
4.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
4.5-1 Would the proposed CPU expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including when wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	While there is Moderate fire threat throughout the CPU area, implementation of policies and regulations within the General Plan, San Diego Fire Code, San Diego Building Regulations, Off-Site Development Impact Regulations, and Brush Management Regulations, as well as policies within the proposed CPU would serve to reduce the availability of fuels to limit the spread of potential wildfires. Therefore, impacts related to wildfires would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.5-2 Would the proposed CPU result in hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school?	In accordance with City, State, and federal requirements, any new development that involves contaminated property would necessitate the cleanup and/or remediation of the property in accordance with applicable requirements and regulations. For any new schools, it is the responsibility of the school district or private entity to perform an in-depth analysis of any potential hazards at the project level. The proposed CPU also includes policies and implementing actions regarding the management of hazardous waste sites. Through implementation of existing regulations and proposed CPU policies,	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
4.5-3 Would the proposed CPU impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	impacts to schools from hazardous materials, substances, or waste would be less than significant. No mitigation is required. The land use and circulation changes identified in the proposed CPU would not physically interfere with any known adopted emergency plans. Furthermore, the proposed CPU includes policies and implementing actions to improve the existing transportation infrastructure, which may improve evacuation and emergency response times. Thus, impacts related to emergency plan consistency would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.5-4 Would the proposed CPU 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, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	According to a search of federal, state, and local regulatory databases, 2,000 documented hazardous material release cases were identified within the proposed CPU area. A final list of 46 sites were selected if they had an unauthorized release of contaminants, were (or had been) under regulatory oversight, and had residual contamination with potential adverse effects in the proposed CPU area. Adherence to existing policies, proposed CPU policies, and federal, state, and local regulations will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.5-5 Would the proposed CPU expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from off-airport aircraft operational accidents?	The CPU is located in two Airport Influence Area (AIA) review areas. With adherence to existing policies and regulations, compliance with the provisions of the SDIA and Montgomery Field ALUCPs, and implementation of proposed CPU policies, potential hazards from airport operations would be minimized and impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
4.6 Historical, Cultural, and Tribal Cultural Resources			
4.6-1 Would the proposed CPU result in an alteration, including the adverse physical or aesthetic effects and/or the destruction of an historic building (including an architecturally significant building), structure, object or site?	The CPU area contains known historic resources including resources listed in the NRHP and the San Diego Historical Resources Register. While the SDMC provides for the regulation and protection of both designated and potential historical resources, it is not possible to ensure the successful preservation of all historic resources within the proposed CPU area at a programmatic level. Although the CPU does not propose specific development, future development and related construction activities under the proposed CPU at the project level could result in the alteration of a historic building, structure, object, or site. Mitigation Measure MM-CULT-1 would address potential significant impacts; however, the degree of future impacts and the success of mitigation measures cannot be adequately known for each specific future project at this program level of analysis. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure MM-CULT-1, as described in 4.6-1 Historical, Cultural, and Tribal Cultural Resources	Significant and unavoidable
4.6-2 Would the proposed CPU result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a prehistoric or historic archaeological resource, a religious or sacred use site, or the disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	The Cultural Resources Constraints Analysis identified 57 recorded archaeological and cultural resources within the proposed CPU area, and much of the area is of moderate or high cultural sensitivity. Future development implemented in accordance with the proposed CPU could result in potential impacts to cultural resources. While existing federal, State, and local regulations, and proposed CPU policies would provide for the regulation and protection of archaeological resources and human remains and avoid potential impacts, these regulations and policies could not guarantee the successful preservation of all archaeological resources, particularly those discovered over the course of future development. While mitigation could reduce the level of significance, the feasibility and efficacy of mitigation measures cannot be determined at this program level of analysis. Thus, impacts to prehistoric and historic archaeological resources, sacred sites, and human remains would be minimized but would remain significant and unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure MM-CULT-2, as described in 4.6-2 Historical, Cultural, and Tribal Cultural Resources	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
4.6-3 Would implementation of the proposed CPU result in 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?	There is precedent for the potential discovery of tribal cultural resources in the CPU area given the prehistoric and historic activity present in the CPU area, as well as information provided by the Iipay Nation of Santa Ysabel. The proposed CPU includes policies that ensure that project-specific Native American consultation occurs early in the development review process. While existing federal, state, and local regulations, and proposed CPU policies would provide for the regulation and protection of tribal cultural resources and avoid potential impacts, there would be no guarantee that any substantial adverse changes to tribal cultural resources could be avoided. Consultation with culturally affiliated tribal groups is on-going and any additional requirements will be incorporated. While mitigation could reduce the level of significance, the feasibility and efficacy of mitigation measures cannot be determined at this program level of analysis. Thus, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be minimized but would remain significant and unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure MM-CULT-2, as described in 4.6-2 Historical, Cultural, and Tribal Cultural Resources	Significant and unavoidable
