

### INITIAL STUDY/ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

1. Project title:  
Tentative Cleanup and Abatement Order No. R9-2010-0002 for the Shipyard Sediment Site, San Diego Bay
2. Lead agency name and address:  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region  
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92123
3. Contact person and phone number:  
Mr. Tom Alo  
(858) 636-3154
4. Project location:  
The Shipyard Sediment Site is located along the eastern shore of central San Diego Bay and encompasses an area extending approximately from the Sampson Street Extension to the north and Chollas Creek to the south and from the National Steel and Shipbuilding Company (NASSCO) and BAE Systems shipyard facilities shoreline out to the San Diego Bay main shipping channel on the west.
5. Project sponsor's name and address:  
California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region  
9174 Sky Park Court, Suite 100  
San Diego, CA 92123
6. General plan designation:  
Industrial
7. Zoning:  
Industrial
8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

The project is a tentative Cleanup and Abatement Order (CAO) for cleanup of contaminated marine sediments at the NASSCO/BAE Systems Shipyard Sediment Site in San Diego Bay. The cleanup remedy may include dredging, capping, and/or natural recovery. Dredge spoils may be dewatered at an onshore facility and disposed of at an appropriate landfill site.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

Industrial land use surrounds the property. The area is located within the Belt Street Industrial and Harbor Drive Industrial of the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal Planning District (Port Master Plan). Belt Street Industrial is a heavy industrial district, south of the Tenth Avenue marine Terminal and consists of several well-established and highly important marine-related manufacturing, processing, and servicing establishments. All of the area is developed and leased to marine related industrial businesses except for a small, partly vacated parcel west of Crosby Road. Harbor Drive Industrial consists entirely of one major shipbuilding plant, National Steel and Shipbuilding Company.

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

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, California Coastal Commission, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Air Pollution Control District

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:


The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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


**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

  
Signature ASSIST. EXECUTIVE OFFICER

12/22/09  
Date

 David W. Gibson  
Name

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such

effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

- c) **Mitigation Measures.** For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
  - 7) **Supporting Information Sources:** A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
  - 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
  - 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
    - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
    - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues:

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **No Impact.** The project is located in a heavy marine industrial area known in the Port Master Plan as the Belt Street Industrial & Harbor Drive Industrial of the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal Planning District. Ship repair and construction activity occurs within the project area for the Navy and commercial customers. The dredging and disposal equipment will likely appear similar and blend with the equipment associated with these activities. Furthermore, the Port Master Plan does not identify scenic vistas that transverse the project. This issue will not be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR).
- b) **No Impact.** The Port Master Plan does not identify scenic highways that transverse the project. No scenic resources, trees or rock outcroppings would be damaged as a result of dredging in the project area. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** The project would not involve the construction or reconstruction of any structures that could potentially alter the visual character of the area surrounding the project. The dredging equipment and covered dredged materials stored on-site

would temporarily alter but not degrade the visual character of the surrounding area. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- d) **No Impact.** Dredging would be conducted during daytime hours and no new structures or lighting facilities would be constructed as part of the project implementation. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |



**DISCUSSION**

- a) **No Impact.** The California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program identify categories of agricultural resources that are significant and therefore require special consideration. The proposed project is not located in an area designated as Prime or Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (California Department of Conservation, 1999). No farmland or row crops currently exist in the vicinity of the proposed project and therefore, none would be converted to accommodate the proposed project. No impacts would occur. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** The project area is not zoned for agricultural use but for heavy industrial use. No agricultural resources or operations exist within the project limits or adjacent areas, and no Williamson Act contracts apply to the area. Therefore, this issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not disrupt or damage the operation or productivity of any areas designated as Farmland. As discussed above, no farmland is located within the project area that could be affected by the project. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- |   |                                     |                          |                          |                          |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
or projected air quality violation?				
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

a) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Dredging, dewatering, and truck trips would all create emissions that would contribute to the existing air quality conditions in the area. Emissions associated with dredging activities come from emissions as opposed to dust; the dewatering phase has a low potential for particulate matter (PM) dust emissions and wind erosion due to self contained equipment being used and to the wet (submerged) nature of the soils that would be disturbed. Truck trips hauling dewatered soils to the landfills are also potential sources for temporary PM and diesel emissions.

