THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Date of Notice: May 13, 2015
PUBLIC NOTICE
OF THE PREPARATION OF A PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
AND
A SCOPING MEETING
INTERNAL ORDER No. 21003516

PUBLIC NOTICE: The City of San Diego as the Lead Agency has determined that the project described below will require the preparation of a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This Notice of Preparation of a PEIR and Scoping Meeting was publicly noticed and distributed on May 13, 2015. This notice was published in the SAN DIEGO DAILY TRANSCRIPT and placed on the City of San Diego website at:

http://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/officialdocs/notices/index.shtml

SCOPING MEETING: A public scoping meeting will be held by the City of San Diego's Planning Department on **Wednesday, June 3, 2015** from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 PM in the City of San Diego RHC Auditorium located at 9601 Ridgehaven Court, San Diego CA 92123. **Please note that depending on the number of attendees, the meeting could end earlier than the end times noted above.** Verbal and written comments regarding the scope and alternatives of the proposed EIR will be accepted at the meeting.

Please send in written/mail-in comments may also be sent to the following address**: Myra Herrmann, Environmental Planner, City of San Diego Planning Department, 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101 or e-mail your comments to DSDEAS@sandiego.gov with the Project Name and Number in the subject line Number** within 30 days of the receipt of this notice/date of the Public Notice above. Responsible agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with this project when responding. An EIR incorporating public input will then be prepared and distributed for the public to review and comment.

PROJECT NAME / No.: SINGLE-USE CARRYOUT BAG ORDINANCE /347344
COMMUNITY AREAS: Citywide
COUNCIL DISTRICT: All Council Districts

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL for the enactment of an ordinance restricting the use of plastic and paper single-use carryout bags, and promoting the use of reusable bags. This proposed ordinance would amend Chapter 6, Article 6 of the San Diego Municipal Code, adding new Division 8, Sections 66.0801, 66.0802, 66.0803, 66.0804, 66.0805, 66.0806, 66.0807, and 66.0808.

The City of San Diego is proposing to reduce the adverse environmental impacts associated with single-use plastic carryout bags, including plastic bag litter. The City proposes to adopt and implement an ordinance to regulate the use of single-use plastic carryout bags and promote the use of reusable bags within the City. The proposed ordinance would: prohibit plastic single-use carryout bags at the point of sale in retail stores and require retailers to provide reusable bags to consumers for sale or at no charge, and mandate a charge on recycled content paper single-use carryout bag and reusable carryout bags at the point of sale in retail stores. More specifically, the proposed Carryout Bag Reduction Ordinance would:

1. Preclude the distribution of single-use plastic carryout bags and non-recyclable single-use paper carryout bags to point-of-sale customers at stores subject to the ordinance.
2. Require stores subject to this ordinance to collect a 10 cent charge for each recyclable single-use paper carryout bag provided to point-of-sale customers.
3. Apply to the following:
    a. Retail stores with annual sales of $2 million selling food and non-food goods, and a line of dry grocery, canned goods, or nonfood items and some perishable items.
    b. Stores with at least 10,000 square feet of retail space with a pharmacy.
    c. Drug stores, pharmacies, supermarkets, grocery stores, convenience food stores, food marts, or other entities selling a limited line of goods that includes milk, bread, soda, and snack foods.
4. Not regulate:
    a. Produce/product bags used to keep individual items separated and protected from other items in the carryout bag.
    b. Restaurants.
    c. Non-profit stores that sell used goods.
    d. Participants in the WIC or Supplemental Food Programs. (The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) provides Federal grants to States for supplemental foods, health care referrals, and nutrition education for low-income pregnant, breastfeeding, and non-breastfeeding postpartum women, and to infants and children up to age five who are found to be at nutritional risk.)
5. Require stores subject to the ordinance to provide or make available to customers only recyclable paper single-use carryout bags or reusable carryout bags for carrying away goods or materials from the point of sale.
6. Require stores subject to the ordinance to charge at least 10 cents per reusable carryout bag.
7. Allow reusable bags to be provided for free during an infrequent (once per 12-month period), limited time (up to 90-days) promotion.
8. Require stores subject to the ordinance to keep complete and accurate records of the number of recyclable single-use paper carryout bags sold and the total amount of monies collected for the sale of recyclable single-use paper carryout bags.
9. Not require periodic reporting, although the City may request data.
10. Provide complaint-based enforcement.
11. Phase implementation to allow for the transitional use of remaining single-use plastic and non-recyclable paper carryout bag inventories.
12. Provide City-sponsored reusable bag distribution events and provide public outreach to describe the ordinance requirements and the correct maintenance of reusable bags.

The proposed ordinance would not preclude plastic or paper bags that are used by customers and the store to protect or contain meat or prepared food; or used for produce, or for other goods that must be protected from moisture. Restaurant, pharmacy, clothing, and dry cleaner bags would be exempt from the proposed ordinance. A grace period of six months for large retailers and one year for small retailers would be provided to allow retailers to phase out stocks of plastic bags. After the grace period, retailers would charge $0.10 per paper bag, which would be retained by the retailer. The City's Environmental Services Department (ESD) has conducted a public education program for several years, and will continue these activities through the grace period.

