



Land Development
Review Division
(619) 446-5460

Mitigated Negative Declaration

LDR No. 42-0574
PTS 4465
SCH No. 2002091083

SUBJECT: **Naval Training Center (Liberty Station) Park General Development Plan:** COUNCIL APPROVAL to construct a 46-acre public regional park and three-acre esplanade in the former Naval Training Center (NTC) Liberty Station site adjacent to the boat channel. The park would include an aquatics complex, ball fields, open space, an historic plaza, a nature area, tot lots, 396 on-site parking spaces, a 7,755 square foot addition to existing Building 619, use of existing Building 191, and an esplanade along both sides of the boat channel. The site is in the OP-1-1 zone, Coastal Overlay Zone. The site is located in the southeastern portion of NTC, southeast of Cushing Road adjacent to the boat channel. Applicant: City of San Diego, Park and Recreation Department.

NOTE: **Minor revisions have been made to this document in response to public comment. Deletions are shown in ~~strikeout font~~; additions are shown in double underline font.**

- I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: See attached Initial Study.
- II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See attached Initial Study.
- III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following area: **WATER QUALITY**. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project as revised now avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

- IV. DOCUMENTATION:

The attached Initial Study documents the reasons to support the above Determination.

- V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

To ensure that site development would avoid significant environmental impacts, a mitigation monitoring, and reporting program (MMRP) shall be required. Compliance with the mitigation measures becomes the responsibility of the applicant. The basis for the MMRP is found in the Initial Study and as described below.

Water Quality

The following Best Management Practices (BMPs), as further defined in the document, *Storm Water Quality Management Program, Naval Training Center Redevelopment Project, San Diego, California* (August 2002), will be incorporated into the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Development The BMPs would comply with all requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order No. 99-08, and the Municipal Storm Water Permit, Order No. 2001-01 (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000002 and CA S0108758), *Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated With Construction Activity*. In accordance with said permit, the SWPPP and a Monitoring Program shall be implemented concurrently with the commencement of grading activities, and a Notice of Intent (NOI) shall be filed with the SWRCB.

A. Construction BMPs

1. Soil stabilization - control techniques would be specified such as seeding, planting, mulching, and scheduling of grading activities to avoid rain events and to disturb limited portions at a time, revegetating as soon as possible.
2. Sediment control - control techniques would be used to minimize runoff where soil would be exposed to rainfall. Stabilized construction entrances at points of entry and exit would be used to minimize sediment tracked into public streets. Other controls such as silt fences, straw bales, sand bags, and storm drain inlet protection would also be used.
3. Roadway cleanliness - control techniques would be used to minimize sediment leaving the site on construction vehicles. Construction road stabilization and stabilized entrance/egress points would minimize soil leaving the site.
4. Dust control - control techniques would be used to minimize airborne dust/particulates leaving the site. Construction vehicles would not exceed 15 miles per hour when traveling over unpaved areas.

B. Post-Construction BMPs

1. Structural controls - All stormwater runoff from the park site would be discharged through at least one structural treatment device. In many cases, the discharge would pass through a structural treatment device such as biofiltration, followed by a stormwater separator. Design parameters are specified in the *Storm Water Quality Management Program* document. Maintenance would be provided by the City of San Diego.

- a. Drain Inlet Filter - This is a device with a filter within the storm water system inlets to capture petroleum hydrocarbons residue from vehicles. Drain inlet filters effective in general trash removal would be specified for park construction activities. Filtration devices were previously specified in the Precise Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
 - b. Biofilter Swales and Strips - Swales are shallow, vegetated channels to retain overland storm water flow to allow for infiltration, sedimentation entrapment, plant nutrient uptake, and physical filtration. Strips promote low-velocity flow across a vegetated surface based on sheet flow conditions. Biofilter swales were previously specified in the Precise Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
 - c. Detention Basin - Detention basins would be constructed to temporarily capture and detain storm water runoff consistent with Regional Water Quality Control Board guidance. Basin depths would be from four to six feet deep. Maintenance would include, but is not limited to, inspection during wet weather to ensure the basin drains in 48 to 72 hours, removal of sediment when sediment depth becomes greater than 18 inches deep or displaces more than 10% of the water quality volume, mowing and maintenance of the side slopes, removal of debris and litter, and elimination of nuisance conditions such as insects, weeds, odors, and algae.
 - d. Wet Basin - A wet basin (a permanent wet pool designed to detain and treat stormwater runoff) would be constructed in the nature area of the park. This basin would contain emergent and submerged aquatic vegetation and an active microbial community capable of dissolved constituent consumption. Shallow depths along the perimeter would gradually slope to a depth of approximately six to eight feet deep. Fish species such as *Gambusia affinis* (mosquito fish) would be stocked at a minimum initial density of 200 individuals per surface acre to eliminate problems with mosquitoes. Maintenance actions include, but not limited to, repair of the embankment and spillway, replacement of vegetation, removal of litter, and control of nuisance conditions such as insects, weeds, odors, and algae.
 - e. Stormwater Separator - Several stormwater separators would be installed in the park and in the existing right-of-way under Cushing Road along the western boundary of the park. These separators allow for settling and separation of stormwater and contaminants through mechanisms such as gravity settling, filtration, and/or screening. Stormwater separators would be installed at each storm drain outfall into the Bay, or at each location where the storm drain system leaves the park site.
2. Non-structural controls - Administrative controls would also be used to help further reduce stormwater runoff impacts as discussed below.

- a. Street Cleaning - Street sweeping would be used on finished roads within the NTC and park site. Frequency of sweeping would increase before the wet season to remove sediments that may have accumulated during the drier months.
- b. Signs - Signs such as "No Dumping, Drains to Ocean" would be installed on all drain inlets in the development and park.
- c. Education/Outreach - Information on the City of San Diego "Think Blue" Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program would be available to users of the park to educate about causes of storm water pollution and about pollution prevention behaviors that they could adopt to help improve water quality and how the BMP measures in the park work to reduce storm water runoff.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

Draft copies or notice of this Mitigated Negative Declaration were distributed to:

U.S. Government

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (23)
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (26)
- Dept. of the Navy, Southwest Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
- U.S. Navy Environmental Planning Division (12)
- U.S. Navy Real Estate Division (8)
- Federal Aviation Administration (1)
- Environmental Protection Agency (19)
- Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service (20)
- Coast Guard Commanding Officer, Marine Safety Office (11)
- U.S. Marine Corps Recruit Depot (MCRD) (14)

State of California

- California Department of Fish and Game (32)
- California Environmental Protection Agency (37A)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board - Region 9 (44)
- California Coastal Commission (47, 48)
- State Clearinghouse (46)
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 11 (31)
- Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics (51)
- Boating and Waterways (52)
- State Coastal Conservancy (54)
- State Water Resources Control Board (55)
- Native American Heritage Commission (56)
- California State Land Commission (62)
- Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation (41)

County of San Diego

Air Pollution Control District (65)
Department of Environmental Health, Brad Long (75, 76)

City of San Diego

Historical Resources Board (87)
Park & Recreation Board (83)
Park & Recreation Department
Wetland Advisory Board (91A)
Library Department (81)
Peninsula Community Service Center (389)
Development Services Department
Planning Department
Peninsula Community Planning Board (390)
Midway Community Plan Advisory Committee (311)
Peninsula Chamber of Commerce (391)

NTC Citizens Implementation Advisory Committee

Celeste Weinsheim, Chair
Carolyn Chase
Kathryn Fulhorst, Design Review Committee
Steve Horrow, Cabrillo Recreation Council
Seth Layton, Peninsula Community Planning Board
Jose Mireles, Implementation Advisory Committee
Jim Peugh, San Diego Audubon Society
June Dudas, City of San Diego, Park & Recreation Department, MS-37C
Steve Silverman, Rick Engineering
Marcela Escobar, MS-5A
Jack Nakawatase, MS-5A
Michelle Frick, MS-5A
Marcia McLatchy, MS-9B
John Hudkins, MS-39
Mark Marne, MS-35
Kirk Mather, Council District 2, MS-10A