The principal source of emissions, however, would be from the dredge's diesel engine used for dredge propulsion, driving dredging pumps, and driving electric generators. These would be large diesel engines, and short-term NO<sub>x</sub> emission rates would very likely exceed the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) thresholds for daily emissions, for new and modified sources. This would require the applicant (i.e., dredge contractor) to obtain an Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate.

As part of the permitting procedure, an Air Quality Impact analysis would be performed, if necessary, to provide data relative to anticipated NO<sub>x</sub> emissions rates, and to demonstrate that the state and federal air quality standards would not be violated, and there would be no significant impact. Alternatively, an individual dredging vessel may be registered with the California Air Resources Board (ARB) and not require a specific air quality permit for this project.

This issue will be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- b) **Potentially Significant Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- c) **Potentially Significant Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- d) **Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated.** Certain population groups are considered particularly sensitive to air pollution. Sensitive receptors consist of land uses that are more likely to be used by these population groups. Sensitive receptors include health care facilities, retirement homes, school and playground facilities, and residential areas. Trucks hauling dewatered soils could subject sensitive receptors within the Barrio Logan community to significant diesel emissions during transport to the landfills. Mitigation could include using alternative fuel vehicles and/or routing trucks away from sensitive receptors. This issue will be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- e) **Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated.** See response to item (d) above.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES --**  
 Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

## DISCUSSION

- a) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.** Marine Vegetation – Patches and beds of eelgrass are present within the project area. Eelgrass beds are considered to be very valuable nursery sites for many species of invertebrates and fish species. Eelgrass bed habitat has been identified as a sensitive marine resource by the California Department of Fish and Game, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Eelgrass beds serve as refuges, foraging areas, and nursery habitats for various coastal and bay invertebrates, fishes, and birds. The loss of eelgrass habitat as a result of dredging in the project area will be addressed through the National Marine Fisheries' Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy (SCEMP). This policy requires a minimum in kind replacement at a ratio of 1:2:1 and a five year monitoring requirement to determine success. Implementation of this policy would reduce the impact caused by the project to a less than significant level.

Invertebrates – Dredging activities inherently cause a disturbance and redistribution of bottom sediments which may persist for the duration of the operation. Some invertebrates, especially small crustaceans and mollusks of the infauna, may be relocated with the dredged material and deposited on the discharge site. Some would be smothered, some would become food for opportunistic shorebirds, and others would survive at the new location. Invertebrates, epifauna, and infauna may be exposed to suspended sediment concentrations during dredging and up to 24 hours later. Dredging operations may cause some clogging to gills and suspension feeding apparatuses, resulting in smothering to invertebrates in the immediate vicinity. Invertebrates are expected to recover from the disturbance upon completion of the project. The impacts to invertebrates are minimal, temporary, and not significant.

Fish and Essential Fish Habitat – The dredging process could result in direct loss of foraging habitat, but perhaps even more significant is the turbidity associated with

this activity. Some fish may avoid the immediate project area during dredging operations because of the increased turbidity, noise levels, and oxygen depletion caused by dredging bottom sediment. The dredging operation will be monitored to ensure that any substantial increases in turbidity or decreases in dissolved oxygen are restricted to the immediate area around the dredge. The potential for significant impacts exist due to the presence of fine sediments and organisms in the potential dredging areas. Fine sediments remain suspended in the water column. On the beneficial side, dredging could increase water circulation and indirectly benefit fish resources. Also, dredging activities sometimes suspend infauna and epifauna to temporarily enhance fish feeding activities. Impacts to fish and essential habitat is minimum and short term, and it would not result in a significant, adverse impact.

Birds – Dredging activities may temporarily degrade water quality and increase ambient noise levels, which could cause disturbances to some birds. Increased levels of activities within the project area may decrease waterfowl use of the water for resting and the use of the any nearby structures for roosting; however given the current industrial activities within the project area (e.g., ship repair and construction), the addition of the dredge would not significantly increase activity levels. Furthermore, these affects are not significant because dredging operations would occur over a short duration and be localized. Birds and marine mammals are expected to rapidly acclimate to the dredge's monotonous, non-threatening noise.