4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality			
4.7-1 Would the proposed CPU result in flooding due to an increase in impervious surfaces, changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate of surface runoff?	Flooding sources in the CPU area include local surface runoff from developed areas and riverine flooding from the San Diego River and its tributaries. The majority of the CPU area is developed and highly impervious in the existing condition. Buildout of the proposed CPU would be required to comply with the drainage regulations in the City's Drainage Design Manual and the hydromodification management requirements in the City's Storm Water Standards Manual. Adherence to these regulations and implementation of proposed CPU policies related to storm water runoff would ensure impacts related to local surface runoff are less than significant. Compliance with the City's drainage and floodplain regulations would ensure that riverine flooding impacts are less than significant; however, impacts related to future	None Required	• <u>Riverine Flooding</u>, <u>Significant and Unavoidable</u> • <u>Local Surface Runoff</u>, <u>Dam Failure</u>, <u>Other</u>

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
	development located behind the provisionally accredited levees (PAL) would be significant and unavoidable given the level of uncertainty regarding the levees status in the next Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), and there are no mitigation measures available. With continued evaluation of dam stability, compliance with State regulations, and a proposed CPU policy to support ongoing dam maintenance, impacts associated with dam failure would be less than significant. The CPU area is not located within a tsunami inundation zone and seiches pose a minimal threat to the CPU area, therefore, impacts related to seiches and tsunamis would be less than significant. Implementation of design measures related to mud and debris conveyance would ensure impacts associated with mudflows are less than significant.		Flood Hazards: Less than significant
4.7-2 Would the proposed CPU result in a substantial increase in pollutant discharge to receiving waters and increase discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body?	Future development and redevelopment would be subject to current, more stringent storm water regulations, which would ensure water quality would not significantly degrade below current water quality levels. Compliance with storm water best management practices (BMPs) and proposed CPU policies would make impacts to water quality less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.7-3 Would the proposed CPU deplete groundwater supplies, degrade groundwater quality, or interfere with groundwater recharge?	The City's Storm Water Standards Manual establishes guidance on the required water quality improvements for new development and redevelopment projects, including required construction BMPs. The requirements are structured to protect both surface water beneficial uses and groundwater beneficial uses of downstream receiving waters. The proposed CPU does not include or require the extraction of groundwater for purposes of supplying future projects within the CPU area and would therefore not deplete groundwater supplies. Thus,	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
4.8 Land Use			
4.8-1 Would the proposed CPU conflict with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a General Plan or Community Plan or other applicable land use plan or regulation, and as a result, cause an indirect or secondary environmental impact?	Land use designations and policies associated with the proposed CPU would be consistent with the SANDAG Regional Plan goals to develop compact, walkable communities close to transit connections and consistent with smart growth principles. This proposed CPU would also be consistent with and implement the General Plan's City of Villages Strategy and would retain proposed CPU policies that align closely with General Plan goals for mobility, urban design, public facilities and services, recreation, conservation, and historic preservation. In general, the land use framework of the proposed CPU would accommodate the development proposed in the CPU area's Specific Plans, but would require amendments to the San Diego Municipal Code. The proposed CPU would not conflict with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of applicable land use plans and therefore would have a less than significant impact. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.8-2 Would the proposed CPU lead to the development or conversion of General Plan or Community Plan designated open space or prime farmland to a more intensive land use, resulting in a physical division of the community?	Implementation of the proposed CPU would not change the proportion of parks and open space/undevelopable areas within the CPU area and would include provisions to promote the creation of public parks and open spaces and the integration of new development with existing parks and open spaces. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact related to the conversion of on open space or farmland. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
4.8-3 Would the proposed CPU conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	Proposed CPU policies and actions do not conflict with the provisions of the City's MSCP Subarea Plan or other habitat conservation plans and would support the implementation of applicable requirements of the ESL Regulations, Biology Guidelines, and the MSCP Subarea Plan for the preservation, mitigation, acquisition, restoration, management, and monitoring of biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant; no mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.8-4 Would the proposed CPU result in land uses which are not compatible with an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)?	Future development under the proposed CPU would be subject to the requirements of the adopted ALUCPs for SDIA and Montgomery Field, the SDMC, and associated FAA requirements. Therefore, impacts related to conflicts with an adopted ALUCP would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.9 Noise			
4.9-1 Would the proposed CPU result in or create a significant increase in the existing ambient noise level?	Future development implemented under the proposed CPU could increase traffic noise along local roadways due to increased density and intensity of use. A significant impact would occur if buildout of the proposed CPU would result in traffic noise levels that exceed the City's significance thresholds. While some projects may adequately attenuate exterior noise, there could still be new noise sensitive land uses located in areas that would experience a significant increase in ambient noise levels exceeding the applicable Land Use-Noise Compatibility Guidelines, and therefore impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	None Feasible	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
