

MINUTE ITEM

This Calendar Item No. C17 was approved as Minute Item No. 17 by the California State Lands Commission by a vote of 3 to 0 at its 1-30-02 meeting.

**CALENDAR ITEM
C17**

A 78
S 39

01/30/02
PRC 7987 WP 7987
J. Porter

AMENDMENT OF LEASE

LESSEE:

San Diego Unified Port District
P.O. Box 488
San Diego, CA 9211-0488

AREA, LAND TYPE, AND LOCATION:

Sovereign lands in and adjacent to San Diego Bay, in National City, San Diego County.

AUTHORIZED USE:

Commercial and recreational navigation, including existing anchorage and mooring basins, buoys, boundary markers and navigational aids; breakwaters; access roads; existing industrial marine facilities.

LEASE TERM:

28 years, beginning July 1, 1997.

CONSIDERATION:

A minimum of \$10,000 per annum; or the total of the following, whichever is greater: (1) 10% of Lessee's gross income from Port operated moorings; and (2) 25% of Lessee's gross income from revenues generated by subleases on the lease premises.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT:

Amend Lease No. PRC 7987.1 to include a mooring dolphin and that portion of a catwalk associated with the extension of the existing west-facing wharf at the National City Marine Terminal. All other terms and conditions of the lease shall remain in effect without amendment.

CALENDAR PAGE	000077
MINUTE PAGE	000095

CALENDAR ITEM NO. C17 (CONT'D)

OTHER PERTINENT INFORMATION:

1. On August 26, 1997, the Commission, pursuant to Minute Item 46, authorized issuance to San Diego Unified Port District of Lease No. PRC 7987.1, a General Lease – Public Agency Use, beginning July 1, 1997, for a term of twenty-eight years, for consolidation of eight existing leases into one master lease. As part of the National City Marine Terminal Improvements Project, the San Diego Unified Port District has proposed the National City Marine Terminal Phase I Wharf Extension Project. The wharf extension project will extend the existing west-facing wharf by approximately 1,025 feet to the south and approximately 220 feet to the west (from the existing shoreline) to align with the existing wharf. A small portion of the project, including a mooring dolphin and a portion of a catwalk that will allow the berthing of ships beyond the new wharf, will extend into ungranted sovereign lands included in Lease No. PRC 7987.1.
2. An EIR was prepared and certified for this project by the San Diego Unified Port District. The California State Lands Commission staff has reviewed such document and Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted by the lead agency.
3. Eelgrass and inter-tidal shallow water habitat will be impacted by this proposed project. An eelgrass mitigation program has been developed in support of the National City Wharf Extension Project. The California State Lands Commission staff has reviewed such document. It is anticipated that eelgrass restoration work will occur during Spring 2004 (to take advantage of the eelgrass growing season) and will commence with the completion of the final construction phase. Eelgrass restoration work will require approximately ten weeks to complete.
4. Findings made in conformance with the State CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, sections 15091 and 15096) are contained in Exhibit E, attached hereto.
5. This activity involves lands identified as possessing significant environmental values pursuant to Public Resources Codes section 6370, et seq. Based upon the staff's consultation with the persons nominating such lands and through the CEQA review process, it is

CALENDAR ITEM NO. C17 (CONT'D)

the staff's opinion that such project, is consistent with its use classification.

APPROVALS OBTAINED:

San Diego Unified Port District; United States Army Corps of Engineers; Regional Water Quality Control Board; California Coastal Commission

EXHIBITS:

- A. Location and Site Map
- B. Legal Description
- C. Notice of Determination
- D. Mitigation Monitoring Program
- E. Findings of Fact

PERMIT STREAMLINING ACT DEADLINE:

June 3, 2002

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

CEQA FINDING:

FIND THAT AN EIR WAS PREPARED AND CERTIFIED FOR THIS PROJECT BY THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT AND THAT THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN.

ADOPT THE FINDINGS MADE IN CONFORMANCE WITH TITLE 14, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, SECTIONS 15091 AND 15096 (h), AS CONTAINED IN EXHIBIT E, ATTACHED HERETO.

ADOPT THE MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM, AS CONTAINED IN EXHIBIT D, ATTACHED HERETO.

CALENDAR ITEM NO. C17 (CONT'D)

SIGNIFICANT LANDS INVENTORY FINDING:

FIND THAT THIS ACTIVITY IS CONSISTENT WITH THE USE CLASSIFICATION DESIGNATED FOR THE LAND PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 6370, ET SEQ.

