(R-88-661)

RESOLUTION NUMBER R- 271449

ADOPTED ON JUL 20 1988

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO CERTIFYING THAT THE COUNCIL HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE FINAL MASTER ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE CENTRE CITY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AS IT PERTAINS TO THE PROPOSED MARINA PLANNED DISTRICT, AND THE PROPOSED SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CENTRE CITY SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY PLAN; AND MAKING CERTAIN FINDINGS AND DETERMINATIONS REGARDING THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF SAID PROPOSED MARINA PLANNED DISTRICT AND SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE CENTRE CITY SAN DIEGO COMMUNITY PLAN.

WHEREAS, the Redevelopment Agency of The City of San Diego (the "Agency") is engaged in activities necessary to carry out and implement the Redevelopment Plans for the Horton Plaza, Columbia and Marina Redevelopment Projects (the "Projects"); and

WHEREAS, the Council of The City of San Diego (the "Council"), consistent with such activities, proposes to approve and adopt the Marina Planned District, and the Second Amendment to the Centre City San Diego Community Plan (which incorporates the Urban Design Plan and Development Guidelines and the revised Streetscape Design Manual, Technical Supplement, as part of the Centre City Community Plan); and

WHEREAS, the Centre City Development Corporation, Inc., acting on behalf of the Agency, has prepared a Master Environmental Impact Report for the Centre City Redevelopment Projects (the "MEIR") in accordance with and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 ("CEQA") and State

and local guidelines and regulations adopted pursuant thereto; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan (incorporating the Marina Urban Design Plan and Development Guidelines and the amended Streetscape Design Manual) are among the activities assessed by the MEIR; and

WHEREAS, the Council has reviewed and considered the information contained in the MEIR; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Council of The City of San Diego, as follows:

1. The Council hereby certifies that the Master Environmental Impact Report for the Centre City Redevelopment Projects, as it pertains to the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, has been prepared and completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 and State and local regulations and guidelines adopted pursuant thereto.

2. The Council hereby further certifies that the information contained in said MEIR, as it pertains to the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, has been reviewed and considered by the Council members.

3. The Council hereby finds and determines that:

a. The proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, will not result in significant environmental

R-271449

effects in certain respects identified in the MEIR, as described in Section I of Attachment A (attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference.)

b. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, which avoid or substantially lessen certain significant environmental effects thereof identified in the MEIR, as described in Section II of Attachment A.

c. Changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen certain significant environmental effects of the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, identified in the MEIR, are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the Agency or the Council, and such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency, as described in Section III of Attachment A.

d. With respect to significant environmental effects of the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, which cannot be avoided or substantially lessened, specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the MEIR, as described in Section IV of Attachment A.

R-271449

e. The significant environmental effects of the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, which cannot be avoided or substantially lessened are acceptable due to overriding concerns, as described in Section V of Attachment A.

4. The City Clerk, or his designee, is hereby authorized and directed to cause the filing of a Notice of Determination with respect to the MEIR as it pertains to the Marina Planned District, and the Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan.

APPROVED: John W. Witt, City Attorney

By Janis Sammartino Gardner
Janis Sammartino Gardner
Deputy City Attorney

JSG:ta
09/30/87
Or.Dept:CCDC
R-88-661
Form=r.none

R-271449

Attachment A

I. The following discussion explains the reasons why, in certain respects, the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, will not result in significant environmental impacts.

A. With respect to Biological Resources:

The Centre City Redevelopment Projects are located in the heavily urbanized setting of downtown San Diego, which is almost totally lacking in native vegetation and its associated wildlife. Ornamental trees, parkways, occasional lawns and gardens comprise the only perennial vegetation within the Project boundaries. Where vacant lots and exposed strips of soil are left undisturbed, invasions of weedy annual herbs and grasses will become established. No Federal or State designated rare, threatened or endangered species have been observed or are expected to occur within the boundaries of the Project areas. The Project area is within proximity to San Diego Bay, which supports over 200 species of fish and invertebrates, as well various waterfowl. The Project would not directly affect San Diego Bay, and would not result in any significant indirect environmental effects on San Diego Bay because measures have been required in, or incorporated into the Project to avoid significant water quality impacts (Par. II. H.).