4.9-2 Would the proposed CPU expose people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Noise Element of the General Plan?	While some projects may adequately attenuate exterior noise, there could still be new noise sensitive land uses that would experience ambient noise levels that exceed the applicable Land Use – Noise Compatibility Guidelines. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.	None Feasible	Significant and unavoidable
4.9-3 Would the proposed CPU result in land uses which are not compatible with aircraft noise levels as defined by an adopted Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP)?	No portion of the CPU area is located within the 60 CNEL noise contours of San Diego International Airport (SDIA) and Montgomery Field. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.9-4 Would the proposed CPU result in the exposure of people to noise levels which exceed property line limits established in the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the Municipal Code?	Implementation of the proposed CPU would promote pedestrian-oriented mixed-use areas and residential uses that would be located in proximity to commercial sites and could result in the exposure to additional noise. Land uses proposed by the CPU would be similar to lands uses that currently exist in the CPU area, although with greater density. Since noise levels in the CPU area are dominated by vehicle traffic on freeways and heavily traveled area roadways, noise levels from stationary sources within the CPU area would not be expected to increase the hourly or daily average sound level with respect to current conditions. Through enforcement of the Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance of the SDMC, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
4.9-5 Would the proposed CPU result in the exposure of people to significant temporary construction noise?	The City regulates construction noise through its Noise Abatement and Control Ordinance, which puts limits on the days of the week and hours of operation allowed for construction. Due to the highly developed nature of the CPU area with sensitive receivers potentially located in proximity to construction sites, there is a potential for construction of future projects to expose existing sensitive receptors to significant noise levels. Mitigation Measure MM-NOS-1 would help reduce construction-related noise impacts for future discretionary projects implemented under the proposed CPU. For ministerial projects, there is no procedure to ensure that construction-related noise impacts are mitigated. Even with implementation of MM-NOS-1, significant construction noise impacts may still occur, therefore this impact would be significant and unavoidable.	Mitigation Measure MM-NOS-1, as described in 4.9-5 Noise	Significant and unavoidable
4.9-6 Would the proposed CPU result in the exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Potential sources of ground-borne vibration could occur as a result of railway operations. Portions of the Green Line Trolley tracks are on elevated structures and do not cause significant vibration impacts to adjacent development. Areas where noise- and vibration-sensitive uses are located the closest to the tracks (as close as 25 feet) are at the existing trolley stations. Because all trolleys stop at each station, trolley speeds approaching and departing from the stations would be very low and would not cause significant vibration levels over existing levels. The future Purple Line Trolley would run through the Stadium Specific Plan area. The exact alignment is not known at this time; however, vibration impacts and screening distances for the Purple Line Trolley are anticipated to be the same as those for the Green Line Trolley. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
4.10 Paleontological Resources			
4.10-1 Would the proposed CPU result in development that requires over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation in a high resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit or over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit?	There are five geologic formations that underlay the CPU area and are considered to be of high sensitivity for paleontological resources. Implementation of future development projects under the proposed CPU would involve excavation into these underlying geological formations and could expose these formations and associated fossil remains. While much of the CPU area is underlain by artificial fill with no potential to uncover paleontological resources, the above-mentioned geologic formations have high resource sensitivity and fossils could be uncovered during future construction-related activities. Implementation of the General Grading Guidelines for Paleontological Resources, as required by the SDMC, would ensure that impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.11 Public Services and Facilities			
4.11-1 Would the proposed CPU promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered public facilities (including police protection, fire/life safety protection, schools, libraries, and parks or other recreational facilities), the construction of which could cause significant	Implementation of the proposed CPU would result in an increase in overall population, which could require the Police and Fire-Rescue Department to expand and construct new facilities. Any future construction of police or fire service facilities would be subject to a separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. The proposed CPU contains policies and implementation actions aimed at reducing potential negative environmental impacts resulting from the construction of police and fire stations. Other proposed CPU policies and implementation actions aim to modernize facilities and equipment to ensure that rights-of-way do not impede access for emergency responders. While the City would collect fees from future development to fund police and fire stations, and the proposed CPU contains policies that support identifying funding to develop and upgrade these facilities, this impact would be significant and	None Feasible	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