NTC Interested Parties list*

NTC Applied Energy, 707 Broadway, Suite 1500, San Diego, CA 92101-5378
San Diego Association of Governments (108)
San Diego Unified Port District (109)
Metropolitan Transit Development Board (115)
San Diego Chamber of Commerce (157)
San Diego Daily Transcript (135)
San Diego Gas & Electric (114)
Sierra Club, San Diego Chapter (165 and 165A)
San Diego Earth Times (165B)
San Diego Natural History Museum, Dr. Deméré (166)
The Audubon Society (167)
Environmental Health Coalition (169)

California Native Plant Society (170)
The Southwest Center for Biological Diversity (176)
Citizens Coordinate for Century III (179)
Endangered Habitats League (182)
The Surfrider Foundation (183)
Historical Resources Board (87)
Dr. Florence Shipek (208)
Dr. Lynne Christenson (208A)
Ron Christman (215)
Louie Guassac (215A)
South Coast Information Center (210)
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
Save Our Heritage Organization (214)
San Diego Historical Society (211)
San Diego County Archaeological Society (218)
Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)
Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians* (225A)
Campo Band of Mission Indians* (225B)
Cuyapaipe Band of Mission Indians* (225C)
Inaja and Cosmit Band of Mission Indians* (225D)
Jamul Band of Mission Indians* (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)
Santa Ysabel Band of Diegueño Indians* (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 Mission Indians* (225Q)
Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians* (225R)
McMillin Land Development
GeoCon
Rob Gehrke, RBF Consulting
San Diego State University (455)
Robert G. Russell, Jr. Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves, and Savitch, LLP

*public notice only

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- () No comments were received during the public input period.
- () Comments were received but did not address the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration finding or the accuracy/completeness of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.
- (x) Comments addressing the findings of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public input period. The letters and responses follow.

Copies of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program and any Initial Study material are available in the office of the Land Development Review Division for review, or for purchase at the cost of reproduction.

original signed
KENNETH TEASLEY, Senior Planner
Development Services Department

September 18, 2002
Date of Draft Report

October 24, 2002
Date of Final Report

Analyst: WILKINSON

City of San Diego
Development Services Department
LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW DIVISION
1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 446-5460

INITIAL STUDY
LDR No. 42-0574
PTS 4465
SCH No. 2002091083

SUBJECT: Naval Training Center (Liberty Station) Park General Development Plan:
COUNCIL APPROVAL to construct a 46-acre public regional park and three-acre esplanade in the former Naval Training Center (NTC) Liberty Station site adjacent to the boat channel. The park would include an aquatics complex, ball fields, open space, an historic plaza, a nature area, tot lots, 396 on-site parking spaces, a 7,755 square foot addition to existing Building 619, use of existing Building 191, and an esplanade along both sides of the boat channel. The site is in the OP-1-1 zone, Coastal Overlay Zone. The site is located in the southeastern portion of NTC, southeast of Cushing Road adjacent to the boat channel. Applicant: City of San Diego, Park and Recreation Department.

NOTE: Minor revisions have been made to this document in response to public comment. Deletions are shown in ~~strikeout font~~; additions are shown in double underline font.

I. PURPOSE AND MAIN FEATURES:

The purpose of this proposed action is to provide the park component of the broader Naval Training Center (NTC) Liberty Station development project as specified in the Master Planned Development Permit/Coastal Development Permit 99-1076.

In September 2000 the Citizens Implementation Advisory Committee (CIAC), Park Planning Subcommittee finalized their recommendations for park development goals at NTC. As a part of the process for formulation of these recommendations the CIAC solicited input from the community and from numerous potential user groups. An evaluation of the City's present and future recreation needs was also performed. These recommendations and concept goals were incorporated into the park General Development Plan.

In late September 2001, the U.S. Navy, acting through the National Park Service, completed the Public Benefit Conveyance of the 46-acre public park and 3-acre eastside

esplanade area to the City of San Diego. The boat channel has not been conveyed and is therefore neither included in the scope of the Park development plans nor this CEQA document. The Navy restricted development within 15 feet of the boat channel (to the edge of the rip-rap) until past contamination issues can be resolved and conveyance is complete.

The proposed General Development Plan for the park provides both active and passive recreation elements. The active recreational elements include ball fields, a multi-use field, multi-purpose courts, a future aquatics complex, and tot lots. Passive recreational elements include group and individual picnic areas, open turf areas, an historic plaza, a nature area, and a dual-use esplanade for walking and bicycling. Sewer, water, and electrical utility connections would be provided. Excavation for utility connections is anticipated to be minimal (about ~~three~~ eight feet deep). Parking would be provided both on-site and along the street frontage.

The ball fields would be sited at the southern end of the park west of the boat channel. This area of the park would also contain the multi-use field, and multi-purpose courts.

The future aquatic complex would be located northeast of the ball fields and could include one or more pools such as a 25 meter pool and a family pool with an interactive play area. Existing Building 619 would be renovated with a 7,755 square foot addition for the aquatics center complex support functions such as locker rooms, offices, restrooms, storage and a concession stand. Building 619 was constructed in 1992 as the Child Development Center.

Picnic areas would be grouped in varying sizes to accommodate various user groups as well as individuals. Natural shading would be provided with tree plantings. The adjacent open turf areas would provide areas for unstructured recreational activities and passive use.

The plaza would be located at the center of the park with a portion of the plaza within the boundary of the NTC Historic District. Design of the plaza area could include water features and enhancement of the existing historic gun placements. A comfort station is proposed adjacent to the plaza, but outside the NTC Historic District.

A nature area would be located at the northeastern portion of the park site and would incorporate native plantings, walkways, and observation areas. The area would also serve as a storm water retention and filtering basin.

An esplanade would extend along the boat channel for the entire length of the park, eventually crossing the boat channel and continuing along the southeast side of the channel. The esplanade would provide two separate ten-foot wide paths to serve both pedestrian and bicycle users. The paths would meander and vary in elevation to provide interest and take advantage of views. Benches and observations areas would be provided along the route for rest and viewing.

Development would be set back from the boat channel by a 15-foot buffer zone for water quality. Materials such as decomposed granite and/or use of vegetation which would require little or no fertilizers and pesticides would be incorporated in this buffer area. Shoreline development or other activity in the boat channel is not currently proposed as part of this Park General Development Plan because of the Navy's prohibition on development activities in the Boat Channel.

Parking would be located in clusters in accordance with the recommendations of the CIAC to cluster parking along existing roads and into pockets adjacent to proposed use areas. The largest parking area would be located adjacent to the ball field/aquatic park area to serve the area of heaviest use. Fewer parking spaces would be provided at the other end of the park near the nature area. In total, approximately 396 parking spaces would be provided. Street parking would be available along Cushing Road with the exception of parking adjacent to the plaza.

Landscaping plans for the park have not yet been fully developed. However, the adopted NTC Precise Plan and Local Coastal Plan (LCP) incorporates landscaping design guidelines and specifies landscaping requirements consistent with the City Landscape Standards and Landscape Concept Plan.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The Naval Training Center (NTC) re-development (Liberty Station) is located in the NTC Precise Plan area of the City of San Diego. NTC is bordered by Rosecrans Street to the northwest, Lytton Street to the northeast, and Harbor Drive to the south. The park site is located in the southeastern portion of NTC adjacent to the boat channel, which is an extension of the San Diego Bay. The project location falls under the California State Coastal Commission jurisdiction. Additional information on the environmental setting of the proposed Park is found in the three existing CEQA documents for the overall NTC project as referenced below.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS: See attached Initial Study checklist.