Applicant: City of San Diego, Environmental Services Department

Recommended Finding: Pursuant to Section 15060(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, it appears that the proposed project may result in significant environmental impacts in the following areas: **Air Quality/Odor, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Agricultural & Forestry Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Energy, Public Services and Facilities, and Public Utilities.**

Availability in Alternative Format: To request the this Notice or the City's letter to the applicant detailing the required scope of work (EIR Scoping Letter) in alternative format, call the Planning Department at (619) 235-5200 (800) 735-2929 (TEXT TELEPHONE).

Additional Information: For environmental review information, contact Myra Herrmann at (619) 446-5372. The Scoping Letter and supporting documents may be reviewed, or purchased for the cost of reproduction, in the Planning Department at 1222 1st Avenue, Fifth Floor. For information regarding public meetings/hearings on this project, contact the Project Manager, Jennifer Ott-Rol, at (858) 573-1285 or via email: jott@sandiego.gov. This notice was published in the SAN DIEGO DAILY TRANSCRIPT and distributed on **May 13, 2015**.

Tom Tomlinson
Interim Director
Planning Department

DISTRIBUTION: See Attached
ATTACHMENT: Scoping Letter

DISTRIBUTION:

United States Government
Federal Aviation Administration (1)
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, SW Division, Environmental Planning (12)
MCAS Miramar (13)
Marine Corps Recruit Depot Facilities Div. (14)
Environmental Protection Agency (19)
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (23)
USDA Natural Resources Conservation Services (25)
Army Corps of Engineers (26)

State of California
Caltrans District 11 (31)
Department of Fish and Wildlife (32)
Cal Recycle (35)
California Environmental Protection Agency (37A)
Department of Toxic Substance Control (39)
Natural Resources Agency (43)
Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 9 (44)
Department of Water Resources (45)
State Clearinghouse (46A)
California Coastal Commission (47)
California Air Resources Board (49)
State Coastal Conservancy (54)
State Water Resources Control Board Division of Clean Water Programs (55)
Native American Heritage Commission (56)
California Energy Commission (59)
California Dept. of Conservation (60)

San Diego County
Agriculture Department (64)
Air Pollution Control Board (65)
Planning and Land Use (68)
Parks Department (69)
Public Works (72)
County Water Authority (73)
Department of Environmental Health (76)

City of San Diego
Office of the Mayor (91)
Scott Chadwick
Stacey LoMedico
David Graham
Ron Villa
Mike Hansen
Council President Lightner, District 1
Councilmember Zapf, District 2
Councilmember Gloria, District 3
Councilmember Cole, District 4
Councilmember Kersey, District 5
Councilmember Zapf, District 6

Councilmember Sherman, District 7
Councilmember Alvarez, District 8
Council President Pro Tem Emerald, District 9

Office of the City Attorney
Shannon Thomas
Heather Stroud
Amanda Guy

Environmental Services Department (Applicant)
Mario Sierra, Director
Darren Greenhalgh, Deputy Director
David Weil
Mary Valerio
Ken Prue
Jennifer Ott-Rol
Lisa Wood
Burton Ewert
Andrea Altman
Gavin Broatch
Meghan Cannis
Ana Carvalho
Martha espinola
Rebecca Hays
Rene Kaprielian
Chelsea Klaseus
Renee Robertson
Julie Sands
Beth Wright
Mike Thompspn
John Howard
Alex Gonzales

Planning Department
Tom Tomlinson, Interim Director
Nancy Bragado
Myra Herrmann
Kristy Forburger
Jeanne Krosch
Rebecca Malone
Susan Morrison
Seth Litchney
Kurtis Steinert

Development Services Department
Robert Vacchi, Director
Kerry Santoro
Martha Blake
Jeff Szymanski
Elizabeth Shearer-Nguyen
Anna McPherson

Corporate Partnerships & Development
Natasha Collura, Director

Communications Department
Bill Harris
Jose Ysea
Lana Findlay

Public Utilities Department
Halla Razak, Director
John Helminski
Mike Elling
Keli Balo

Public Works Department
James Nagelvoort, Director

Economic Development
Erik Caldwell, Director
Cody Hooven
Russ Gibbon
Jim Davies

Park and Recreation Department
Herman Parker, Director
Andrew Field
Chris Zirkle

Fire-Rescue Department
Chief Javier Mainar
Chief Rick Wurts

Police Department
Chief Shelley Zimmerman

Transportation & Storm Water Department
Kris McFadden, Director
Andrew Kleis
Ruth Kolb
Linda Marabian

Real Estate Assets Department
Cybele Thompson, Director

City Government
Civic San Diego (242)
San Diego Housing Commission (88)

City Advisory Boards or Committees
Mission Bay Park Committee (318A)
Airports Advisory Committee (MS 14)
Park and Recreation Board (83)
Community Forest Advisory Board (90)
Small Business Advisory Board (MS 904)
Historical Resources Board (87)
Wetland Advisory Board (91A)
La Jolla Shores PDO Advisory Board (279)
Sustainable Energy Advisory Board