Marine Mammals – San Diego Bay does not constitute essential feeding or breeding habitat for any marine mammal species that may be present in the project area. Sea lions would probably keep clear of the dredging activities; therefore, there would be no significant impacts to these mammals. Similarly, the proposed dredging operation is not expected to adversely affect any other marine mammals. Any short-term disruptions to pre-dredge foraging or movement behaviors would be temporary and not significant, as wildlife activities would return to normal upon project completion.

- b) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.** See response to item (a) above - Marine Vegetation.
- c) **No Impact.** No known federally protected wetlands exist in or near the project site. No impacts would occur, and no further study this issue is required.
- d) **Less Than Significant Impact.** Dredging of the project area would temporarily disturb subtidal habitat (eelgrass bed). This aquatic habitat within the project area is not located in any important fish or wildlife movement corridor or located in any identified native wildlife nursery site, though the eelgrass beds are likely to provide this resource. Mobile marine organisms such as fish are anticipated to avoid the

immediate vicinity of the dredging activities; however, fish are expected to return to the project area in the absence of dredging activities, especially at night, and subsequent to project completion.

- e) **No Impact.** The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No policies specifically apply to eelgrass or eelgrass habitat. Mitigation and habitat protection as part of the project and mitigation strategy will be consistent with the SCEMP. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- f) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not within the area of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No plans specifically apply to eelgrass or eelgrass habitat. Mitigation and habitat protection as part of the project and mitigation strategy will be consistent with the SCEMP. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES --  
 Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

a) **No Impact.** The project site is currently, and has been for many years, utilized as shipyards providing shipyard construction and repair services to both commercial customers and the Navy. The project does not entail grading undisturbed areas on the site, and the area proposed for dredging consists of recently deposited material and undisturbed subtidal material below the depth that would include cultural resources. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on historical or archaeological resources pursuant to '15064.5. No paleontological resources or unique geologic features would be impacted.

As part of the project, standard BMPs will be employed to ensure no impacts occur. In the event that an archaeological or paleontological resource is found during implementation of this project, the contractor will immediately cease all construction at the place of discovery and a qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist will evaluate the find. If the archaeologist or paleontologist determines that potentially significant archaeological or paleontological materials or human remains are encountered, the archaeologist or paleontologist will recover, retrieve, and/or remove any archaeological or paleontological materials. The archaeologist will provide a copy of documentation of all recovered data and materials found on site to the regional information center of the California Archaeological Inventory for inclusion in the permanent archives and another copy shall accompany any recorded archaeological materials data.

No potential indirect, operational, or cumulative impact to cultural resources have been identified. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

a.i) **No Impact.** Seismic- and soil-related issues from project implementation would not be a significant consideration since the project consists of dredging contaminated sediments within the water area of the project site and no structures would be constructed for human occupancy. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

a.ii) **Potentially Significant Impact.** Backfill material such as imported sand may shift during a seismic event, which in turn could lead to exposure to underlying contaminated sediment.

a.iii) **No Impact.** See response to item (a.i) above.

a.iv) **No Impact.** See response to item (a.i) above.

b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a.i) above.

c) **No Impact.** See response to item (a.i) above.

d) **No Impact.** See response to item (a.i) above.

e) **No Impact.** See response to item (a.i) above.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:</b>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.** The proposed project could result in a significant release of hazardous material into the environment. During dredging and disposal of contaminated sediment, operational BMPs will be employed to prevent the release of contaminants into the marine environment. Silt curtains will be deployed around the in-water work site, which will contain temporary construction-related turbidity. The contractor will be responsible for removing any debris in the water at the end of each work day. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.** Accidental spills of oil, grease, or other petroleum products could occur during dredging. The contractor will implement a Spill Prevention, Containment, and Control (SPCC) Plan to avoid