B. With respect to Hydrology:

There are no major surface water resources in the entirely urbanized setting of the Centre City Redevelopment Projects, including the Marina Project. The closest surface water resource is San Diego Bay. Surface water within the Project area consists of runoff from periodic rainfall, estimated to be about 500 cubic feet per second (cfs), which is collected by the extensive existing storm drain system and discharged to San Diego Bay via five individual outfalls. There have been no significant changes in the hydrological setting of downtown; continued redevelopment would similarly not change surface hydrology. Groundwater resources in the Project area are limited and do not represent an important source of fresh water. The occurrence of groundwater encountered during excavation for construction is addressed by the site specific engineering and design of structures (Par. II. H.) and is not a significant impact.

II. The following discussion explains the reasons why certain changes or alterations which have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed Marina Planned District, and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan will avoid or substantially lessen certain significant environmental effects of each of the Projects.

A. With respect to Land Use:

The potential incompatibility of the existing railroad right-of way and the planned residential community would be mitigated by measures to reduce the noise and improve the visual impact of trains passing or idling near the community. Landscaped berms could be constructed between the community and the railroad tracks. The proposed linear park on the north side of the railroad right-of-way will provide a setback for the residential uses as well as opportunities for landscaped sound attenuation features. The linear park and an enhanced at-grade extension of First and Front Street to Harbor Drive will greatly enhance the visual and pedestrian access between the residential community and the bayfront.

The potential significant adverse land use and urban design impacts of projected traffic volumes on the First and Front Street couplet can be mitigated by the proposed street cross-sections and urban design improvements contained in the proposed Marina Urban Design Plan and Development Guidelines.

Land use compatibility considerations between ultimate development of the Navy Broadway Complex and Substation B, and the adjacent Marina residential community must be taken into consideration as part of the planning for these major developments.

The Centre City Community Plan was adopted in 1976. The Community Plan should be revised to reflect the proposed amendments to the Redevelopment Plan to provide consistency between the proposed planning documents for downtown.

B. With respect to Traffic and Circulation:

Critical Intersection Mitigations

Intersection capacity analyses have been performed incorporating, where applicable, the recommendations of the previous CCTAP study (MTDB 1985) and assuming "G" Street to be a two-way 4-lane roadway between Pacific Highway and Fourth Avenue. At some intersections additional measures are necessary to achieve acceptable traffic flow conditions, as described on pages VI-37 through VI-41 in the EIR and page 10 of Section 2.0 in the Final EIR Addendum.

Public Transportation Measures

The Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB) is presently involved in the preliminary engineering and environmental analysis phase of the planning process for the proposed Bayside Light Rail Transit Line. The Bayside line, scheduled for completion in late 1989, will be a 1.1-mile light rail transit (LRT) extension linking the San Diego Trolley station at the Santa Fe Depot and the transfer station at Imperial and 12th Avenues. It is currently proposed that stations be provided in the vicinity of Harbor Drive and Fourth or Sixth Avenue; Harbor Drive and First Avenue; Martin Luther King Jr. Way at India Street; a transfer station in the vicinity of the Santa Fe Depot between Broadway and "C" Street; and between Cedar and Beech Streets, south of the northern terminus at Grape Street.

The existing San Diego Trolley line is the highest volume transit line in the Centre City. The extension of the LRT line in the form of the Bayside LRT line offers a potential to significantly reduce future vehicular travel in the Centre City. The greatest benefits would be expected along the regional travel corridors within the Centre City such as Broadway, "G" Street and Martin Luther King Jr. Way.