Libraries
Central Library, Government Documents (81 & 81A)
Balboa Branch Library (81B)
Beckwourth Branch Library (81C)
Benjamin Branch Library (81D)
Carmel Mountain Ranch Branch Library (81E)
Carmel Valley Branch Library (81F)
City Heights/Weingart Branch Library (81G)
Clairemont Branch Library (81H)
College-Rolando Branch Library (81I)
Kensington-Normal Heights Branch Library (81K)
La Jolla/Riford Branch Library (81L)
Linda Vista Branch Library (81M)
Logan Heights Branch Library (81N)
Malcolm X Library & Performing Arts Center (81O)
Mira Mesa Branch Library (81P)
Mission Hills Branch Library (81Q)
Mission Valley Branch Library (81R)
North Clairemont Branch Library (81S)
North Park Branch Library (81T)
Oak Park Branch Library (81U)
Ocean Beach Branch Library (81V)
Otay Mesa-Nestor Branch Library (81W)
Pacific Beach/Taylor Branch Library (81X)
Paradise Hills Branch Library (81Y)
Point Loma/Hervey Branch Library (81Z)
Rancho Bernardo Branch Library (81AA)
Rancho Peñasquitos Branch Library (81BB)
READ San Diego (81CC)
San Carlos Branch Library (81DD)
San Ysidro Branch Library (81EE)
Scripps Miramar Ranch Branch Library (81FF)
Serra Mesa Branch Library (81GG)
Skyline Hills Branch Library (81HH)
Tierrasanta Branch Library (81II)
University Community Branch Library (81JJ)
North University Branch Library (81JJJ)
University Heights Branch Library (81KK)

Other City Governments
City of Chula Vista (94)
City of El Cajon (97)
City of Escondido (98)
City of Imperial Beach (99)
City of National City (102)
City of Poway (103)
City of Santee (104)
San Diego Association of Governments (108)
San Diego Unified Port District (109)
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (110)
Metropolitan Transit System (112/115)
San Diego Gas & Electric (114)
San Dieguito River Park JPA (116)

School Districts
Chula Vista School District (118)
Grossmont Union High School District (120)
La Mesa-Spring Valley School District (121)
National City School District (123)
Poway Unified School District (124)
San Diego Unified School District (125)
San Ysidro School District (127)
Santee School District (128)
South Bay Unified School District (130)
San Diego Community College District (133)
UCSD (134)

Community Planning Groups or Committees
Community Planners Committee (194)
Balboa Park Committee (226, MS 35)
Black Mountain Ranch –Subarea I (226C)
Otay Mesa - Nestor Planning Committee (228)
Otay Mesa Planning Committee (235)
Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee (248)
Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee (259)
Serra Mesa Planning Group (263A)
Kearny Mesa Community Planning Group (265)
Linda Vista Community Planning Committee (267)
La Jolla Community Planning Association (275)
City Heights Area Planning Committee (287)
Kensington-Talmadge Planning Committee (290)
Normal Heights Community Planning Committee (291)
Eastern Area Planning Committee (302)
Midway/Pacific Highway Community Planning Group (307)
Mira Mesa Community Planning Group (310)
Mission Beach Precise Planning Board (325)
Mission Valley Unified Planning Organization (331)
Navajo Community Planners Inc. (336)
Carmel Valley Community Planning Board (350)
Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board (361)
North Park Planning Committee (363)
Ocean Beach Planning Board (367)
Old Town Community Planning Committee (368)
Pacific Beach Community Planning Committee (375)
Pacific Highlands Ranch – Subarea III (377A)
Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board (380)
Peninsula Community Planning Board (390)
Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board (400)
Sabre Springs Community Planning Group (406B)
San Pasqual - Lake Hodges Planning Group (426)
San Ysidro Planning and Development Group (433)
Scripps Ranch Community Planning Group (437)
Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee (439)
Skyline - Paradise Hills Planning Committee (443)
Torrey Hills Community Planning Board (444A)
Southeastern San Diego Planning Committee (449)
Encanto Neighborhoods Community Planning Group (449A)
College Area Community Planning Board (456)

Tierrasanta Community Council (462)
Torrey Highlands – Subarea IV (467)
Torrey Pines Community Planning Board (469)
University City Community Planning Group (480)
Uptown Planners (498)

Community Councils
Town Council Presidents Association (197)
Barrio Station, Inc. (241)
Downtown Community Council (243)
Harborview Community Council (245)
Clairemont Town Council (257)
Serra Mesa Community Council (264)
La Jolla Town Council (273)
Rolando Community Council (288)
Oak Park Community Council (298)
Darnell Community Council (306)
Mission Beach Town Council (326)
Mission Valley Community Council (328 C)
San Carlos Area Council (338)
Carmel Mountain Ranch Community Council (344)
Ocean Beach Town Council, Inc. (367 A)
Pacific Beach Town Council (374)
Rancho Penasquitos Town Council (383)
Rancho Bernardo Community Council, Inc. (398)
San Dieguito Planning Group (412)
United Border Community Town Council (434)
Tierrasanta Community Council (462)
Murphy Canyon Community Council (463)