environmental impacts in order to maintain service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives?	unavoidable since impacts associated with the construction and operation of future facilities are not known at this time. Under the proposed CPU, residential population growth would generate an elementary school population that would exceed the existing elementary school capacity, while the estimated middle and high school populations could be accommodated by existing facilities. To ensure that school space is available for future residential growth, SDUSD may undertake a number of potential measures, including a reduction in the number of non-resident students or adjustments to attendance boundaries. Under SB 50 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 1998), a school district may levy impact fees on new development in order to mitigate potential impacts of the development on school facilities. While SDUSD would collect fees from future development to fund school facilities, if needed, this impact would be significant and unavoidable since impacts associated with the construction and operation of any future facility are not known at this time. The proposed CPU does not include construction of new library facilities. Implementation of the proposed CPU could result in additional residents and associated demand for library services. If implementation of the proposed CPU results in the need for new or expanded library facilities, existing development regulations would serve to reduce potential environmental impacts associated with construction. Future projects would be subject to a separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. Nevertheless, this impact would be significant and unavoidable since impacts associated with the construction and operation of future facilities are not known at this time. The proposed CPU includes policies to develop new parks and recreation facilities in the CPU area. There may be a need for additional parkland to serve the community at buildout of the CPU, which may be attained through parkland included in new		

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
	developments or park equivalencies as provided for through CPU policies. As new recreational facilities are sited, designed, and constructed, existing regulations would serve to reduce potential construction impacts. In addition, future projects would be subject to a separate environmental review at the time design plans are available. Nevertheless, this impact would be significant and unavoidable since impacts associated with the construction and operation of any future park facilities are not known at this time.		
4.12 Public Utilities and Infrastructure			
4.12-1 Would the proposed CPU use excessive amounts of water beyond projected available supplies?	The proposed CPU projections are consistent with water demand assumptions included in the regional water resource planning documents of the San Diego County Water Authority and Metropolitan Water District (MWD). Current and future water supplies, as well as actions necessary to develop those supplies, have been identified in water resources planning documents, in addition to existing and planned future water demand forecasted by the City's Public Utilities Department (PUD). Impacts related to water supply are less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.12-2 Would the proposed CPU promote growth patterns resulting in the need for and/or provision of new or physically altered utilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain service ratios	The City's existing built areas are currently served by storm water, wastewater, potable water distribution, and communications systems infrastructure. However, some areas within the CPU area have existing infrastructure deficiencies and may require capacity improvements. No new storm water drains or drainage facilities, sewer collection or wastewater treatment facilities, water distribution/treatment facilities, or communications systems infrastructure are proposed and project-level review for future facilities would be required since details are not currently known. Future development must comply with the City's Storm Water Standards, Sewer Design Guide, SDMC, and other local regulations.	None Feasible	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
or other performance objectives?	Nevertheless, this impact would be significant and unavoidable since impacts associated with the construction of these facilities is unknown.		
4.12-3 Would the proposed CPU result in impacts to solid waste management resulting in the need for construction of new solid waste infrastructure, including organics management, materials recovery facilities, and/or landfills; or result in a land use plan that would not promote the achievement of a 75-percent target for waste diversion, as required under AB 341 and the City's Climate Action Plan?	While some land uses would decrease under the proposed CPU, increases in certain types and amounts of other land uses would cause an overall net increase in solid waste generation. Landfills currently serving the CPU area and the City of San Diego have sufficient remaining capacity to handle the increase in solid waste generation resulting from implementation of the proposed CPU. Furthermore, future projects that would occur in the CPU area are required to comply with existing City regulations regarding solid waste management. Impacts on solid waste management would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.13 Transportation			
4.13-1 Would the proposed CPU result in an increase in projected traffic, which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system including	To provide better connectivity throughout Mission Valley and provide additional access to potential new developments within existing "super blocks," the proposed CPU roadway network modifications would be designed in accordance with the City of San Diego Street Design Manual and their corresponding classification. All future community conditions were developed based on the project land use and network assumptions within the study area superimposed on the SANDAG 2050 Series 13 Traffic Forecast Model. The project would have	Mitigation Measures MM-TR-1 through MM-TR-64, as described in 4.13-1 Transportation	Significant and unavoidable

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Results of Impact Analysis	Mitigation	Impact Level after Mitigation
roadway segments, intersections, freeway segments, interchanges, or freeway ramps?	significant cumulative impacts on roadway segments and intersections listed in Impact 4.13-1 Traffic Circulation. While Mitigation Measures MM-TR-1 through MM-TR-41 would reduce potentially significant impacts to roadway segments and intersections if implemented, none of the measures are proposed to be included within the proposed CPU because they would require road widening or other automobile-related improvements that would preclude implementation of planned pedestrian and bicycle improvements as well as realization of the proposed CPU mobility vision and other proposed CPU and General Plan goals and policies regarding walkability and bicycling, and were therefore determined not to be appropriate for the roadway network. Therefore, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable. Mitigation Measures MM-TR-42 through MM-TR-62 are identified for impacts to freeways and onramps. The improvements identified in SANDAG's Regional Plan (2015) would improve operations along the freeway segments and ramps; however, there is insufficient information regarding the improvements and future developments' project-level impacts to allow the City to include such improvements within the proposed CPU to form the basis for a fair share mitigation fee for future development at this time. The City will continue to coordinate with Caltrans and SANDAG on future improvements, as future project-level development proceeds, to potentially develop "fair share" mitigation strategies for freeway impacts, as appropriate. MM-TR-63 and MM-TR-64 encourage this inter-agency coordination. However, these impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.		