In addition to the Bayside LRT Line, the MTDB is also formulating and evaluating improvements to bus service within the Centre City. In particular, two route modifications are under consideration: 1) the extension of Route 7 along Harbor Drive from Seaport Village to the Convention Center; and 2) the extension of Route 1 along Fifth Avenue (from its present terminus at Martin Luther King Jr. Way) to Harbor Drive, then northwest along Harbor Drive to Seaport Village. In conjunction with the Bayside LRT, these improvements to bus service will provide an important transportation link between the residential development in the Marina Plan area and the commercial and employment opportunities in the rest of the Centre City.

Traffic Mitigation Conclusions

In summary, the improvements identified in the CCTAP Final Report were designed to accommodate future travel demand based on CCTAP Level 2 development. To the extent that these improvements would adequately accommodate Level 2 development, they would also accommodate the proposed levels of development under the amended Redevelopment Plan.

The CCTAP recommendations include the widening of Harbor Drive from a 4-lane to a 6-lane roadway. The proposed project would also include the realignment of Harbor Drive northerly to Martin Luther King Jr. Way (Market Street) in the vicinity of India Street. Martin Luther King Jr. Way would terminate in a "T" intersection at Harbor Drive. It appears that this configuration would generally improve

6. Integrating development plans with any future trolley service modifications where applicable.

7. Unifying the various TCM elements into a transportation system management (TSM) program, including funding support for a TSM coordinator position specifically for the downtown San Diego area.

8. With respect to construction-related mitigation, because of the limited distance between construction sites and nearby receptors within the CBD environment, it will be important to minimize any localized concentrations of emissions such as from trucks idling and queueing while waiting to load dirt or to drop off building materials, and from project trucks blocking traffic on nearby streets that might cause high microscale levels of automotive exhaust.

Incorporation of these TCMs into project planning, in conjunction with the following "standard" construction activity and energy conservation measures will create a tangible air quality benefit that will allow economic growth and improved air quality to be mutually compatible goals in the Centre City Redevelopment Projects:

9. Construction activity dust generation can be reduced through regular watering required by the SDAPCD and through erosion control and street washing to reduce dirt spillage onto travelled roadways near the construction site.

10. Nominal energy conservation can be achieved through low power/high output street lighting, which is the type now used throughout the City of San Diego, and additional energy conservation design is required by the new Title 24 non-residential and hotel energy saving design standards adopted by the California Energy Commission.

D. With respect to Noise:

The cumulative effect of implementation of the three Redevelopment Projects, including the Marina Project as guided by the proposed Marina Planned District and Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, would produce significantly higher noise levels over more area within the Projects than exists today. Environmental noise will constitute a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to a level of insignificance because: 1) the predicted noise environment in the Project areas conflicts with the General Plan recommendations for acceptable noise levels for residential use, and in some areas, for office use; and 2) the strict mitigation of enclosing all residential open space throughout the Project areas would not be practical and would significantly impact the goals and objectives for achieving a viable residential community downtown. The significant noise impacts can be lessened by the

lessened by the mitigations presented below, which will be implemented according to existing City policies.

1. Fixed Sources Fixed sources include such categories as bus stops, light rail transit (LRT) stations and stops, parking facilities, loading docks, and mechanical equipment. These sources are governed by the City's Noise Ordinance and are largely of concern as to how they affect residential uses. All mechanical equipment will be required to be installed to meet the requirements of the City's Noise Ordinance, and evidence of compliance will be required.

2. Land Use Relationships The critical issue will be exterior noise control on residential sites for transportation noise. Virtually every site would exceed 65 CNEL, which is the City's General Plan criteria for residential uses. The levels would be sufficiently high to make exterior noise control in private open space almost impossible where such space faces the streets or rights-of-way because of the proximity of property lines to the sources. Typically, the private open space takes the form of balconies, which are difficult to shield, unless they are oriented in a way that the building structure is interposed between the space and the sources. Ground level patios are much easier to shield. However, most would require walls seven to ten feet high.