Other Agencies, Organizations and Individuals
San Diego Chamber of Commerce (157)
Building Industry Association (158)
San Diego River Park Foundation (163)
San Diego River Coalition (164)
Sierra Club (165)
San Diego Canyonlands (165A)
San Diego Natural History Museum (166)
San Diego Audubon Society (167)
Jim Peugh (167A)
San Diego River Conservancy (168)
Environmental Health Coalition (169)
California Native Plant Society (170)
San Diego Coast & Baykeeper (173)
Citizens Coordinate for Century 3 (179)
Endangered Habitats League (182 & 182A)
San Diego Tracking Team (187)
League of Women Voters (192)
National City Chamber of Commerce (200)
Carmen Lucas (206)
South Coastal Information Center (210)
San Diego Historical Society (211)
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
Save Our Heritage Organization (214)
Ron Chrisman (215)
Clint Linton (215B)
Frank Brown - Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Council (216)

Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)
San Diego County Archaeological Society Inc. (218)
Kuumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)
Kuumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)
Native American Distribution
    Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (225A)
    Campo Band of Mission Indians (225B)
    Ewiiaapaayp Band of Mission Indians (225C)
    Inaja Band of Mission Indians (225D)
    Jamul Indian Village (225E)
    La Posta Band of Mission Indians (225F)
    Manzanita Band of Mission Indians (225G)
    Sycuan Band of Mission Indians (225H)
    Viejas Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (225I)
    Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians (225J)
    San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians (225K)
    Ipai Nation of Santa Ysabel (225L)
    La Jolla Band of Mission Indians (225M)
    Pala Band of Mission Indians (225N)
    Pauma Band of Mission Indians (225O)
    Pechanga Band of Mission Indians (225P)
    Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians (225Q)
    San Luis Rey Band of Luiseno Indians (225R)
    Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians (225S)
Otay Valley Regional Park CAC – John Willett (227)
Tijuana River National Estuarine Reserve (229)
Chuck Tanner – County San Diego OVRP Rep (232)
Downtown San Diego Partnership (237)
Deron Bear – Marion Bear Natural Park Recreation Council (253)
Tecolote Canyon Citizens Advisory Committee (254)
Friends of Tecolote Canyon (255)
Tecolote Canyon Rim Owner's Protection Association (256)
Friends of Switzer Canyon (260)
Marion Bear Natural Park Recreation Council (266A/267A)
UCSD Natural Reserve System (284)
John Stump (304)
Chollas Lake Park Recreation Council (305)
Friends of Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve, Inc. (313)
Surfer's Tired of Pollution (318)
Debbie Knight (320)
League of Conservation Voters (322)
Mission Bay Lessees (323)
San Diego River Conservancy (330A)
Friends of the Mission Valley Preserve (330B)
River Valley Preservation Project (334)
Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens Advisory Committee (341)
Carmel Valley Trail Riders Coalition (351)
Carmel Mountain Conservancy (354)
Los Peñasquitos Canyon Preserve Citizens Advisory Committee (360)
Ocean Beach Merchant's Association (367B)
Friends of Rose Canyon (386)
San Dieguito Lagoon Committee (409)
San Dieguito River Park CAC (415)
Friends of San Dieguito River Valley (419)
San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy (421)
RVR PARC (423)

Beeler Canyon Conservancy (436)
Jim Dawe (445)
Mission Trails Regional Park (465)
San Diego 350.org - Emily Weir
Allovher@me.com
Jonathan Zaidman
Ann Kinner
Barbara Janeway
Ben Kalasho
Bill Hickman
Brigid Moore
Camille Hogan
Carlos Illingworth
Carlytoyer@gmail.com
Cathy Browne
Chris Carter
Chris Clark
Chris Duggan
Stephen Heverly
Coriretherford@yahoo.com
Crystal Carson
Cyndee Mendonca
David Koontz
David Rabban
Deirdre Ballou
Devin Longfellow
Diana Castaneda
Diane Takvorian
Drew Beal
Faith Picking
Haley Haggerstone
Herbert Schwab
Janet Whited
Jeff Olson
Jenna Harris
Jennifer Finnegan
John Reaves
Jon Basolone
JP Conley
Kath Rogers
Kathy Lynch
Kendra Doyel
Kevin Konopasek
Kristin Kuhn
Lani Lutar
Lindsay Goodwin
Mandy Lee
Mark Arabo
Masada Disenhouse

Megan Baehrens
Michael Wonsidler
Morgan Justice-Black
Nathan Weaver
Orlando Palizzolo
Paola Avila
Patrick Rita
Laura Peralta
Philip Rozenski
R.monique.88@gmail.com
Rachel Bair
Rafael Guerrero
Randy Okamura
RicAnthony@aol.com
Richard Miller
Rick Crandall
Roger Kube
Sara Church
Sarah Diaz Roth
Sarah Hutmacher
Shari Sehlhorst
Stephen Joseph
Sue Vang
William Evans
Alex Acuña
Benita Webber
Christy Johnson
Emily Bates
Erin Pennell
Jacob Zehnder
John Adam
Leigh Brown
Pauline Martinson
Rock Church - God's Clean Earth Ministry
Sean Fruin
Simpao, Monique Y
Zachary Plopper
Beth Foster
Jacy Bolden
Joan Raphael
Angela Deegan
Grace Van Thillo
Janina Moretti
Philip Petrie
Lyla Fadali
Mike Bullock

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

May 13, 2015

SUBJECT: Scope of Work for a Draft Program Environmental Impact Report for the City of San Diego Municipal Code Single-Use Carryout Bag Ordinance ("Project"). SCH No. *Pending*

Pursuant to Section 15060(d) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Environmental and Resource Analysis (E&RA) Division of the City of San Diego Planning Department has determined that the proposed project, referenced above, may have significant effects on the environment, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

The purpose of this letter is to identify the specific issues to be addressed in the EIR. The EIR shall be consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15161 and will focus on key environmental issue areas.