This Initial Study and the associated Mitigated Negative Declaration, LDR No. 42-0574, were prepared in accordance with the "tiering" concept described in Section 15152 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, whereby the additional environmental effects of a proposal which were not fully addressed through previously certified environmental documents are now addressed. This Initial Study and proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration tiers off the following previously-certified environmental documents:

- C *Disposal and Reuse of Certain Real Properties at Naval Training Center, San Diego, California Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report ("Reuse EIS/EIR")*, LDR No. 96-0255, SCH No. 96051057, certified by the City of San Diego on October 20, 1988.

- C *Environmental Impact Report for the NTC Redevelopment Project* ("Redevelopment EIR"), SCH No. 99081140, certified by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego on February 1, 2000.
- C *Mitigated Negative Declaration NTC Precise Plan and Local Coastal Plan & Related Entitlements/MWWD Environmental Monitoring and Technical Services Laboratory*. LDR No. 99-1076, SCH No. 2000081037. September 14, 2000.

These documents are available for review at the City of San Diego Development Services Department, Land Development Review Division, 1222 First Avenue, Fifth Floor, San Diego, California, 92101.

At the time of preparation of these documents, the proposed Park was conceptualized, but detailed development plans were not yet proposed. This Initial Study and proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration provide the project-specific CEQA analysis for the development plans for the Park.

IV. DISCUSSION

- A. The existing analysis in the two EIRs and MND analyzed broad issues associated with the future use of the area designated for the park. With the current proposal for the park General Development Plan, project-specific analysis is provided in this document. The following issues either remain unchanged from the existing analysis, or have been determined **NOT** to be potentially significant. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures beyond those previously identified are required for: **biological resources, historical resources, air quality, water use, visual quality, land use, traffic, health and safety, geology, paleontological resources, archaeological resources, and hydrology**. The existing mitigation measures remain applicable and are summarized for each resource area below.

Biological Resources

Potential impacts to biological resources were analyzed in Section 4.6 of the Redevelopment EIR. The Redevelopment EIR and the Precise Plan MND identified potentially significant impacts to avian resources for any development along the shoreline areas of the boat channel. A nature area would be located at the northeastern portion of the park site and would incorporate native plantings, walkways, and observation areas. The location of this nature area would accommodate existing waterfowl use of the area. Shoreline development or other activity in the boat channel is not proposed as part of this Park General Development.

The existing land was used for military uses and did not contain a diversity of natural vegetation. The proposed park would create new vegetation, natural areas, and open areas increasing localized floral species diversity. Landscaping plans for the new park would be consistent with the City Landscape Ordinance and Landscape Technical Manual.

The Redevelopment EIR specifies the following mitigation measures, now included as part of this project scope, to further reduce impacts to biological resources:

- C Construction noise adjacent to breeding, roosting, and foraging areas of birds shall be kept to a minimum, particularly during the breeding season.

- C All trash containers or trash dumpsters shall be covered at all times to discourage the use of these facilities as a source of food by mammalian (e.g., cats, dogs, skunks, opossums) and avian (e.g., gulls, crows, ravens) predators of the California least tern. Trash containers would meet current City specifications.

The MND 99-1076 specifies the following mitigation measure, now included as part of this project scope, to further reduce impacts to biological resources:

- C Prior to the preconstruction meeting, a qualified biologist shall determine the potential for sensitive bird species including those protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act to occur within or adjacent to the project impact area throughout the anticipated construction period. If any areas are identified as having the potential to be breeding, roosting or foraging areas for such species, including the rip rap along the boat channel, appropriate construction buffers, to be determined by the qualified biologist, City, and appropriate state and federal agencies, shall be provided.

Additional biological surveys were conducted in August 2002 and February 2001 to further assess potential impacts to nesting herons in the ficus trees north of the project site. No evidence of nesting by herons or any other species was observed.

Historical Resources

A portion of the park would develop the Preble Field area into a plaza. The Preble Field area is part of the previously-established NTC Historic District, listed as an Historical Landmark by the San Diego Historical Resources Board as analyzed in the prior Redevelopment EIR and MND.

The existing historic gun emplacements (Building 453 and Building 454 both built in 1945) along Cushing Road between Roosevelt Road and Dewey Road would be integrated into the park design.

As agreed to in the existing Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program associated with the Mitigated Negative Declaration LDR 99-1076, the following commitment has been made with respect to the protection of this historical resources:

- C Prior to the issuance of any building permit or grading permit which would affect historic buildings or landscape elements within the designated NTC

Historic District, . . . the Master Developer (McMillin NTC, LLC) shall provide evidence to the satisfaction of the City manager that the preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, reconstruction or new construction is consistent with the adopted version of the *Naval Training Center San Diego Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Properties*, prepared by Architect Milford Wayne Donaldson, FIA and KTU+A, *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (June 2000)*, and *The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, as appropriate.

Development plans for the plaza area within the Historic District would be reviewed by the City of San Diego Historical Resources Board (HRB) for consistency with the above-mentioned Standards.

Air Quality

Air quality impacts from construction activities, and from transportation associated with vehicle trips to the redeveloped NTC site were previously analyzed in the Redevelopment EIR, section 4.9. No new impacts to air quality have been identified for the Park proposal. The Redevelopment EIR specified mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts to a level below significance:

- C Vehicles will not exceed 15 miles per hour when traveling over unpaved areas.
- C Include construction specifications that commercial electric power from poles on or near the site will be used during construction wherever feasible.

The Redevelopment EIR (page 4.9-9) recommended the following practices to further reduce air impacts. These recommended practices would be incorporated to the extent possible:

- C apply Best Available Control Technology to reduce exhaust emissions from construction equipment
- C graded areas should be stabilized as soon as possible
- C trucks hauling fill material should be properly covered or would maintain at least 2 feet of free board
- C construction activities should cease when prevailing winds exceed 25 mph
- C diesel equipment should use low-sulfur-content (less than 0.05%) diesel fuel.

Water Use

The Redevelopment EIR (page 4.5-5) estimated total water use for the park at 4,000 gallons/net-acre per day. Based on updated development plans which include projected water use for irrigation and the three pools, projected water use would be reduced to approximately 2,502 gallons/net-acre per day. Landscaping plans would incorporate use of vegetation to minimize water and fertilizer requirements.

Visual Quality

Potential impacts to visual quality were analyzed in the Redevelopment EIR and MND. Development in the park calls for a 7,755 square foot addition to existing Building 619, the construction of three pools, two ballfields, and the plaza.

The Mitigated Negative Declaration analyzed impacts to visual quality and determined that the proposed new buildings would not block or partially obstruct the view of San Diego Bay from public and private viewing areas. Additionally, it is unlikely that any development within the NTC site would impact existing views to San Diego Bay, unless building heights are proposed to be greater than the existing NTC buildings and/or exceed 60 feet in height. The addition to Building 619 would be integrated with the existing single-story structure (approximately 15 feet high) and would therefore not result in a significant visual impact.

Lighting would be provided for the aquatics complex, ballfield, parking lots, and general park areas. Stadium-style lighting would not be provided for the ballfield areas or aquatic complex.

Land Use

Use of the land for a park was analyzed in the Precise Plan MND and EIRs. As analyzed in the MND 99-1076, the Lindbergh Field Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) overlays a portion of the park site which would be used for the nature area and a portion of the historic plaza. The existing recreation Building 191, also within this zone, would remain and would be used for storage and use by City personnel (not as a publically-accessible facility). As specified in the MND 99-1076, buildings remaining in the Runway Protection Zone, such as B-191, cannot be converted to uses which would result in the concentration of large numbers of people. Appendix A of the NTC Precise Plan contains height and use restrictions for structures in the RPZ.