accidental spills and to have the appropriate materials on site in order to respond to any gas, oil, or other leak or spill. All equipment (on land and over water) will be kept in proper operating condition, and any leak will be immediately repaired. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- c) **No Impact.** The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, on a site listed on the list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5, or within an airport land use plan. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- e) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- f) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- g) **No Impact.** The project will comply with all applicable fire codes and emergency evacuation plans set forth by the City of San Diego Fire Department. Existing emergency access to the project site will remain in place. Emergency plans will be made by the contractor to ensure prompt, safe, and orderly evacuation at any time during dredging and disposal activities, if necessary. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- h) **No Impact.** The project is located in an industrial environment removed from wildlands. Therefore, no fire hazard related to wildlands is identified. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER  
 QUALITY -- Would the project:

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.** The project could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements (WDR) during dredging and disposal activities as a result of accidental release of contaminants from construction equipment. Discharges into San Diego Bay would be managed in accordance with applicable state regulations, including WDRs and water quality monitoring during dredging and disposal. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** Groundwater at the project site has significant saltwater intrusion and is therefore unsuitable for use as drinking water. The area does not support surface recharge of groundwater and the project will have no affect on existing groundwater conditions. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- c) **No Impact.** The proposed project involves dredging contaminated sediments within the water area of the project site. This activity would not affect surface runoff levels or direction, nor would it increase the potential for flooding or erosion. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- e) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.
- f) **Less than Significant Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- g) **No Impact.** The project is located within San Diego Bay and is subject to tidal variations that could potentially create risks to people and property. The proposed project involves dredging contaminated sediment within the water area of the project site, which would not increase exposure of people, housing, or other property to risks associated with flooding. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- h) **No Impact.** See response to (g) above.
- i) **No Impact.** See response to (g) above.
- j) **No Impact.** The project is located within San Diego Bay and is within a designated tsunami hazard area. In addition, it could be vulnerable to a seiche (inland tsunami). However, the proposed dredging project would not increase the severity of such risks as it would not add people or activities to the existing facility. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	----------------------

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -**  
 Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|



	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project will not physically divide an established community, conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **No Impact.** The proposed project will not result in the loss of availability of known mineral resources.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

XI. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
vibration or groundborne noise levels?				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

a) **Less than Significant Impact.** The project is located in a heavy marine industrial area. Noise generated from the dredging would come from the use of large generators, engine noise from tug, cable winches, and clamshell bucket. Short-term dredging noise levels will likely blend with the noise from existing marine operations. Dredging and disposal activities could generate temporary, periodic increases in noise levels in the project vicinities. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** Activities that result in the generation of groundborne vibrations are typically associated with construction activities such as blasting, grading or pile driving. The proposed project does not include these activities. Dredging activities typically do not result in high levels of groundborne vibration. Dewatering procedures would similarly not result in the generation of groundborne vibrations that would affect nearby land uses. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** The proposed dredging and dewatering of dredged materials would be temporary and would not be a permanent noise source. After the project is completed, the noise levels would be similar to existing conditions. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- d) **Less than Significant Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- e) **No Impact.** The proposed project is not located within an airport use plan or located within two miles of a public airport.
- f) **No Impact.** See the response to item (e) above.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING --  
 Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **No Impact.** The project would not directly or indirectly induce population growth in the project vicinity. The project would not create any new housing units or employment generating land uses. The water area of the project site is intended for ship building and construction for the Navy and commercial customers and would therefore have no population growth impacts. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** There are no housing units on the project site or people residing on the project site in any form of temporary housing. The project would therefore not displace any existing housing units or people from the project site. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** See response to item (b) above.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	----------------------

**XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES**

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **No Impact.** The project does not include any new buildings or structures, as the work scope involves only for dredging and eelgrass replacement activities. Therefore, this project would not significantly impact existing fire service ratios and response times. It would also not increase the demand for additional fire protection services. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** See response to item (a) above. The project would not significantly impact existing police service ratios and response times, and would not increase the demand for additional police protection services. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- c) **No Impact.** The project does not involve any housing units or employments generating land uses and therefore would not create the demand for any new school facilities. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- d) **No Impact.** See response to item (c) above.