The EIR should be prepared in accordance with the *City of San Diego Technical Report and Environmental Impact Report Guidelines* (Updated May 2005). A Notice of Preparation (NOP) is being distributed concurrently to Trustee and Responsible Agencies and others who may have an interest in the project in accordance with CEQA Section 21083.9(a)(2) for projects of statewide, regional, or area-wide environmental impacts. A Scoping Meeting has been scheduled for June 3, 2015. Changes or additions to the scope of work may be required as a result of input received in response to the Scoping Meetings and NOP. Furthermore, should the project scope be modified during the scoping stage or EIR review process and/or by the applicant, these changes shall be disclosed in the EIR under the section "History of Project Changes" and be accounted for in the EIR impacts analysis to the extent required by CEQA.

Each section and issue area of the EIR shall provide a descriptive analysis of the project followed by a comprehensive evaluation. The EIR shall also include sufficient graphics and tables, which in conjunction with the relevant narrative discussions, provide a complete and meaningful description of all major project features, the environmental impacts of the project, as well as cumulative impacts, mitigation of significant impacts, and alternatives to the project.

Project Location: The Municipal Code regulates activities within the entire City of San Diego.

SUBJECT: CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL for the enactment of an ordinance restricting the use of plastic and paper single-use carryout bags, and promoting the use of reusable bags. This proposed ordinance would amend Chapter 6, Article 6 of the San Diego Municipal Code, adding

new Division 8, Sections 66.0801, 66.0802, 66.0803, 66.0804, 66.0805, 66.0806, 66.0807, 66.0808 and 66.0809.

The City of San Diego is proposing to reduce the adverse environmental impacts associated with single-use plastic carryout bags, including plastic bag litter. The City proposes to adopt and implement an ordinance to regulate the use of single-use plastic carryout bags and promote the use of reusable bags within the City. The proposed ordinance would: prohibit plastic single-use carryout bags at the point of sale in retail stores and require retailers to provide reusable bags to consumers for sale or at no charge, and mandate a charge on recycled content paper single-use carryout bag and reusable carryout bags at the point of sale in retail stores. More specifically, the proposed Carryout Bag Reduction Ordinance would:

1. Preclude the distribution of single-use plastic carryout bags and non-recyclable single-use paper carryout bags to point-of-sale customers at stores subject to the ordinance.
2. Require stores subject to this ordinance to collect a 10 cent charge for each recyclable single-use paper carryout bag provided to point-of-sale customers.
3. Apply to the following:
    a. Retail stores with annual sales of $2 million selling food and non-food goods, and a line of dry grocery, canned goods, or nonfood items and some perishable items.
    b. Stores with at least 10,000 square feet of retail space with a pharmacy.
    c. Drug stores, pharmacies, supermarkets, grocery stores, convenience food stores, food marts, or other entities selling a limited line of goods that includes milk, bread, soda, and snack foods.
4. Not regulate:
    a. Produce/product bags used to keep individual items separated and protected from other items in the carryout bag.
    b. Restaurants.
    c. Non-profit stores that sell used goods.
    d. Participants in the WIC or Supplemental Food Programs. (The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) provides Federal grants to States for supplemental foods, health care referrals, and nutrition education for low-income pregnant, breastfeeding, and non-breastfeeding postpartum women, and to infants and children up to age five who are found to be at nutritional risk.)
5. Require stores subject to the ordinance to provide or make available to customers only recyclable paper single-use carryout bags or reusable carryout bags for carrying away goods or materials from the point of sale.
6. Require stores subject to the ordinance to charge at least 10 cents per reusable carryout bag.
7. Allow reusable bags to be provided for free during an infrequent (once per 12-month period), limited time (up to 90-days) promotion.
8. Require stores subject to the ordinance to keep complete and accurate records of the number of recyclable single-use paper carryout bags provided and the total amount of monies collected for the sale of recyclable single-use paper carryout bags.
9. Not require periodic reporting, although the City may request data.

10. Provide complaint-based enforcement.
11. Phase implementation to allow for the transitional use of remaining single-use plastic and non-recyclable paper carryout bag inventories.
12. Provide City-sponsored reusable bag distribution events and provide public outreach to describe the ordinance requirements and the correct maintenance of reusable bags.

The proposed ordinance would not preclude plastic or paper bags that are used by customers and the store to protect or contain meat or prepared food; or used for produce, or for other goods that must be protected from moisture. Restaurant, pharmacy, clothing, and dry cleaner bags would be exempt from the proposed ordinance. A grace period of six months for large retailers and one year for small retailers would be provided to allow retailers to phase out stocks of plastic bags. After the grace period, retailers would charge $0.10 per paper bag, which would be retained by the retailer. The City's Environmental Services Department (ESD) has conducted a public education program for several years, and will continue these activities through the grace period.