Any effort to achieve significant mitigation of exterior areas would most likely require a major re-orientation of where private space is placed on a site. In some situations, such as high rise buildings, other considerations, such as views, would conflict with this approach. In certain cases, site size would make it impossible to build a high rise where balconies face to inner courts.

A feasible mitigation to lessen environmental noise impacts will be to require that some common open space be provided that is sheltered to levels below 65 CNEL, and to provide open space buffers, where possible, between transportation noise sources and adjacent residential use.

Notwithstanding the general transportation noise issue, the placement of residential uses adjacent to non-residential uses poses the need for exterior noise control to comply with the City's Noise Ordinance. Therefore, site layout, building orientation and shielding of mechanical equipment will be reviewed for both residential developments and non-residential uses to minimize noise-related conflicts. Loading docks, parking facilities, and mechanical equipment are some of the prime sources that will be considered.

3. Structure Control The State Housing Code requires that all attached residential projects in areas exceeding 60

CNEL must comply with Title 25 of the California Administrative Code (Section 1092). This mandates that interior noise levels not exceed 45 CNEL. Since virtually the entire area of each Project is projected to exceed 60 CNEL, every residential project would be required to demonstrate compliance. This mitigation will be implemented by including the requirement on all building permit checkoff lists for developments within the Redevelopment Project areas. The condition usually reads, "Provide a study by a recognized Acoustical Engineer showing compliance with Title 25."

E. With respect to Cultural and Historical Resources:

CCDC will continue to implement its ongoing historic archaeology program in the Marina Project, which requires review and mitigation of potential significant subsurface cultural resources as individual implementation activities are undertaken.

F. With respect to Aesthetics/Urban Design

Mitigation of the short-term localized aesthetic effects related to construction will be achieved through careful planning and conformance with existing City regulations. Noise and dust emissions from construction activities are largely mitigated by contractor compliance with equipment standards and CCDC's monitoring of construction procedures, including the designation of truck routes, haul routes and contractor clean-up of any construction debris in the public right-of-way. Regulation of the hours of construction will become more important as residential development in the Marina Project advances.

Implementation of the proposed Marina Planned District and Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan on a comprehensive project-by-project basis will be an important factor in achieving the positive cumulative effect of improved urban design in the Marina Project. Specifically:

1. CCDC will review each development in the context of the sun-shadow analysis and the proposed site design guidelines to maximize solar access to public pedestrian spaces and private outdoor living spaces.

2. CCDC will review all developments for compliance with the recommended setbacks, street wall configuration and building siting maintain important public view corridors and enhance identified essential pedestrian routes through the Project.

3. Implementation of recommended street cross-sections on First and Front, G Street, King Way (Market Street) and Pacific Highway will be important to achieve the

necessary pedestrian linkage throughout the Project. The street cross-sections must be reviewed with the City Engineer to identify acceptable improvements in these public rights-of-way that facilitate adequate traffic movement and provide for an appropriate scale of street and pedestrian facilities throughout the predominantly residential Marina Project.

4. The Design Review Process The long-term aesthetic and urban design effects of the Projects will be monitored by application and enforcement of the design review process, as guided by the existing Centre City Urban Design Program and the accompanying technical supplement, the Streetscape Design Manual (CCDC 1983), and the proposed Marina Urban Design Plan and Development Guidelines. A sun-shadow and wind acceleration analysis will be required as part of the design review process for all proposed developments over 50 feet, including a cumulative shading analysis.

G. With respect to Services, Infrastructure and Utilities:

Potential significant impacts are anticipated in the areas of schools, chilled water service and electrical utilities. These imapcts will be mitigated by the following measures:

1. Schools In order to accomodate projected enrollments at Sherman Elementary and Washington Elementary, the City of San Diego School District may reconfigure schools, including adding portable classrooms, limiting programs which bring students into the area from outlying communities, and possible year-round programs. In addition, to the extent that development in the Project areas would be subject to school fee legislation, the fees from Centre City redevelopment would provide school funding well in excess of the Project areas' probable contribution to enrollment in area schools.