AUTHORIZATION:

AUTHORIZE THE AMENDMENT OF LEASE NO. PRC 7987.1, A GENERAL LEASE – PUBLIC AGENCY USE, OF LANDS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT A ATTACHED AND BY THIS REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF; EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1, 2002, TO INCLUDE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MOORING DOLPHIN AND THAT PORTION OF A CATWALK ASSOCIATED WITH THE EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING WEST-FACING WHARF AT THE NATIONAL CITY MARINE TERMINAL; SUCH PERMITTED ACTIVITY IS CONTINGENT UPON APPLICANT'S COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE PERMITS, RECOMMENDATIONS, OR LIMITATIONS ISSUED BY FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS; ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE LEASE SHALL REMAIN IN EFFECT WITHOUT AMENDMENT.


CALENDAR PAGE	000080
MINUTE PAGE	000098

NO SCALE

SITE MAP



San Diego Bay



National City Marine Terminal

Proposed Wharf Extension, Mooring Dolphin and Catwalk

NO SCALE

Location Map




Exhibit A

WP 7987
National City Marine Terminal
San Diego Bay

SAN DIEGO COUNTY



This Exhibit is solely for purposes of generally defining the lease premises, is based on unverified information provided by the lessee or other parties and is not intended to be, nor shall it be construed as, a waiver or limitation of any state interest in the subject or any other property.

CALENDAR PAGE 000023
MINUTE PAGE 000099

MJJ 1/2002

EXHIBIT B

A parcel of State owned tide and submerged land situated in San Diego Bay, lying adjacent to the westerly boundary of the grant to the City of National City, Chapter 1185, Statutes of 1953, San Diego County, State of California, more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the southeasterly corner of those certain tide and submerged lands granted to the City of National City by the State of California, by Chapter 183, Statutes of 1947 of the California Legislature being a point on the ordinary high water mark of San Diego Bay described in that certain "Agreement (Arbitrating Ordinary High Water Mark)" recorded in Book 2442 page 209, Official Records in the Office of the Recorder of the County of San Diego, said point of commencement having California Coordinate System Zone VI coordinates of North 176,822.12, East 1,736,086.08; thence S 72° 15' 22" W 2638.18 feet along the southerly boundary of the above mentioned lands granted in Chapter 183, Statutes of 1947, to the southwesterly corner of said land, also being the southeasterly corner of the lands granted to the City of National City by the State of California, by Chapter 1185, Statutes of 1953 of the California Legislature; thence S 82° 28' 30" W 999.86 feet along the southerly boundary of said lands granted in Chapter 1185, Statutes of 1953 to the intersection with the United States Pierhead Line as shown on United States Corps of Engineers Harbor Lines Map of San Diego Bay, File No. 424, being the southwesterly corner of the lands granted by said Chapter 1185, Statutes of 1953, said point also being the TRUE POINT OF BEGINNING; thence continuing S 82° 28' 30" W 163.32 feet to a point on the combined United States Pierhead and Bulkhead Line as said line is shown on U.S.C.E. Harbor Lines Map of San Diego Bay, File No. 427; thence along said Combined United States Pierhead and Bulkhead Line N 11° 11' 51" W 1474.40 feet to the southwesterly corner of those lands granted to the City of National City by the State of California, by Chapter 46, Statutes of 1923 of the California Legislature; thence leaving said Combined United States Pierhead and Bulkhead

CALENDAR PAGE	000082
MINUTE PAGE	000100

Line and along the southerly boundary of the above mentioned lands granted by Chapter 46, Statutes of 1923, N 72° 15' 33" E 261.92 feet to a point on the U. S. Pierhead Line shown on said U.S.C.E. Harbor Lines Map, File No. 424, said point also being the northwesterly corner point of said lands granted by Chapter 1185, Statutes of 1953; thence along the westerly boundary of the above mentioned lands granted by Chapter 1185, Statutes of 1953 S 7° 31' 30" E 1517.78 feet to the point of beginning.

Bearings, distances and coordinates in the above description are based upon the California Coordinate System, Zone 6.