EIR FORMAT AND CONTENT

The EIR serves to inform governmental agencies and the public of a project's environmental impacts. Emphasis on the EIR must be on identifying feasible solutions to environmental problems. The objective is not simply to describe and document an impact, but to actively create and suggest mitigation measures or project alternatives that would avoid or substantially reduce the significant adverse environmental impacts. The adequacy of the EIR will depend greatly on the thoroughness of this effort. The EIR must be written in an objective, clear and concise manner, and must meet the requirements of CEQA. Wherever possible, use graphics to replace extensive word descriptions and to assist in clarification. Conclusions must be supported by substantial evidence presented in the EIR or otherwise contained in the administrative record, with quantitative, as well as qualitative information to the extent practicable.

Prior to distribution of the Draft EIR (DEIR), Conclusions will be attached to the front of the DEIR. The Conclusions cannot be prepared until a DEIR has been submitted and accepted for release by the City. The DEIR shall include a Title Page which includes the Project Number, State Clearinghouse Number (SCH No.) and the date of publication and an Executive Summary, reflecting the DEIR outline for each issue area identified below in Section V, but need not contain every element of the DEIR. Additional information regarding specific content and formatting of the DEIR can be found in the City's *Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (updated December 2005)* as outlined below.

I. INTRODUCTION

Introduce the proposed project with a brief discussion on the intended use and purpose of the PEIR. Describe and/or incorporate by reference any previously certified environmental documents that address the project site. Summarize the discretionary City actions associated with the project and other local, state, or federal approvals or reviews anticipated to occur for the project, with the more detailed description of required approvals to be projects in Section III-Project Description. This section should also describe the basis for how this PEIR will be used for subsequent environmental review of projects implemented in accordance with the Program and/or additional required approvals (if applicable).

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The EIR should (i) describe the general location of the City of San Diego planning area and present it on a topographic map and regional map; (ii) provide a local and regional description of the environmental setting of the project as it relates to the project; and (iii) include any applicable land use plans/overlay zones, if any, that would be affected by the ordinance such as the City of San Diego's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP)/Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), environmentally sensitive lands such as steep hillsides, wetlands, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100 year floodplains or floodways.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Draft PEIR shall include a statement of the goals and objectives of the ordinance. A clearly written statement of the project objectives will assist in defining a reasonable range of alternatives to include in the Draft PEIR, which would avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts. This section of the document should include a discussion of all discretionary actions required for Project approval and implementation.

Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines (Section 15168), a Program EIR allows the lead agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures at an early time when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts, and allow reduction in paperwork. In addition, it may be used with the intent of streamlining and limiting the later environmental review required for subsequent actions associated with ordinance implementation.

IV. HISTORY OF PROJECT CHANGES

This section of the EIR shall outline the history of the project and any material changes that have been made to the proposed project in response to environmental concerns raised during public and agency review of the project (i.e., in response to NOP or public scoping meetings or during the public review period for the Draft EIR).

V. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The potential for significant environmental impacts must be thoroughly analyzed and mitigation measures identified that would avoid or substantially lessen any such significant impacts. Below are key environmental issue areas that have been identified for this project, within which the issue statements must be addressed individually. Discussion of each issue statement should include an explanation of the existing conditions, impact analysis, significance determination, and appropriate mitigation. The impact analysis should address potential direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that could be created through implementation of the proposed project and its alternatives. Because bag manufacture does not occur locally, only a general description of manufacturing should be provided.

AIR QUALITY/ODOR

Issue 1: Would the proposed project result in air emissions that would substantially deteriorate ambient air quality, including the exposure of sensitive receptors

to substantial pollutant concentrations, (e.g., exposure to new residential areas resulting from truck route emissions; MHPA buffers)?

Issue 2: Would the proposed project affect the ability of the Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) to meet the federal and state clean air standards? Would the proposed project conflict with implementation of other regional air quality plans?

The EIR should describe the City of San Diego's climatological setting within the San Diego Air Basin and the basin's current attainment levels for state and federal Ambient Air Quality Standards. It should discuss potential modifications to traffic emissions that could result from differential stocking requirements caused by foreseeable shifts in consumer behavior. However, because it is not known what, if any, manufacturing sources of carryout bags will be affected; speculative life-cycle detail should be avoided. Only a general description of air emissions associated with manufacturing processes should be provided.

The EIR should discuss any short, long-term, and cumulative impacts the project may have on regional air quality, including construction and transportation-related sources of air pollutants, and any proposed mitigation measures.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Issue 1: Would the proposed project generate Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment?

Issue 2: Would the proposed project conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The GHG analysis should describe the City and State's greenhouse gas reduction efforts. It should discuss potential modifications to traffic emissions that could result from differential stocking requirements caused by foreseeable shifts in consumer behavior. However, because it is not known what, if any, manufacturing sources of carryout bags will be affected; speculative life-cycle detail should be avoided. Only a general description of greenhouse gases associated with manufacturing processes should be provided.

The EIR should discuss any short-term, long-term, and cumulative greenhouse gas emissions including construction and transportation-related sources, and any proposed mitigation measures.

AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

Issue 1: Would the proposed project have any significant impacts on agricultural and forestry resources?