The City and the State Lands Commission have entered into the "Naval Training Center San Diego Title Settlement and Exchange Agreement" which was recorded February 28, 2002. The agreement, together with the grant deeds and patents recorded concurrently, modified the boundary of the Tidelands Trust. The boundary now includes the entire area of the 46-acre park and 3-acre esplanade.

Noise issues associated with land use were analyzed in the Reuse EIR, the Redevelopment EIR, and the Precise Plan MND. Because of the existing noise contours from Lindbergh Field operations, use of the area set aside for park land was considered incompatible with the land use-noise compatibility standards. As such, Findings, and a Statement of Overriding Considerations were issued to address this unmitigable impact. As such, no additional analysis or mitigation is necessary.

Traffic

Traffic impacts were analyzed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration (page 23) and the Redevelopment EIR (page 4.2-1). With the implementation of the mitigation

measures defined in the Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program for MND 99-1076, no significant unmitigated direct or cumulative traffic impacts would result beyond those identified in the Reuse EIR or the Redevelopment EIR. The park would provide for 396 on-site parking spaces.

Health and Safety

Above-ground steam lines exist at the proposed esplanade path on the southeast side of the boat channel near the bridge adjacent to the Metropolitan Waste Water Department Area (MWWD) and the Regional Public Safety & Training Institute (RPSTI) area. Implementation of the General Development Plan includes undergrounding these steam lines.

Several Point of Interest (POI) areas have been identified where past releases of hazardous materials may have occurred. These areas were evaluated and cleaned or otherwise determined that No Further Action required.

- C POI 29 was the former small arms range Number 2, Building 192, demolished in 1993 and was located in the southeast nature area of the proposed park. This site had soil contaminated with lead, antimony, and copper in excess of the concentrations acceptable under approved residential soil guidelines. All contaminated soil was removed from the site. A residual risk analysis was completed indicating that residual concentrations of lead, antimony, and copper in the soil were all below the residential cleanup criteria and did not post an unacceptable risk to human health. The Regional Water Quality Control Board approved site closure on January 3, 2000, with concurrence of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on January 4, 2000.
- C POI 43 was a former mattress sterilizer (Building 288) located near the proposed esplanade near the bridge over the Boat Channel. No evidence of hazardous substance use, disposal, or storage was discovered, therefore No Further Action was recommended.
- C POI 59 was the former pumping dock Number 1 (Building 447) located along the proposed esplanade south of the proposed parking lots to the east of the proposed ballfields. No Further Action concurrence received from regulators in December 1996.
- C POI 62 was the former small arms range Number 1 (demolished in 1942) located along the northwestern boundary of the park near Cushing Road northwest of the proposed pools. Soil analysis from this site revealed arsenic-containing soils considered to be naturally occurring based on analytical results from other soil samples collected throughout the NTC area. This site received a No Further Action determination from the regulators in December 1996.
- C POI 73 was the former boat dock house (Building 417) located in the northeastern portion of the proposed nature area of the park. The

Redevelopment EIR (page 4.13-9) documents that all ordinance has been removed from the former range sites. No Further Action concurrence received from regulators in December 1996.

The Redevelopment EIR discussed asbestos containing material (ACM) and lead-based paint issues. Building 619 (proposed for a 7,755 square foot addition as part of the proposed Aquatics Complex) was determined not to have asbestos containing material (ACM) or lead-based paint. Building 619 was constructed in 1992 as the Child Development Center.

Building 191 (built in 1942), is also proposed to remain in the park, but only for use by City employees and not the public. B-191 was found to have ACM and lead-based paint present. Prior to transfer, the Navy abated B-191 so it did not contain friable, accessible, and damaged ACM. However, "abatement" may mean "encapsulation" and not necessarily "removal." Therefore, if any rehabilitation is to be done in Building 191, it would be necessary to have an asbestos survey completed to determine locations of any remaining ACM. There are no requirements for the abatement of lead-based paint. Since the public (and children) would not have access to or use of Building 191, further action to abate potential lead-based paint is not necessary.

The proposed park location is within the accident potential zone of the NTC cogeneration energy facility (Building 566) located across the boat channel at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot (Facility ID 100000089487). Site/Applied Energy, Inc (AEI) operates this facility under a Risk Management Plan (permit number 129187) for handling anhydrous ammonia (NH₃) pursuant to the California Accidental Release Program (CalARP). The plant uses NH₃ to control emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) from the gas turbine exhaust at the cogeneration facility.

The facility is in compliance with CalARP, and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Process Safety Management (PSM) Program, which provide for the identification, prevention and minimization of chemical releases that could result from failures in processes, procedures and equipment. The facility complies with federal and state emergency response and safety plan requirements, including the Hazardous Substance Control Plan, Emergency Action Plan, Fire Prevention Plan, Exposure Control Plan, Injury and Illness Prevention Plan, Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasures Plan; and the Hazardous Materials Business Plan. As such, no additional mitigation is necessary to ensure health and safety impacts from off-site sources remain below significance.

Geology

The January 2000 report, "*Geotechnical Land Use Investigation, Naval Training Center San Diego, California*," indicates the area of the proposed park has up to a 10-foot liquefiable zone with bay muds approximately 15 feet thick. The ground surface elevations range from about 7 feet to about 12 feet Mean Sea Level (MSL) in the proposed park area. Groundwater elevation is estimated at about 7 feet MSL. In the area near the proposed pools, the geotechnical report documents about 7 feet undocumented fill, 9 feet hydraulic fill, 5 feet bay muds, and 19 feet of bay deposits. Baypoint geologic formation (Qbp) begins at about 15 feet below the surface.

The July 2001 report, "*Geotechnical Investigation Naval Training Center Mass Grading Unit 1 (Units 1 Through 6)*" indicates the shallow groundwater surface elevations could have significant influence on construction. The report makes several recommendations applicable for construction relating to the park:

- C Dewatering will likely be required for excavations below an elevation of about 5 feet MSL.
- C Deep dynamic compaction, use of stone columns, or other soil compaction/densification for new construction.
- C A site-specific foundation investigation is necessary prior to construction of new structures to include mitigation of liquefaction.
- C Use of new fill greater than two feet should be placed at locations chosen by the Geotechnical Engineer and surveyed on a weekly basis following placement of the fill. When survey data indicate that only ½ inch of long-term settlement remains, construction of improvement could then begin.
- C Grading should be performed in accordance with the *Recommended Grading Specifications* in Appendix D of the report. Grading depths and recompaction should be determined by the Geotechnical Engineer.
- C In parking areas, existing hydraulic fill should be removed and recompacted to provide a minimum of 2 feet of compacted fill beneath placement subgrade.

MND 99-1076 addressed impacts from geological hazards. The geotechnical investigation indicated the site has a high potential for liquefaction in the event of a maximum probable earthquake on the Rose Canyon Fault approximately 2.5 miles to the east. The report recommended densification of loose soils and an updated geotechnical evaluation was specified prior to the issuance of final improvement plans, grading plans, and/or grading permits to identify final mitigation for conditions such as liquefiable soils. Fulfillment of this mitigation would be required for construction of the aquatics complex pools including the addition to Building 619 and the foundations needed for these structures.

The Coastal Development Permit 99-1076 specified the following:

- C An updated report addressing site specific soil and groundwater contamination will be required to be submitted to LDR Geology for review and approval prior to issuance of final improvement plans, grading plans, and/or grading permits.

The report will need to address health and safety impacts for any excavations required for construction of structures or utilities in areas mapped with contaminants that were left in place based on maps provided in “Document Review Summary, Naval Training Center, San Diego; prepared by Geocon, Inc., dated March 17, 2000.” The lead Agency for this site contamination, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, will need to concur with the new land use, type of excavations, and any health and safety plan.