2. Chilled Water Any facility improvements necessary to accommodate future capacity needs will be addressed by the franchise utility and the Redevelopment Agency through the standard public utilities planning process. If it is determined that an additional chilled water plant is needed, the Redevelopment Agency will work with the franchise utility to determine an appropriate location.

3. Electricity Any facility improvements necessary to accommodate future capacity needs will be addressed by the franchise utility and the Redevelopment Agency through the standard public utilities planning process. If it is determined that a new substation or improvements to an existing substation are needed in one of the three Redevelopment areas then the Redevelopment Agency will work with the franchise utility to determine an appropriate location.

R-271149

H. With respect to Geological Resources:

The length of time that graded, exposed ground surfaces are unstabilized by removal of existing pavement, buildings or landscaping will be minimized. CCDC will ensure that developers undertake proper erosion control measures which may be essential when considering the length of time some of the sites within the Redevelopment Project might be under development. In addition, coordinated demolition and construction activities throughout the Projects will minimize the length of time large graded areas are exposed, particularly during winter (rainy) months.

Seismic considerations will be incorporated into any site specific planning decision for development in the Project area. Before construction in the Redevelopment Project, appropriate site specific geotechnical studies, and soil borings must be conducted to identify potentially expansive soils and the presence of groundwater. The results of such studies shall be incorporated into appropriate structural engineering for specific project design. These requirements are implemented through the City's enforcement of the Uniform Building Code.

I. With respect to Soils/Groundwater Contamination:

Two areas within the Marina Project have been identified to date which contain soil and groundwater contamination. Remedial Action Plans have been prepared for the existing contaminated sites in the Marina Project area. The Redevelopment Agency is working with the property owners affected by the contamination to coordiante clean up programs. The Redevelopment Agency will require existing and future property owners to test for potential soil and groundwater contamination prior to redevelopment of their property. Site safety plans will be required as necessary to assure safety during clean up and construction at any contaminated sites.

J. With respect to Socieconomic Characteristics:

The cumulative effect of the three Redevelopment Projects, including the Marina Project as guided by the proposed Marina Planned District and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, is expected to have a positive impact on downtown San Diego by improving the social and economic environment in Centre City. Implementation of the Redevelopment Plans is expected to increase the downtown residential population to over 8,000 residents by the year 2000, and to provide an estimated 135,000 permanent jobs. Redevelopment will continue to cause some economic dislocation related to relocation of businesses. The economic impacts of dislocation and relocation are mitigated by the Redevelopment Agency's

implementation of its relocation program, as required by state law. Implementation of the Agency's relocation program is included as part of the Redevelopment Plans.

III. The following discussion explains the reasons why changes or alterations which avoid or substantially lessen certain significant environmental effects of the proposed Marina Planned District and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the Redevelopment Agency or the City Council, and how such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and chould be adopted by such other agency.

A. With respect to significant cumulative traffic and circulation impacts:

Future significant traffic volumes on Project area streets can be further mitigated by the ensured implementation of traffic management mitigation measures identified in the San Diego Unified Port District's 1984 EIR for the San Diego Convention Center, which is currently under construction south of the Marina Project. The EIR for the Convention Center identified the need to develop and implement a traffic management program to direct Convention Center traffic around Centre City rather than through the community, especially with respect to heavy truck and bus traffic (SDUPD 1984). Implementation of the Convention Center traffic management program will be the responsibility of the City of San Diego, the San Diego Unified Port District and the Convention Center Corporation.

IV. The following discussion explains the reasons why specific economic, social or other considerations make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives with respect to each significant effect of the proposed Marina Planned District and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, which cannot be avoided or substantially lessened.