Because it is not known what, if any, manufacturing sources of carryout bags will be affected, speculative life-cycle detail should be avoided. Only a general description of agricultural and forest resources associated with manufacturing processes should be

provided. The EIR should discuss any short, long-term, and cumulative forest impacts the project may have in the City of San Diego, if any, and any proposed mitigation measures.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Issue 1: Would the proposed project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Because it is not known what, if any, manufacturing sources of carryout bags will be affected, speculative life-cycle detail should be avoided. Only a general description of hazardous materials associated with manufacturing processes should be provided.

The EIR should discuss any short, long-term, and cumulative hazardous materials impacts the project may have in the City of San Diego, if any, and any proposed mitigation measures.

HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Issue 1: Would adoption of the ordinance have any impact on surface or groundwater quality or would it lower the groundwater?

Issue 2: Would adoption of the ordinance result in a substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes?

Issue 3: Would adoption of the ordinance substantially degrade water quality and violate any water quality objectives set by the State Water Resources Control Board, due to increases in sediments and other contaminants?

The proposed ordinance does not include any local development and therefore direct impacts to hydrology and water quality are not anticipated; however, the EIR should address the incremental increase in the number of recycled paper and reusable bags that would be used in the City of San Diego, the overall reduction in the total amount of carryout bags that would incrementally reduce the amount of litter and waste entering storm drains, and the beneficial effect this would have on improving water quality, hydrologic flow through the City's storm drain system and on downstream resources.

UTILITIES

Issue 1: Would the proposed project result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing infrastructure within the project area?

The proposed ordinance does not include any local development and therefore would have no effect on local utilities. Because it is not known what, if any, manufacturing sources of carryout bags will be affected, speculative life-cycle detail should be avoided. Only a general description of hypothetical utility needs associated with bag manufacturing should be provided.

PUBLIC SERVICES:

Issue 1: Would the project result in demand for new or physically altered governmental facilities or services that could cause significant impacts in the project area?

The proposed ordinance does not include any local development and therefore would have no effect on local public services. Because it is not known what, if any, manufacturing sources of carryout bags will be affected, speculative life-cycle detail should be avoided. Only a general description of hypothetical utility needs associated with bag manufacturing should be provided.

MINERAL RESOURCES:

Issue 1: Would the project result in the loss of availability of a mineral resource that is of local, regional, or statewide importance.

The proposed ordinance does not include any local development and therefore would have no effect on local mineral resources. Because it is not known what, if any, manufacturing sources of carryout bags will be affected, speculative life-cycle detail should be avoided. Only a general description of hypothetical mineral resource use associated with bag manufacturing should be provided.

ENERGY

Appendix F of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that potentially significant energy implications of a project shall be considered in an EIR to the extent relevant and applicable to the project. Particular emphasis on avoiding or reducing inefficient, wasteful, and unnecessary consumption of energy should be included in this section. The PEIR section shall address the estimated energy use for the project and assess whether the project would generate a demand for energy (electricity and/or natural gas) that would exceed the planned capacity of the energy suppliers and include any water saving project features in this section. This section would be cross-referenced with the GHG Emissions discussion section of the PEIR as appropriate, shall describe any proposed measures included as part of the project directed at conserving energy and reducing energy consumption, and shall address all applicable issues described within Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines.

VI. SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED IF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED

This section shall describe the significant unavoidable impacts of the ordinance, if any, including those significant impacts that can be mitigated but not reduced to below a level of significance, if any.

VII. SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

In accordance with CEQA Section 15126.2(c), the EIR must include a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the proposed action should it be implemented. The EIR should also address the use of nonrenewable resources associated with ordinance implementation. See CEQA Section 15127 for limitations on the requirements for this discussion.

VIII. GROWTH INDUCEMENT

The EIR should address the potential for growth inducement through implementation of the project. The EIR should discuss the ways in which the ordinance could foster economic or population growth, or construction of additional housing either directly or indirectly. Accelerated growth could further strain existing community facilities or encourage activities that could significantly affect the environment. This section need not conclude that growth-inducing impacts, if any, are significant unless the project would induce substantial growth or concentration of population.

IX. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

CEQA requires a discussion of cumulative impacts when they are significant. The determination of cumulative significance calls for reasonable effort to discover and disclose other related projects. The direct and indirect impacts of each related project need to be identified and looked at comprehensively. CEQA provides various alternative methods to achieve an adequate discussion of cumulative impacts (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 noting the repealed sections of 15064(i)(4) and 15130(a)(4)). Specific sections of the City's Significance Thresholds provide significance determination criteria for cumulative impacts under individual issue areas (e.g. biology, air quality, traffic). However, in general the following rule of thumb should apply for determining significant cumulative impacts:

1. If there are known documented existing significant impacts occurring in a community, additional increments would exacerbate the impact (e.g. an overloaded transportation system).

2. If a community plan and/or precise plan identifies cumulative impacts in the community wide EIR, individual projects which contribute significantly to the community wide impacts would be considered cumulatively significant.

3. A large scale project (usually regional in nature) for which direct impacts are mitigated by the collective number of individual impacts results in a cumulative impact.

As defined in Section 15355, a cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the project evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) together with other projects causing related impacts. An EIR should not discuss impacts which do not result in part from the project evaluated in the PEIR.

Section 15355 defines "cumulative impacts" as follows:

Cumulative impacts refers to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

(a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects;

(b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other

closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

The PEIR cumulative impact analysis should be based on either "(A) a list of past, present, and probably future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or (B) a summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative effect. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the Lead Agency."

X. EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

A separate section of the EIR should include a brief discussion of issue areas that were not considered to be potentially significant. If these or other potentially significant issue areas arise during detailed environmental investigation of the project, however, consultation with this division is recommended to determine if these other issue areas need to be addressed in the EIR. Issues considered not to be potentially significant are Land Use, Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character, Biological Resources, Geologic Resources, Historical and Paleontological Resources, Transportation/Circulation, Noise, and Water Supply. Additionally, as supplementary information is submitted, the EIR may need to be expanded to include additional issue areas.

XI. ALTERNATIVES

The PEIR should analyze reasonable alternatives that can avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental impacts associated with adoption of the proposed ordinance. These alternatives should be identified and discussed in detail, and should address all significant impacts associated with the Program. The alternative's analysis should be conducted in sufficient graphic and narrative detail to clearly assess the relative level of impacts and feasibility. Preceding the detailed alternatives analysis should be a section entitled "Alternatives Considered but Rejected." This section should include a discussion of preliminary alternatives that were considered but not analyzed in detail. The reason for rejection should also be explained. At a minimum, the following alternatives shall be considered:

1. THE NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative should discuss the existing conditions of the planning area at the time the Notice of Preparation is published, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the ordinance were not approved. This alternative should compare the environmental effects of the planning area remaining in its existing state (or in what would reasonably be expected to occur on-site) against environmental effects that would occur if the ordinance were approved. Should the No Project Alternative prove to be the environmentally superior alternative, then pursuant to Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines, the PEIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

2. **APPLY THE CARRYOUT BAG REDUCTION ORDINANCE TO ALL RETAIL VENDORS**

To simplify enforcement and public information campaigns, the proposed ordinance selected the retailer establishments responsible for the majority of single-use bags. It is believed that this approach would be broadly accepted, and customers would not find it overly inconvenient. In contrast, under this alternative, the ordinance would be applied to all retailers. Alternative 2 would eliminate single-use plastic bags and thus would promote the shift towards reusable bags to a greater extent than the proposed ordinance. The analysis for this alternative should compare the beneficial effects of the proposed ordinance, whether any environmental affects would be increased, and if all of the City's goals and objectives for the ordinance could be achieved.

3. **APPLY THE CARRYOUT BAG REDUCTION ORDINANCE TO ONLY LARGE ("BIG-BOX") RETAIL VENDORS**

Under existing conditions, retailers typically provide carryout bags for no charge, which means they must absorb the cost. Thus, for many retailers, the ordinance will be financially beneficial. However, under the proposed ordinance Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) participants would be provided paper bags at no charge if they do not provide their own reusable bag. This would not only contribute to the worst case scenario's possibility of increased paper bag use, it also could cause a financial hardship on retailers with many WIC participants, since paper bags are more expensive than plastic bags. While financial hardship is not an environmental consideration, it may have an impact on the acceptance, and thus the effectiveness, of the ordinance. As such, the analysis under this alternative should compare the relative benefits and impacts associated with only large retail vendors that distribute large numbers of plastic bags.

4. **APPLY THE CARRYOUT BAG REDUCTION ORDINANCE, BUT IMPOSE A HIGHER FEE ON SINGLE-USE PAPER CARRYOUT BAGS**

This alternative assumes a worst case scenario which increases paper bag consumption. This increase could result in the consumption of more commercial forest products, energy, increases GHG production, and shifts to a manufacturing process that consumes more water and energy per bag than does plastic bag manufacture. Increasing the fee on paper bags could discourage this shift. Because this alternative considers a higher fee per recyclable paper bag and reusable carryout bags, the analysis should include a comparison of the environmental affects or benefits and whether this alternative would achieve the goals and objectives of the ordinance.

If through the environmental analysis process, other alternatives become apparent that would mitigate potentially significant impacts, such alternatives must be reviewed and discussed with environmental staff prior to including them in the PEIR. It is important to emphasize that the alternatives section of the PEIR should constitute a major part of the document. The timely processing of the environmental review will likely be dependent on the thoroughness of effort exhibited in the alternatives analysis.

XII. MITIGATION FRAMEWORK - MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)

A Mitigation Framework should be developed to provide guidance if any mitigation measures are identified in the EIR. The PEIR should describe the significant impact(s) addressed by each measure and the anticipated effectiveness and outcome of the measure as addressed in the PEIR. The Mitigation Framework will be the basis for assuring compliance with goals, objective and policies contained in the ordinance. At a minimum, the Mitigation Framework should identify for each mitigation measure: 1) the City department or other entity responsible for implementing the program or monitoring its affects; 2) the monitoring and reporting schedule, and 3) the completion requirements. The MMRP shall be presented as a separate chapter at the back of the PEIR. Formatting of this section will be developed in consultation with the Planning Department environmental analyst.

XIII. OTHER

The PEIR shall include sections for references, individuals and agencies consulted, as well as a certification page. Appendices shall be included in the Table of Contents, but are bound under separate cover and/or will be included on a CD attached to the back page of the DEIR. In addition, other specific direction regarding formatting, content and processing of the DEIR will be provided by environmental staff prior to submittal of the first screencheck DEIR for internal staff review.