END OF DESCRIPTION

Prepared

M. L. Graf

Checked

R. L. Blake

Reviewed

D. Brittnacher

Date

6/18/76



CALENDAR PAGE

000083

MINUTE PAGE

000101

Notice of Determination

EXHIBIT C

Form C

To: Office of Planning and Research
 PO Box 3044, 1400 Tenth Street, Room 222
 Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

County Clerk
 County of San Diego, Records Div
 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 260
 San Diego CA 92065

From: (Public Agency) San Diego Port District
P.O. Box 120488
San Diego CA 92112-0488
 (Address)

RECEIVED
 DEC 14 2000
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Subject:

Filing of Notice of Determination in compliance with Section 21108 or 21152 of the Public Resources Code.

National City Marine Terminal Improvements Project

Project Title

1999091006

Melissa Mailander

(619) 686-6283

State Clearinghouse Number
(If submitted to Clearinghouse)

Lead Agency
Contact Person

Area Code/Telephone/Extension

24 Street, National City, San Diego County

Project Location (include county)

Project Description:

The dredging of approximately 227,000 cy of sediment from the National City Marine Terminal Berths 24-1 through 24-5, and the extension of the marginal wharf approximately 1,025 feet south.

This is to advise that the San Diego Unified Port District has approved the above described project on
December 12, 2000 and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:
 (Date) Lead Agency Responsible Agency

1. The project will will not] have a significant effect on the environment.
2. An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
 A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.
3. Mitigation measures were were not] made a condition of the approval of the project.
4. A statement of Overriding Considerations was was not] adopted for this project.
5. Findings were were not] made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the final EIR with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at:
San Diego Unified Port District, District Clerk, 3165 Pacific Hwy, San Diego

Melissa Mailander
 Signature (Public Agency)

December 13, 2000
 Date

Environmental Review Coord.
 Title

Date received for filing at OPR:

000034
 CALENDAR PAGE
 MINUTE PAGE Revised May 000102

EXHIBIT D

**THE BOARD OF PORT COMMISSIONERS
OF THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT**

"EXHIBIT B"

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

FOR

**NATIONAL CITY MARINE TERMINAL
IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT**

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(UPD 83356-EIR-204; SCH # 1999091006)**

DECEMBER, 2000

CALENDAR PAGE	<u>000085</u>
MINUTE PAGE	<u>000103</u>

National City Marine Terminal
Improvements Project
Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program