A. With respect to significant traffic circulation and traffic-related land use impacts:

All traffic mitigation measures identified in the MEIR will be incorporated into implementation of the Redevelopment Project. However, even with implementation of the identified mitigations, significant cumulative traffic impacts would occur. Further mitigation would require a significant reduction in the scale or volume of future development in the Project area. The MEIR assessed the effect of alternatives which would provide for increased ownership participation; lessened intensity of development;

R-271449

ownership participation; lessened intensity of development; increased intensity of development; changed land use emphasis; retention of existing land uses; and, the no project alternative. The scale or volume of development in the Project area could be reduced by all of the alternatives except the alternative to increase the intensity of proposed development. The economic feasibility of a reduced scale of development was specifically addressed for the Marina Project area in the market analysis prepared by Keyser Marston & Associates, contained in "Urban Design Plan - A Proposal for Community Review" (CCDC 1986). The analysis concluded that the existing Redevelopment Plan provides for development at a density lower than would be economically feasible.

The no project alternative would eliminate the guidance of future Project area development by the Redevelopment Plan. The analysis contained in the MEIR finds that anticipated Centre City development with no redevelopment plan would result in traffic and related noise increasing at existing rates, and corresponding air quality decreasing over time, with none of the coordinated planning and mitigation mechanisms available with the use of a redevelopment plan. Furthermore, the loss of a coordinated plan for redevelopment would result in an underutilization of land within the urban core, thereby encouraging further development pressure in outlying areas, with the attendant potential significant impacts on regional traffic, air quality, energy consumption, public services, loss of open space and potential loss of agricultural land. The no project alternative would not encourage the objectives and goals of the existing redevelopment plans, the City's Progress Guide and General Plan, and the Centre City Community Plan, with respect to elimination of urban blight and incompatible land uses within the urban core. The no project alternative would further endanger the City's ability to promote the identified goals to establish the essential linkages between the downtown business district, developing residential areas in the Marina Project, the Embarcadero bayfront, and the San Diego Convention Center.

The alternative to increase ownership participation would replace the Redevelopment Agency's role in assembling and preparing land for redevelopment with increased individual property owner participation in redevelopment. A reduced scale of development would be expected, which would result in less tax increment being generated to be used in assisting with funding for public improvements, including street and transportation improvements, and less tax increment would be available for redevelopment functions such as payment of relocation benefits.

B. With respect to significant air quality impacts:

All air quality mitigation measures identified in the MEIR will be incorporated into implementation of the Redevelopment Project. However, even with implementation of the identified mitigations, significant cumulative air quality impacts would occur during peak hours at seven intersections within or adjacent to the Project area. Further mitigation would require a significant reduction in the scale or volume of future development in the Project areas. The MEIR assessed the effect of alternatives which would provide for increased ownership participation; lessened intensity of development; increased intensity of development; changed land use emphasis; retention of existing land uses; and, the no project alternative. The scale or volume of development in the Project area could be reduced by all of the alternatives except the alternative to increase the intensity of proposed development. The social, economic and other considerations which make these alternatives infeasible are the same as those described under paragraph IV. A. above and are hereby included in this finding by this reference.

C. With respect to significant noise impacts:

The MEIR assessed the effect of alternatives which would provide for increased ownership participation; lessened intensity of development; increased intensity of development; changed land use emphasis; retention of existing land uses; and, the no project alternative. None of the alternatives would avoid or substantially lessen the significant noise impact in the Project area to a level of non significance because existing traffic-generated sound levels throughout most of the Project area currently exceed traditionally acceptable levels for residential use, and in some areas, for office use. The strict mitigation of enclosing all residential open space throughout the Project area would not be practical and would significantly impact the goals and objectives for achieving a viable residential community downtown. The projected sound levels would be sufficiently high to make exterior noise control in private open space almost impossible where such space faces the streets or rights-of-way because of the proximity of property lines to the sources. Typically, the private open space takes the form of balconies, which are difficult to shield, unless they are oriented in a way that the building structure is interposed between the space and the sources. Requiring all exterior balconies to be located within interior courtyards would adversely affect urban design and quality of life goals of the Redevelopment Plan. Ground level patios are much easier to shield. However, most would require walls seven to ten feet high, resulting in similar undesirable and unmarketable design effects for individual units and the Project areas.