Paleontological Resources

The Mitigated Negative Declaration discussed the potential impacts to paleontological (fossil) resources (page 22 of the MND). However, the aquatic park development plans were not available in sufficient detail to be fully analyzed in the MND and are therefore further analyzed in this document. Development of the aquatic complex would include excavation for three pools at a maximum cut of approximately 12 feet deep. Trenching for new utility lines would also occur to depths of approximately ~~three~~ eight feet.

The area to be developed for the park is underlain in both artificial fill and Bay Point (Qbp) formation. Based on the results of the January 2000 geotechnical investigation, Bay Point formation in the area of the proposed pools begins at a depth of approximately 15 feet below the surface. Existing elevations of the park range from about 7 - 12 feet mean sea level. Monitoring for paleontological resources would be therefore not be required for excavation associated with the development of the pools and utility trenching.

Archaeological Resources

As analyzed in the Redevelopment EIR (page 4.3-3) and in the Precise Plan MND (page 22), the potential exists for unknown subsurface historical resources (prehistoric and/or historic) to be present west of the 1850 mean high tide line. The existing Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program established the requirement for archaeological monitoring when excavating or grading in areas west of the 1850 mean high tide line; monitoring shall not be required in areas east (bayward) of the 1850 mean high tide line.

Areas east of the mean high tide line were formerly inundated with waters of the San Diego Bay thereby making the presence of archaeological remains unlikely. As demonstrated in a recent survey for mineral reservations from the Tidelands Exchange Agreement, the entire project area for the park is east of the mean high tide line (formerly inundated with water).

The January 2000 *Geotechnical Land Use Investigation, Naval Training Center San Diego, California* report indicates the area of the proposed park is underlain in about 7 feet undocumented fill, 9 feet hydraulic fill, 5 feet bay muds, and 19 feet of bay deposits. The same report further shows the proposed park area is also completely within the area covered by the 1918 mean high tide line (e.g., this area was generally underwater).

Because all areas of proposed park site were formerly inundated with water of the 1850 mean high tide line, archaeological monitoring will therefore **not** be required for any areas of excavation associated with the development of the park as determined by the previously-certified CEQA documents.

Hydrology

Surface runoff and the storm drainage system of the entire NTC site have been evaluated in the report, "Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis of the NTC Redevelopment Project" of March 2000. Previous hydrologic issues identified with approval of the Tentative Map were addressed with the conditional approval of the downstream drainage study, subject to conditions of agreements such as deferred improvements and maintenance. The Secured Maintenance Agreement filed 4/9/02 in the Office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR-296312 states, "In a letter to Developer dated December 31, 2001, the City conditionally approved the hydrology study for the Project and required the construction and upgrading of certain public drainage facilities." This Agreement was approved by City Council as a companion item to the approval of the subdivision map for NTC Unit 1. No additional mitigation measures beyond those previously-identified are required to address site hydrology.

- C. The following issues require additional analysis in this document and have been determined **to be potentially significant**. As such, additional mitigation measures are provided in Section V of this document for the following: **water quality**.

Water Quality

The Mitigated Negative Declaration 99-1076, the associated Coastal Development Permit (99-1076), and the Redevelopment EIR discussed preliminary Best Management Practices (BMPs) necessary to minimize the impacts of surface water runoff. Since issuance of MND 99-1076, additional engineering analysis has resulted in an updated Storm Water Quality Management Program (August 2002) prepared to further define both construction and post-construction BMPs to be incorporated into the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The upgraded analysis is designed to further improve water quality by treating all surface runoff through a structural treatment device before it reaches the park. The revised BMPs are summarized below.

Construction BMPs

1. Soil stabilization - control techniques would be specified such as seeding, planting, mulching, and scheduling of grading activities to avoid rain events and to disturb limited portions at a time, revegetating as soon as possible.
2. Sediment control - control techniques would be used to minimize runoff where soil would be exposed to rainfall. Stabilized construction entrances at points of entry and exit would be used to minimize sediment tracked into public streets. Other controls such as silt fences, straw bales, sand bags, and storm drain inlet protection would also be used.
3. Roadway cleanliness - control techniques would be used to minimize sediment leaving the site on construction vehicles. Construction road stabilization and stabilized entrance/egress points would minimize soil leaving the site.
4. Dust control - control techniques would be used to minimize airborne dust/particulates leaving the site. Construction vehicle speed would be reduced as discussed in the Air Quality section of this document. Construction vehicles would not exceed 15 miles per hour when traveling over unpaved areas.

Post-Construction BMPs

1. Structural controls - All stormwater runoff from the park site would be discharged through at least one structural treatment device. In many cases, the discharge would pass through a structural treatment device such as biofiltration, followed by a stormwater separator. Design parameters are specified in the *Storm Water Quality Management Program* document. Maintenance would be provided by the City of San Diego.
 - A. Drain Inlet Filter - This is a device with a filter within the storm water system inlets to capture petroleum hydrocarbons residue from vehicles. Drain inlet filters effective in general trash removal would be specified for park construction activities. Filtration devices were previously specified in the Precise Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
 - B. Biofilter Swales and Strips - Swales are shallow, vegetated channels to retain overland storm water flow to allow for infiltration, sedimentation entrapment, plant nutrient uptake, and physical filtration. Strips promote low-velocity flow across a vegetated surface based on sheet flow conditions. Biofilter swales were previously specified in the Precise Plan Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
 - C. Detention Basin - Detention basins would be constructed to temporarily capture and detain storm water runoff consistent with Regional Water

Quality Control Board guidance. Basin depths would be from four to six feet deep. Maintenance would include, but is not limited to, inspection during wet weather to ensure the basin drains in 48 to 72 hours, removal of sediment when sediment depth becomes greater than 18 inches deep or displaces more than 10% of the water quality volume, mowing and maintenance of the side slopes, removal of debris and litter, and elimination of nuisance conditions such as insects, weeds, odors, and algae.

- D. Wet Basin - A wet basin (a permanent wet pool designed to detain and treat stormwater runoff) would be constructed in the nature area of the park. This basin would contain emergent and submerged aquatic vegetation and an active microbial community capable of dissolved constituent consumption. Shallow depths along the perimeter would gradually slope to a depth of approximately six to eight feet deep. Fish species such as *Gambusia affinis* (mosquito fish) would be stocked at a minimum initial density of 200 individuals per surface acre to eliminate problems with mosquitoes. Maintenance actions include, but not limited to, repair of the embankment and spillway, replacement of vegetation, removal of litter, and control of nuisance conditions such as insects, weeds, odors, and algae.
 - E. Stormwater Separator - Several stormwater separators would be installed in the park and in the existing right-of-way under Cushing Road along the western boundary of the park. These separators allow for settling and separation of stormwater and contaminants through mechanisms such as gravity settling, filtration, and/or screening. Stormwater separators would be installed at each storm drain outfall into the Bay, or at each location where the storm drain system leaves the park site.
2. Non-structural controls - Administrative controls would also be used to help further reduce stormwater runoff impacts as discussed below.
- A. Street Cleaning - Street sweeping would be used on finished roads within the NTC and park site. Frequency of sweeping would increase before the wet season to remove sediments that may have accumulated during the drier months.
 - B. Signs - Signs such as "No Dumping, Drains to Ocean" would be installed on all drain inlets in the development and park.
 - C. Education/Outreach - Information on the City of San Diego "Think Blue" Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program would be available to users of the park to educate about causes of storm water pollution and about pollution prevention behaviors that they could adopt to help improve water quality.