Environmental Category and Associated Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Monitoring Requirement	Responsible for Mitigation Implementation	Time Frame of Mitigation	Completion Requirement	Agency Responsible for Verification	Date of Completion
<p>Arising Water and Sediment Quality</p> <p>Short-term increases in turbidity from suspended sediments could reduce water clarity and dissolved oxygen levels</p>	<p>Place a silt screen around all dredging sites, pile-driving, and around locations where dredged sediments are being used as fill for the new wharf.</p>	<p>Install and maintain silt screens around all locations where in-water construction activities are occurring. Field inspection and monitoring shall be completed to determine effectiveness and to ensure mitigation success.</p>	<p>The person responsible for installing the silt screen is the construction contractor. The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Prior to any in-water construction work.</p>	<p>Certify that silt screens were installed and maintained during the entire in-water construction phase.</p>	<p>Port</p>	
<p>Resuspension of sediments during construction could result in water column concentrations of copper and zinc that exceed EPA criteria.</p>	<p>Dispose of sediment removed only from Sites 2 through 7, 9 and 13 (see Figure 3.3-4 of the EIR) at the in-bay borrow pit site (see Figure 3.3-5 of the EIR) or offshore at the LA-5 site, or as engineered fill behind the new bulkhead.</p>	<p>In accordance with the elutriate testing report completed for the proposed project, dispose of sediments from Sites 2, 7, 9, and 13 at either the in-bay borrow pit site, the LA-5 offshore site or behind the new bulkhead.</p>	<p>The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p>	<p>During project construction.</p>	<p>Written evidence that sediment disposal activities were completed in accordance with the elutriate testing report and that sediments from Sites 2, 7, 9, and 13 were disposed of at either the in-bay borrow pit site, the LA-5 offshore site or behind the new bulkhead.</p>	<p>Port</p>	
<p>Water quality impacts could result from the controlled filling of wharf extension in contaminated areas</p>	<p>Dispose of sediments from Sites 8, 10, 11, and 12 (see Figure 3.3-4 of the EIR) at LA-5 bulkhead, but not at the in-bay borrow pit site.</p> <p>Use sediments from Site 1 (see Figure 3.3-4 of the EIR) as engineered fill behind the new bulkhead.</p>	<p>In accordance with the elutriate testing report completed for the proposed project, dispose of sediments from Sites 8 and 10, 12 at either the LA-5 offshore site or behind the new bulkhead.</p> <p>In accordance with the elutriate testing report completed for the proposed project, dispose of sediments from Site 1 behind the new bulkhead.</p>	<p>The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p> <p>The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p>	<p>During project construction.</p>	<p>Written evidence that sediment disposal activities were completed in accordance with the elutriate testing report and that sediments from Sites 8 and 10-12 were disposed of at either the LA-5 offshore site or behind the new bulkhead.</p> <p>Written evidence that sediment disposal activities were completed in accordance with the elutriate testing report and that sediments from Site 1 were disposed of behind the new bulkhead.</p>	<p>Port</p>	
<p>Water quality impacts could result from the incidental release of petroleum products during construction</p>	<p>Comply with ACOE, RWQCB, California Coastal Commission and EPA permit conditions related to dredge material disposal, discharge of liquids from dredge spoils, and monitoring and reporting activities. A permit to dredge is also required from the State Lands Commission.</p>	<p>Submittal of test data of dredged material to permitting agencies (listed below). Confirm that recommendations from NMFS, USFWS and EPA regarding disposal options are submitted to the permitting agencies. Prepare and submit applications for dredge material disposal.</p>	<p>The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Prior to construction activities</p>	<p>Written evidence that the permitting agencies have reviewed and approved test data of dredged material to determine suitability of disposal options.</p> <p>Issuance of ACOE, RWQCB, California Coastal Commission, EPA and State Lands Commission permits constitutes completion of this requirement.</p>	<p>Port/ACOE/RWQCB/California Coastal Commission/EPA</p>	
<p>Water quality impacts could result from the incidental release of petroleum products during construction</p>	<p>Place an impervious berm around surface storm drains during construction and locate any petroleum storage facilities at the site at least 50 ft from the edge of wharf and drains</p>	<p>Install and maintain impervious berms around all surface storm drains where construction activities are occurring. Field inspection and monitoring shall be completed to determine effectiveness and to ensure mitigation success. In addition, prepare a construction materials storage facilities plan. Field inspections to ensure the plan is implemented and that petroleum storage facilities are located at least 50 feet from the edge of the wharf</p>	<p>The person responsible for installing the berm is the construction contractor. The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Prior to any in-water construction work.</p>	<p>Certify that the impervious berms were installed and maintained during the entire construction phase. Written evidence that the construction materials storage facilities plan has been prepared and implemented on-site, and that all provisions in the plan shall ensure the proper storage, and use of construction materials and that good engineering and housekeeping practices are followed</p>	<p>Port</p>	

DATE: 01/11/2000 11:41 AM

CALENDAR PAGE 000086
DATE PAGE 000104

National City Marine Terminal
Improvements Project
Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program

Environmental Category and Associated Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Monitoring Requirement	Responsible for Mitigation Implementation	Time Frame of Mitigation	Completion Requirement	Agency Responsible for Verification	Date of Completion
Seismic/Geological Hazards	Assure that all construction vessels and cargo vessels are in compliance with California State Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) regulations related to petroleum and hazardous material response and recovery.	Review of construction vessels and cargo vessels compliance with OSPR regulations related to petroleum and hazardous material response and recovery. Field inspections to ensure compliance with OSPR and compliance with other applicable regulatory requirements.	The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.	Prior to and during construction and operational activities.	Written proof (i.e. copies of approval letters) that all vessels visiting the site are in compliance with OSPR.	Port	
Seismic/Geological Hazards	Critical structures and the associated land area would be carefully and conservatively engineered during the design phase to minimize the impacts of a potential seismic event. Foundations for buildings, slopes and building structures would incorporate earthquake-resistant designs (e.g., treatment walls and pile-supported foundations) that meet or exceed those required by building codes.	Design review to verify that project is consistent with the building codes, particularly earthquake resistant design features, and are incorporated in to the final design/ite plans.	The person responsible for designing the project components is the project engineer. The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.	Prior to issuance of building permits and occupancy permits.	Approval of final design/ite plans. Field notes documenting compliance with the approved design/ite plans.	Port	
Seismic/Geological Hazards	In areas along Berth 24-5, deep soil densification by vibration would be implemented during construction to compact and densify underlying soils.	Implement soil densification in areas along Berth 24-5 where in-water construction activities are occurring. Field inspection and monitoring shall be completed to determine effectiveness and ensure mitigation success.	The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.	Prior to and during construction activities.	Certify that deep soil densification by vibration was completed at Berth 24-5 during the construction phase.	Port	