e) **No Impact.** No other impacts have been identified that would require the provision of new or physically altered government facilities. Due to the nature and scope of the proposed dredging, project implementation would not increase the demand for any other public facilities (e.g., libraries) or create the need for alteration or construction of any government buildings. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

XIV. RECREATION --

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **No Impact.** The project does not involve new housing units or construction of new parks or any other type of recreational facilities. The project would not create any new demands for parks or recreational facilities. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --</b>				
<b>Would the project:</b>				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.** The project involves dredging contaminated sediments within the water area of the project site. The dredging activities would include truck and construction vehicle trips. A few construction vehicle trips would be required for movement of dredging equipment. Most project vehicle trips would involve the transport of dredged materials to landfills. All dredging-related traffic impacts would cease at the end of the project dredging and eelgrass transplantation phases. The contractor will be required to prepare a traffic plan that ensures adequate access to all residences and businesses in the project area during all aspects of construction. This issue will be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.** See the response to item (a) above.
- c) **No Impact.** Dredging operations would not impact airport operations, alter traffic patterns or in any way conflict with established Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) flight protection zones. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- d) **No Impact.** The project would not alter the design features of any streets or alleys and would not introduce or encourage any incompatible land uses in the project vicinity. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- e) **No Impact.** The project would not alter any land uses, transportation patterns, or emergency access routes. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- f) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.** Additional parking would be required for the workers conducting the dredging and disposal operations.

As a result, the employee parking lot may be impacted. This issue will be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

- g) **No Impact.** The project would not set forth or encourage any proposals or projects that would conflict with any adopted alternative transportation policies. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<b>XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b> Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**DISCUSSION**

- a) **No Impact.** For Sections XVI. (a) through (g) – The project would not create any housing units or growth inducing commercial, industrial or institutional land uses and therefore the project would not create any substantial demands or place an undue burden on any utility or service system. This issue will not be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **No Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- c) **No Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- d) **No Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- e) **No Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- f) **No Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.
- g) **No Impact.** See the response to item (a) above.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --**

- |   |                          |                                     |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</p>   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>            | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## DISCUSSION

- a) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.** The dredging of the proposed area will result in a temporary loss of the eelgrass. This eelgrass resource provides important functions to the ecosystem and is regulated by state and federal agencies. Impacts to eelgrass will therefore need to be mitigated in accordance with the Southern Eelgrass Mitigation Policy. Monitoring the success of eelgrass mitigation shall be required for a period of five years in accordance with the SEMP. An eelgrass mitigation plan shall be prepared to discuss the methods and schedule for planting eelgrass, and post-planting monitoring. The mitigation plan will include the following information, as relevant to the eelgrass mitigation sites: baseline conditions, transplant methods, transplant timing, success criteria, and a five year monitoring program. Eelgrass beds provide nursery habitat for some species of invertebrates and fish. The existing eelgrass will be supplemented by the creation of additional eelgrass habitat and transplanting. Any loss of eelgrass within the project site will be offset through the implementation of a mitigation measure in accordance with the SEMP. Therefore, impacts to potential aquatic nursery sites are less than significant with mitigation incorporation. This issue will be addressed in the EIS/EIR.
- b) **Less than Significant Impact.** This project is one of several contaminated sediment dredging projects expected to take place in San Diego Bay over the next 10 years. Other sites include the Naval Training Center Boat Channel, the East Harbor Basin, and other potential sites along the commercial/industrial water front of San Diego Bay. Impacts to eel grass beds are not expected to be cumulatively considerable because the SCEMP requires a replacement at a ratio of 1:2:1 and a five year monitoring requirement to determine success. Any dredging project that will impact eel grass beds must comply with this federal plan.

Cumulative air quality impacts from the operation of dredges and trucks should be addressed in the Air Quality Impact analyses required in order to obtain an Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate. As long as each dredging project does not violate a state or federal air quality standard, the cumulative impacts to air quality should be less than significant.

The various dredging projects are located far enough apart that, in the event that dredging and hauling activities coincide, the noise and vibration effects of each individual project will not be additive.

- c) **Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation.** Potential project impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, hazardous materials, noise and other environmental issues will be analyzed in the EIR/EIS.