The Precise Plan MND specified the following mitigation measures which have been incorporated into the scope of the project:

- C Development would comply with all requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Order No. 92-08-DWQ (NPDES General Permit No. CAS000002, *Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated With Construction Activity*). In accordance with this permit, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Monitoring Program Plan would be developed and implemented concurrently with the commencement of grading activities, and a complete and accurate Notice of Intent (NOI) shall be filed with the SWRCB. The City has filed for, and received an NOI. The City conveyed title to the Redevelopment Agency for all property on the west side of the channel except for the park. The park area is therefore still covered by the City's original NOI.
- C If large areas of turf are installed as part of park and recreation space, BMPs shall be required to minimize the potential for relatively soluble turf amendments (e.g., fertilizers, pesticides) to migrate to surface water or groundwater. Such practices include, but are not limited to: managing irrigation to avoid excess water percolation and runoff; when possible, leaving grass clippings on the turf which can reduce the amount of nitrogen fertilizer required by about one-third; using organic nitrogen sources rather than nitrate fertilizers; as necessary, applying low rates of fertilizers and pesticides frequently rather than high rates infrequently; applying fertilizers only when the grass is growing and the roots are active; when seeding turf areas, making maximum use of less nitrogen-demanding grasses; using minimal rates of nitrogen-supplying fertilizers at times of seeding and after sodding; and reducing nitrogen rates on turf that has been intensely managed for several years to prevent soils from becoming nitrogen-saturated.
- C The owner(s) and subsequent owner(s) of any portion of the property covered by this grading permit and by SWRCB Order No. 92-08-DWQ, and any subsequent amendments thereto, shall comply with special provisions as set forth in Section C.7 of SWRCB Order No. 92-08-DWQ.
- C All development, public and private, shall meet or exceed the stormwater standards of the State of California, and the most recent standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board with regard to stormwater runoff, and any amendment to, or re-issuance thereof.
- C During storm events, divert first-flush runoff washloads (the first half inch of precipitation) from all paved surfaces to soakway basins, or other suitable treatment structures, prior to release into the Bay. These structures allow for relatively rapid infiltration of storm water runoff prior to discharge into natural channels. Treatment structures include unlined drainage channels; grassy swales along roads, parking lots, and storm drain channels; infiltration ditches and trenches; and constructed wetlands.

V. RECOMMENDATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- The proposed project would not have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described in Section IV above have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION should be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT should be required.

PROJECT ANALYST: WILKINSON

Attachments: Figure 1, Location Map
Figure 2, Site Plan
Figure 3, NTC Runoff Management Plan

III. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

The purpose of the Initial Study is to identify the potential for significant environmental impacts which could be associated with a project pursuant to Section 15063 of the State CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the Initial Study provides the lead agency with information which forms the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), Negative Declaration (ND) or Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). This Checklist provides a means to facilitate early environmental assessment. However, subsequent to this preliminary review, modifications to the project may mitigate adverse impacts. All answers of "yes" and "maybe" indicate that there is a potential for significant environmental impacts and these determinations are explained in Section IV of the Initial Study.

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
I. AESTHETICS / NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER – Will the proposal result in:			
A. The obstruction of any vista or scenic view from a public viewing area? <u>Visual quality was previously analyzed in the Redevelopment EIR and Precise Plan MND. The Park General Development Plan calls for a 7,755 square foot addition to Building 619. The height of the building would be approximately 15 feet high to integrate with the existing one-story building. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
B. The creation of a negative aesthetic site or project? <u>See I-A.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
C. Project bulk, scale, materials, or style which would be incompatible with surrounding development? <u>Park design aligns with NTC Precise Plan.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
D. Substantial alteration to the existing character of the area? <u>See I-C.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
E. The loss of any distinctive or landmark tree(s), or a stand of mature trees? <u>No landmark trees present in the park area. Several mature palms would be removed.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
F. Substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features?	—	<u>U</u>	—

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
<p><u>Existing site topography would be altered from a relatively flat area to areas of gently rolling terrain for both aesthetics and for improved drainage. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>			
G. The loss, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features such as a natural canyon, sandstone bluff, rock outcrop, or hillside with a slope in excess of 25 percent? <u>No unique geological features exist in the project's area of potential effect.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
H. Substantial light or glare? <u>Lighting would be provided in the park for recreational uses such as the ballfields, aquatic complex, and walkway areas. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
I. Substantial shading of other properties? <u>No substantial shading would occur. No off-site shading impacts would result from expansion of existing Building 619.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
<p>II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES / NATURAL RESOURCES / MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:</p>			
A. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource (e.g., sand or gravel) that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? <u>The project would result in excavation of artificial fill material not suitable for sand/gravel extraction or mineral resources.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
B. The conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural use or impairment of the agricultural productivity of agricultural land? <u>The project site is an urbanized area not suitable for agricultural uses.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
<p>III. AIR QUALITY – Would the proposal:</p>			
A. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? <u>The project would not establish a new air emission source.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
B. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected			

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
<p>air quality violation? <u>The project would result in temporary airborne emissions from construction equipment and from vehicle trips to the park. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>	—	<u>U</u>	—
<p>C. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? <u>Airborne pollution could result from construction activities and vehicle trips to the park. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>	—	<u>U</u>	—
<p>D. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? <u>Project activities are not anticipated to create objectionable odors. However, off-site facilities may result in odors to users of the park and esplanade. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>	—	—	<u>U</u>
<p>E. Exceed 100 pounds per day of Particulate Matter 10 (dust)? <u>Site grading is proposed over 46 acres. An existing mitigation measure would require construction traffic to not exceed 15 miles per hour on unpaved areas. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>	—	<u>U</u>	—
<p>F. Alter air movement in the area of the project? <u>Construction and use of the park would not substantially alter air movement. New construction would be added to existing Building 619. However, this new construction is not substantial enough to block air movement to the new residential construction associated with the rest of the Liberty Station project.</u></p>	—	—	<u>U</u>
<p>G. Cause a substantial alteration in moisture, or temperature, or any change in climate, either locally or regionally? <u>The project would not alter existing macro-climatic regimes. Small-scale, localized beneficial impacts of increased cooling and moisture could be reasonably foreseeable from addition of new turf and vegetation in the park. These effects would likely not be substantial, but perhaps noticeable to users of the park.</u></p>	—	—	<u>U</u>

Yes Maybe No

IV. BIOLOGY – Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <p>A. A reduction in the number of any unique, rare, endangered, sensitive, or fully protected species of plants or animals?
 <u>As analyzed in the previous CEQA documents, the project location is used by a variety of birds. Design of the park would integrate human and avian uses. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> | <p>—</p> |
| <p>B. A substantial change in the diversity of any species of animals or plants?
 <u>The existing land was used for military uses and did not contain a diversity of natural vegetation. The proposed park would create substantial new vegetation, natural areas, and open areas increasing localized floral species diversity.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> | <p>—</p> |
| <p>C. Introduction of invasive species of plants into the area?
 <u>Review by City Landscape Planners would ensure use of non-invasives in the park landscaping design.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> |
| <p>D. Interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors?
 <u>Prior to construction, a biologist would verify presence or absence of migratory birds. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> | <p>—</p> |
| <p>E. An impact to a sensitive habitat, including, but not limited to streamside vegetation, aquatic, riparian, oak woodland, coastal sage scrub or chaparral?
 <u>Sensitive habitat exists in the Boat Channel and along the Boat Channel shoreline which includes some soft substrate, but mostly rocky (rip-rap) shoreline. The General Development Plan of the park does not propose development in or along the Boat Channel at this time. Future development in these areas would be evaluated in additional CEQA documents.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> |
| <p>F. An impact on City, State, or federally regulated wetlands (including, but not limited to, coastal salt marsh, vernal pool, lagoon, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption or other means?</p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> |