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
4.13-2 Would the proposed CPU conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?	The proposed CPU would be consistent with the adopted policies, plans, or programs that support alternative transportation and improvements to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. These improvements include enhancements to pedestrian travel within the CPU area such as implementing the multi-use urban path system, constructing sidewalks and intersection improvements, and installing missing sidewalks and curb ramps. The IFS for the proposed CPU will also include planned pedestrian improvements to install curb ramps, sidewalks, and audible pedestrian signals to meet ADA standards. Implementation of the proposed CPU would not restrict or impede pedestrian connectivity and would not conflict with any adopted policies or plans addressing pedestrian facilities. Thus, impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None required	Less than significant
4.14 Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character			
4.14-1 Would the proposed CPU result in substantial obstruction of a vista or scenic view from a public viewing area as identified in the community plan?	Implementation of the proposed CPU would not result in a substantial alteration or blockage of public views from critical view corridors, designated open space areas, public roads, or public parks; new development within the community would take place within the constraints of the existing urban framework and development pattern. Thus, future development would not impact view corridors or viewsheds as viewed from identified public vantage points. Impacts would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.14-2 Would the proposed CPU result in substantial adverse alteration (e.g., bulk, scale, materials or style) to the existing or planned (adopted) character of the area?	Future development projects would be undertaken in accordance with the General Plan, which provides direction on urban design in accordance with a community vision, and the SDMC, which provides development standards by zone. As an amendment to the General Plan, the proposed CPU maintains existing policies and regulations related to bulk, scale, materials, and style. As part of the proposed CPU implementation, the SDMC will be amended to add CPIOZ regulations from the existing Mission Valley Planned District	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
	Ordinance (PDO) to provide consistent development standards. Compliance with the General Plan policies and SDMC regulations, and implementation of proposed CPU policies would ensure new development would be consistent with or enhance the existing neighborhood character. Impacts related to substantial alterations to the existing or planned character of the area would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.		
4.14-3 Would the proposed CPU result in the loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or stand of mature trees as identified in the community plan?	No distinctive or landmark trees or mature stands of trees have been designated in the CPU area. Adherence to the regulations in the Hillside Conservation Design, and Height Limitation CPIOZ and the San Diego River CPIOZ regarding the preservation and use of trees, and implementation of proposed CPU policies supporting the incorporation of trees would ensure that impacts are less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant
4.14-4 Would the proposed CPU result in a substantial change in the existing landform?	The proposed CPU would entail intensification of uses on the northern and southern hillsides of the CPU area. Through adherence to regulations in the San Diego River CPIOZ; the Hillside Conservation, Design, and Height Limitation CPIOZ; and the SDMC; and through implementation of proposed CPU policies, impacts to the landform from future development would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant

Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

<i>Impact</i>	<i>Results of Impact Analysis</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Impact Level after Mitigation</i>
4.14-5 Would the proposed CPU create substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime and nighttime views in the area?	Future development implemented in accordance with the proposed CPU would necessitate the use of additional light fixtures and may contribute to existing conditions of light and glare. Glare from new development would be regulated under the SDMC, and lighting impacts to the MHPA that occur adjacent to the CPU area would be addressed through compliance with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The proposed CPU also includes policies encouraging lighting that is energy efficient and that minimizes light pollution. Therefore, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant. No mitigation is required.	None Required	Less than significant