CALENDAR PAGE
MINUTE PAGE

000097
000105

EXHIBIT E

THE BOARD OF PORT COMMISSIONERS
OF THE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED PORT DISTRICT

"EXHIBIT A"

FINDINGS OF FACT

FOR

NATIONAL CITY MARINE TERMINAL
IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(UPD 83356-EIR-204; SCH # 1999091006)

DECEMBER, 2000

CALENDAR PAGE	000089
MINUTE PAGE	000106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Section 1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT.....	3
1.1 Project Location.....	3
1.2 Proposed Project Description.....	3
1.3 Project Purpose and Need and Project Objectives.....	7
Section 2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES.....	10
2.1 Lead Agency	10
2.2 Intended Use of the EIR Document.....	10
2.3 Public Participation.....	10
2.4 Record of Proceedings.....	11
Section 3 FINDINGS UNDER CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT	13
3.1 Purpose.....	13
3.2 Terminology.....	13
3.3 Legal Effect	14
3.4 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	14
Section 4 FINDINGS REGARDING DIRECT SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS	16
Section 5 FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS	22
5.1 Cumulative Projects	22
5.2 Cumulative Significant Effects	23
Section 6 FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES.....	26

CALENDAR PAGE	000089
MINUTE PAGE	000107

**FINDINGS OF FACT
FOR THE
NATIONAL CITY MARINE TERMINAL
IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT**

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
(UPD # 83356-EIR-204; SCH # 1999091006)**

INTRODUCTION

The Board of Port Commissioners of the San Diego Unified Port District (Port) hereby makes the following Findings regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the National City Marine Terminal Improvements Project, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code section 21000, *et seq.* (CEQA), and its implementing regulations, 14 California Code of Regulations section 15000, *et seq.* (CEQA Guidelines).

The National City Marine Terminal Improvements Project is a proposal by the Port to extend the existing wharf at the Terminal approximately 1,025 feet (ft) to the south and approximately 220 ft to the west (from the existing shoreline), to match the existing wharf at Berths 24-3 and 24-4. Once constructed, the wharf would provide approximately 2,035 linear ft (1,010 ft of existing wharf frontage plus the proposed 1,025 ft of new wharf area) of contiguous wharf. In addition, the project proposes deepening a portion of Berth 24-1 and maintenance dredging Berths 24-2 through 24-4 to accommodate deeper draft vessels. Approximately 227,000 cubic yards (cu/yds) of sediment would be dredged and disposed of in-bay or offshore.

The Final EIR prepared for the proposed project consists of three documents:

1. Document 1 is the Final EIR that contains the comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) and the Port's responses to those comments, errata and revisions to the Draft EIR text, a list of public agencies, organizations and persons commenting on the Draft EIR, and a Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program

CALENDAR PAGE	000090
MINUTE PAGE	000108

2. Document 2 is the Draft EIR
3. Document 3 is the Appendices to the Draft EIR.

The Draft and Final EIRs' environmental analyses, proposed mitigation measures and alternatives, and the public comments have influenced the design of the project components. These environmental documents and procedures reflect the Port's commitment to incorporate into the project the environmental considerations identified during the CEQA process.

CALENDAR PAGE	000091
MINUTE PAGE	000109

SECTION 1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The proposed project site is located at the southwestern edge of National City in the National City Bayfront District (Planning District 5) of the Port of San Diego (Port). The project site is located within the National City Marine Terminal (Terminal), approximately 1,500 feet (ft) north of the Sweetwater Flood Control Channel on the eastern shoreline of San Diego Bay. Primary access to the Terminal is from Bay Marine Way (formerly known as 24th Street) via Interstate 5 (I-5) or Tidelands Avenue, National City.

1.2 PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.2.1 General Characteristics

The Port proposes to extend the west-facing wharf at the Terminal approximately 1,025 ft to the south and approximately 220 ft to the west (from the existing shoreline), to match the existing wharf at Berths 24-3 and 24-4. A small mooring dolphin and associated catwalk would be located 200 ft south of the new wharf extension. The mooring dolphin would allow berthing of ships beyond the end of the new wharf. Once constructed, the west-facing wharf would provide approximately 2,035 linear ft (1,010 ft of existing wharf frontage plus the proposed 1,025-foot-long wharf) of contiguous wharf. In addition, the project proposes deepening a portion of Berth 24-1 through 24-4 to accommodate vessels with deeper drafts. The area for the new wharf extension would also be dredged level with adjacent berths to the north to accommodate deep draft vessels. Approximately 227,000 cubic yards (cu/yds) of sediments would be dredged and disposed of in bay or offshore.