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>A 15-foot buffer would be maintained along the Boat Channel. See IV E above and Initial Study discussion.</u>				
G.	Conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan? <u>The project is not within the Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), and would not conflict with the Multi Species Conservation Plan (MSCP).</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
V.	ENERGY – Would the proposal:			
A.	Result in the use of excessive amounts of fuel or energy (e.g. natural gas)? <u>Standard excavating/construction equipment would be used.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
B.	Result in the use of excessive amounts of power? <u>The project would not create new urban infrastructure requiring use of excessive power.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
VI.	GEOLOGY/SOILS – Would the proposal:			
A.	Expose people or property to geologic hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? <u>Geotechnical investigations have documented a liquefiable zone underlying the park. New structures such as the addition to B619 and the pools would require additional engineering analysis. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
B.	Result in a substantial increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? <u>Some soil erosion could be reasonably foreseeable during construction activities. Engineering controls would be required to mitigate impacts. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
C.	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? <u>See VI-A above.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—

Yes Maybe No

VII. HISTORICAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <p>A. Alteration of or the destruction of a prehistoric or historic archaeological site?
 <u>The entire park site is bayward of the 1850 Mean High Tide Line. As this entire area was underwater, no archaeological monitoring would be required as determined by the previous MND and EIRs. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> |
| <p>B. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to a prehistoric or historic building, structure, object, or site?
 <u>A portion of the park (the new plaza) would be constructed in the NTC Historic District. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> | <p>—</p> |
| <p>C. Adverse physical or aesthetic effects to an architecturally significant building, structure, or object?
 <u>The plaza would incorporate the existing historic gun emplacements. See VII-B above.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> | <p>—</p> |
| <p>D. Any impact to existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?
 <u>No known sites are in the area of the Park.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> |
| <p>E. The disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?
 <u>No known sites are in the area of the Park.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> |

VIII. HUMAN HEALTH / PUBLIC SAFETY / HAZARDOUS MATERIALS :
 Would the proposal:

- | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------------|----------|
| <p>A. Create any known health hazard (excluding mental health)?
 <u>The project would not create any new health hazard. Previous ground contamination has been cleaned and cleared with the regulators. Steam lines would be underground. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p> | <p>—</p> | <p><u>U</u></p> | <p>—</p> |
| <p>B. Expose people or the environment to a significant hazard through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous</p> | | | |

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
materials? <u>The project scope does not include storage or transport of unusual hazardous materials other than materials commonly associated with construction/excavation/demolition equipment.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
C. Create a future risk of an explosion or the release of hazardous substances (including but not limited to gas, oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation, or explosives)? <u>No future risk is associated with the project.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
D. Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? <u>The project conforms to the plans.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
E. 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? <u>Past releases associated with the Point of Interest sites have been abated. See Initial Study.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
F. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? <u>The location is near the NTC energy cogeneration facility across the boat channel. However, existing safety features would prevent any release which would affect users of the park. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
IX. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY – Would the proposal result in:			
A. An increase in pollutant discharges, including down stream sedimentation, to receiving waters during or following construction? Consider water quality parameters such as temperature dissolved oxygen, turbidity and other typical storm water pollutants. <u>Increased sedimentation is reasonably foreseeable as a result of construction activities grading the 46 acre park. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
B. An increase in impervious surfaces and associated increased runoff?	—	<u>U</u>	—

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
<p><u>The project would create new impervious surfaces (parking lots), however, new permeable vegetated surfaces would also be created along with areas for stormwater runoff retention. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>			
<p>C. Substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes? <u>Drainage patterns would be altered in a positive way to improve stormwater runoff conditions by increasing vegetated surfaces and better managing stormwater runoff. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>	—	<u>U</u>	—
<p>D. Discharge of identified pollutants to an already impaired water body (as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list)? <u>The Boat Channel is affected from past sewage and runoff discharges. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>	—	<u>U</u>	—
<p>E. A potentially significant adverse impact on ground water quality? <u>The project would neither add on nor withdraw from existing ground water.</u></p>	—	—	<u>U</u>
<p>F. Cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses? <u>The project would improve water quality through implementation of BMPs. See Initial Study discussion.</u></p>	—	—	<u>U</u>
<p>X. LAND USE – Would the proposal result in:</p>			
<p>A. A land use which is inconsistent with the adopted community plan land use designation for the site or conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over a project? <u>Land use issues were address in previous CEQA documents. See Initial Study discussion for Runway Protection Zone and State Lands Commission updates.</u></p>	—	<u>U</u>	—
<p>B. A conflict with the goals, objectives and recommendations of the community plan in which it is located? <u>Use of the land for a park is consistent with the Precise Plan.</u></p>	—	—	<u>U</u>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
C. A conflict with adopted environmental plans, including applicable habitat conservation plans adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect for the area? <u>See X-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
D. Physically divide an established community? <u>See X-A above.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
E. Land uses which are not compatible with aircraft accident potential as defined by an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan? <u>See X-A above.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
XI. NOISE – Would the proposal result in:			
A. A significant increase in the existing ambient noise levels? <u>Temporary construction noise impacts within acceptable City thresholds would be reasonably foreseeable during excavation/construction activities.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
B. Exposure of people to noise levels which exceed the City's adopted noise ordinance? <u>See XI A and Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
C. Exposure of people to current or future transportation noise levels which exceed standards established in the Transportation Element of the General Plan or an adopted airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan? <u>Transportation patterns were analyzed in the Precise Plan MND and are unaffected by the proposal for the Park. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
XII. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the proposal impact a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? <u>The project site contains fill and alluvium down to about 15 feet followed Baypoint formation (Qbp). Excavation would not extend into Baypoint formation. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the proposal:			
A. Induce substantial population growth in			

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
	an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? <u>The project would be compatible with land use plans for the area.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
B.	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? <u>Work would not displace residences.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
C.	Alter the planned location, distribution, density or growth rate of the population of an area? <u>The project would be compatible with land use plans for the area.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
XIV.	PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas:			
A.	Fire protection? <u>No additional fire protection services would be required.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
B.	Police protection? <u>No additional police protection would be required.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
C.	Schools? <u>No change to school services.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
D.	Parks or other recreational facilities? <u>The project would create a new regional park. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
E.	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? <u>Additional public infrastructure would be created. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
F.	Other governmental services? <u>Existing services would remain unaffected.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
XV.	RECREATIONAL RESOURCES – Would the proposal result in:			
A.	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that			

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? <u>The project would create a new regional park. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
B. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? <u>See XV A.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION – Would the proposal result in:			
A. Traffic generation in excess of specific/ community plan allocation? <u>Construction of the park and projected traffic volume for users of the park were considered in the Precise Plan MND. See Initial Study.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
B. An increase in projected traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system? <u>See XVI-A.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
C. An increased demand for off-site parking? <u>The project would provide almost 400 spaces of on-site parking. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
D. Effects on existing parking? <u>The project would provide almost 400 spaces of on-site parking. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
E. Substantial impact upon existing or planned transportation systems? <u>Public transportation systems may experience increase in use to provide service to the park.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
F. Alterations to present circulation movements including effects on existing public access to beaches, parks, or other open space areas? <u>Use of the area as a park is consistent with traffic analysis in the Precise Plan MND.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
G. Increase in traffic hazards for motor vehicles, bicyclists or pedestrians due to a proposed, non-standard design feature (e.g., poor sight distance or driveway onto an access-restricted roadway)?	—	—	<u>U</u>

		<u>Yes</u>	<u>Maybe</u>	<u>No</u>
	<u>Pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle traffic to and in the park has been analyzed and incorporated in the scope of existing plans.</u>			
H.	A conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs supporting alternative transportation models (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? <u>The project would be compatible with land use and community plans for the area.</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
XVII.	UTILITIES – Would the proposal result in a need for new systems, or require substantial alterations to existing utilities, including:			
A.	Natural gas? <u>Natural gas may be required to be extended to Building 619. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
B.	Communications systems? <u>Existing utilities not affected</u>	—	—	<u>U</u>
C.	Water? <u>Water service would be required for park irrigation, restroom, and pool use. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
D.	Sewer? <u>Sewer connections would be required for the new restrooms. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
E.	Storm water drainage? <u>Stormwater drainage would be improved through Best Management Practices and a stormwater pollution prevention plan. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
F.	Solid waste disposal? <u>Solid waste would be generated through users of the park. Existing mitigation measures define controls on design of waste cans to limit impacts to wildlife. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
XVIII.	WATER CONSERVATION – Would the proposal result in:			
A.	Use of excessive amounts of water? <u>Water consumption would be less than estimated in the previous EIR. See Initial Study discussion.</u>	—	<u>U</u>	—
B.	Landscaping which is predominantly non-drought resistant vegetation?	—	—	<u>U</u>

Yes Maybe No

Landscape plans would be reviewed by City Landscape Planners to ensure use of appropriate vegetation for the various areas of the park.

XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

The project design incorporates both human and avian use of the resource. See Initial Study discussion.

— — U

- B. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals? (A short-term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long-term impacts would endure well into the future.)

The short-term and long-term goals of the project are consistent with the community and site plans.

— — U

- C. Does the project have impacts which are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project may impact on two or more separate resources where the impact on each resource is relatively small, but where the effect of the total of those impacts on the environment is significant.)

No cumulative impacts beyond those identified in the previously-certified environmental documents are anticipated

— — U

D. Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No adverse human impacts are reasonably foreseeable. Use of the park would create positive impacts for human users.

Yes Maybe No

— — U

**INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST
REFERENCES**

The following previously-certified CEQA documents were referenced for all resource impact areas:

- C *Disposal and Reuse of Certain Real Properties at Naval Training Center, San Diego, California Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report ("Reuse EIS/EIR")*, LDR No. 96-0255, SCH No. 96051057, certified by the City of San Diego on October 20, 1988.
- C *Environmental Impact Report for the NTC Redevelopment Project ("Redevelopment EIR")*, SCH No. 99081140, certified by the Redevelopment Agency of the City of San Diego on February 1, 2000.
- C *Mitigated Negative Declaration NTC Precise Plan and Local Coastal Plan & Related Entitlements/MWWD Environmental Monitoring and Technical Services Laboratory*. LDR No. 99-1076, SCH No. 2000081037. September 14, 2000.

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

- ___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- U Community Plans: Peninsula Community Plan, Ocean Beach Precise Plan, and Ocean Beach Action Plan.
- ___ Local Coastal Plan.
- U North Bay Revitalization Area Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR). City of San Diego, March 1998.

II. Agricultural Resources / Natural Resources / Mineral Resources

- ___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- U U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973.
- ___ California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification.
- ___ Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps.

III. Air

- ___ California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990.

U Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD.

U Other reports:

C Mitigated Negative Declaration. Wet Weather Storage Facility. LDR 42-0056. January 2002.

C Risk Management Plan Public Document for NTC/MCRD Energy Facility Applied Energy, Inc. June 1999. Submitted to County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Prepared by a Resource Catalysts (R|CAT) Project Team.

IV. Biology

U City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997

U City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" maps, 1996.

U City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997.

___ Community Plan - Resource Element.

___ California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001.

___ California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001.

U City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines.

U Other reports:

C Mitigated Negative Declaration. North Harbor Drive Bridge Over Navy Boat Channel (NTC), San Diego Bay - Seismic Retrofit. LDR No. 98-0235 (SHC 98081025). July 27, 2000.

V. Energy

U Project design review meeting, August 7, 2002

VI. Geology/Soils

U City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study.

U U.S. Department of Agriculture Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, December 1973 and Part III, 1975.

U Other reports:

- C Liberty Station Project Update. November 8, 2001. Megan Conley, Director of Communications, The Corky McMillin Companies.
- C Geotechnical Investigation. Naval Training Center Mass Grading Unit 1 (Units 1 - 6). San Diego, California. Geocon. July 19, 2001.
- C Geotechnical Investigation. Naval Training Center Residential Housing and Office Complex. San Diego, California. Geocon. January 24, 2001.

VII. Historical Resources

- City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines.
- U City of San Diego Archaeology Library.
- U Historical Resources Board List.
- Community Historical Survey: _____
- U North Bay Revitalization Area Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR). City of San Diego, March 1998.
- U Plat of State of California Mineral Reservation from the Tidelands Exchange Agreement and Parcel Map 18941.

VIII. Human Health / Public Safety / Hazardous Materials

- U San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing, 2001.
- San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division
- FAA Determination
- State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized 1995.
- U Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
- U Other reports:
 - C Base Realignment and Closure Cleanup Plan (BCP) for the former Naval Training Center, San Diego, CA. U.S. Department of the Navy. March 1999.
 - C Naval Training Center Reuse Plan. Conditions and Considerations - Existing Conditions at NTC Which Affect the Reuse Planning Effort. Rick Engineering Company. October 14, 1994.
 - C Document Review Summary. Naval Training Center San Diego, California. Geocon. March 2000.
 - C Memo from Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves, and Savitch, LLP to Kathleen Riser, McMillin Land Development. "McMillin NTC." May 22, 2000.

- C Memo from Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch, LLP to Kathleen Riser, McMillin Land Development. "NTC Small Arms Range No. 2 and Buildings 191 and 619." July 31, 2002.
- C Memo from County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Brad Long to Cory Wilkinson, City of San Diego. "Request for Information Regarding the California Accidental Release Program (Cal-ARP)." August 7, 2002.
- C Risk Management Plan Public Document for NTC/MCRD Energy Facility Applied Energy, Inc. June 1999. Submitted to County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Prepared by a Resource Catalysts (R|CAT) Project Team.

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

- Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program - Flood Boundary and Floodway Map.
- Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, dated May 19, 1999, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html.
- Other Reports:
 - C Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis of the Naval Training Center (NTC) Redevelopment Project. Rick Engineering Company, Water Resources Division. March 15, 2000.
 - C Geotechnical Land Use Investigation. Naval Training Center San Diego, California. Geocon. January 2000.
 - C Storm Water Quality Management Program Naval Training Center Redevelopment Program. San Diego, California. RBF Consulting. August 2002.
 - C NTC Runoff Management Plan, Figure 9-8. NTC Redevelopment Proposed Post-Construction BMPs. RBF Consulting. August 15, 2001.

X. Land Use

- City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan
- City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- FAA Determination
- Other Reports:
 - C NTC Precise Plan and Local Coastal Plan. Rick Planning Group. July 2000.

- C Naval Training Center (MMRP) Master Planned Development Permit/Coastal Development Permit No. 99-1076. City Council, City of San Diego. Approved by the Council of the City of San Diego on November 19, 2001 by Resolution R-295753.
- C North Bay Revitalization Area Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR). City of San Diego, March 1998.

XI. Noise

- U Community Plan
- ___ Site Specific Report: _____.
- U San Diego International Airport - Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps.
- ___ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps.
- ___ Montgomery Field CNEL Maps.
- ___ San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes.
- U San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.
- ___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.
- ___ Site Specific Report: _____
- U North Bay Revitalization Area Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR). City of San Diego, March 1998.

XII. Paleontological Resources

- U City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines.
- ___ Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996.
- U Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 200, Sacramento, 1975.
- ___ Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977.
- U Other Reports:
 - C Mitigated Negative Declaration. Wet Weather Storage Facility. LDR No. 42-0056. January 16, 2002.

XIII. Population / Housing

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

U Community Plan.

___ Series 8 Population Forecasts, SANDAG.

___ Other: _____

XIV. Public Services

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

U Community Plan.

XV. Recreational Resources

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

U Community Plan.

___ Department of Park and Recreation

___ City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map

XVI. Transportation / Circulation

___ City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan.

U Community Plan.

___ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.

___ San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG.

XVII. Utilities

U Project design review meeting, August 7, 2002

XVIII. Water Conservation

___ Sunset Magazine, New Western Garden Book. Rev. ed. Menlo Park, CA: Sunset Magazine.

U Project design review meeting, August 7, 2002