Any effort to achieve significant mitigation of exterior areas would most likely require a major re-orientation of where private space is placed on a site. In some situations, such as high rise buildings, other considerations such as views, would conflict with this approach. In most cases, site size would make it impossible to build a high rise where balconies face to inner courts.

V. The following discussion explains the benefits of the proposed Marina Planned District and the proposed Second Amendment to the Centre City Community Plan, which outweigh the significant environmental effects of each of the Projects which cannot be avoided or substantially lessened.

A. The proposed activities in the Centre City Redevelopment Projects, including the Marina Project as changed by the Fifth Amendment to the Marina Redevelopment Plan, are designed to complement one another and revitalize the Centre City. The Marina Project will establish the primary downtown residential community, providing the base for increased retail and entertainment activities as well as a resident workforce. The adjacent Horton Plaza Project will provide increased commercial retail, entertainment, office and residential uses to attract regional and local interest in renewed activities downtown. The Columbia Project will provide high-rise, office developments and mixed use projects which will physically complement the Central Business District while providing increased space for employment and indirectly promoting residential living in the downtown area.

B. The significant unavoidable noise impact associated with downtown redevelopment is partially offset by the benefits of implementing the Marina Redevelopment Plan goals of re-establishing a residential community in Centre City. Because perception is a significant factor in determining an individual's reaction to environmental noise levels, it is reasonable to note that persons attracted to an urban downtown setting will likely have different expectations regarding the level of activity than those who choose a suburban neighborhood.

C. The areas downtown that are underutilized will be revitalized and utilized to their highest potential under the Redevelopment Plans. There are many areas in the Marina Redevelopment Project that are vacant and/or used for outdoor storage. These useable parcels of property lack maintenance. Redevelopment activities include incorporation of small, underutilized parcels into larger, potentially income-producing developments.

D. The economic environment in and around the Redevelopment Project will be revitalized through new development, including continued increases to the property tax base and resultant increases to the tax increment available for redevelopment. Redevelopment will bring residents, employees and visitors into downtown, with associated increases in spending and consumption of services. Properties adjacent to the redeveloped areas will have the incentive to improve their facilities to capitalize on the increase in activity downtown.

E. The upgraded downtown will enhance the social and cultural environment both locally and regionally by making the Centre City a more attractive area for living, working and recreation. An estimated future residential population of over 8,000 residents may occupy the Marina, Horton Plaza and Columbia residential areas. An estimated 135,000 permanent jobs would be generated by the projected level of cumulative development in the Project areas.

F. Continued redevelopment of Centre City will complement the attractiveness of the San Diego Convention Center with convention-related activities and services.

R271449

Passed and adopted by the Council of The City of San Diego on JUL 20 1988, by the following vote:

Council Members	Yeas	Nays	Not Present	Ineligible
Abbe Wolfsheimer	☐	☐	☑	☐
Ron Roberts	☑	☐	☐	☐
Gloria McColl	☑	☐	☐	☐
H. Wes Pratt	☐	☐	☑	☐
Ed Struiksma	☑	☐	☐	☐
J. Bruce Henderson	☐	☐	☑	☐
Judy McCarty	☑	☐	☐	☐
Bob Filner	☑	☐	☐	☐
Mayor Maureen O'Connor	☑	☐	☐	☐

AUTHENTICATED BY:

MAUREEN O'CONNOR,
Mayor of The City of San Diego, California.

(Seal)

CHARLES G. ABDELNOUR,
City Clerk of The City of San Diego, California.

By Rhonda L. Barnes Deputy.

Office of the City Clerk, San Diego, California

Resolution Number R-271449 Adopted JUL 20 1988

CC-1276 (Rev. 12-87)