	000092
CALENDAR PAGE	000110
MINUTE PAGE	000110

1.2.2 Operation Activities

The following subsections describe the proposed changes that would result from the proposed project.

Ship Loading and Unloading

The predominant use of the Terminal would continue to be receiving, shipping, handling and storage of Neobulk and Breakbulk commodities. The proposed facility improvements would improve the efficiency of activities at the Terminal by enhancing the transfer of cargo at higher rates. This will reduce the time required to load and unload cargo from ships while they are at dock. No changes from current volumes or types of commodities handled at the Terminal are anticipated to result from implementation of the proposed project. No changes in the frequency of vessel calls would occur as a result of the project; the Terminal would continue to receive, on the average, 16 to 18 vessels a month.

Terminal operations would not require additional personnel as part of this project.

Rail Operations

Existing rail operations would not be expected to change as result of the proposed improvements. No new rail equipment or facilities are proposed as part of this project.

Truck Operations

The proposed project improvements would not directly result in any additional truck trips to/from the Terminal. No new improvements or facilities would be required for truck operations as a result of the proposed project.

CALENDAR PAGE	000093
MINUTE PAGE	000111

1.2.3 Construction Activities


This section describes the construction activities proposed as part of the project. The proposed project would include the following major construction improvements and activities.

- Deepening portions of Berth 24-1 and 24-5.
- Maintenance dredging at Berths 24-2, 24-3, and 24-4.
- Wharf extension at Berth 24-5.

The following discussion provides a generalized outline of the improvements of the proposed project development.

Deepening Berth 24-1. The project proposes deepening the westerly 250-foot end of Berth 24-1 from approximately -20 ft and -30 ft mean lower low water (MLLW) to -32 ft MLLW, plus 2 ft of over-dredge. Deepening this portion of Berth 24-1 will provide additional berthing for vessels. To retain the toe of the existing slope and soils surrounding the wharf piles, an underwater bulkhead would be constructed at the pierhead line. The bulkhead would consist of steel sheet piles driven at the tow of the existing rock dike. The estimated volume of sediments to be removed from this berth is approximately 20,000 cu/yds.

Maintenance Dredging at Berth 24-2. Maintenance dredging is proposed to remove sediment that has accumulated along the base of the slope underlying the wharf dock. Dredging is proposed along approximately 800 ft of bottom immediately adjacent to the pierhead line at Berth 24-2. Maintenance dredging along the pierhead line would result in final depth of approximately -30 ft MLLW to -32 ft MLLW, plus allowance for 2ft of over-dredge. The estimated volume of sediments to be removed along Berth 24-2 is approximately 1,000 cu/yds.



Sediments within the project area have been contaminated by past industrial activities. Characteristics of sediments adjacent to the Terminal have been previously assessed and are discussed in greater detail in the Draft EIR. Contaminants present within the sediments at the proposed project site have been identified in the report entitled Port of San Diego NCMT Wharf Extension, Maintenance Dredging Project (Ogden, 2000). According to the report, sediments underlying the project site meet ocean disposal requirements for disposal at the offshore "LA-5" (Los Angeles-5) Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site. The report also concludes that dredge sediments from near shore areas (south of Berth 24-2) are suitable for use as backfill in the proposed project's bulkhead cells (refer to the wharf extension discussion below). Sediments disposal in the borrow and fill area, located offshore of Chula Vista in South San Diego Bay, would also be proposed as part of the project's eelgrass mitigation.

Maintenance Dredging at Berths 24-3 and 24-4. Maintenance dredging along the western face of the wharf at Berths 24-3 and 24-4 will be necessary as part of the proposed project. Bottom depths in the berthing areas in front of the wharf would increase from -36 ft to -40 ft MLLW, plus 2 ft of over-dredge. The berthing and approach areas would be dredged approximately 200 ft west of the pierhead line. Maintenance dredging would remove about 31,000 cu/yds of material. The material would be disposed of offshore at the LA-5 Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site or placed in the South Diego Bay borrow and fill area.

Dredging at 24-5. Localized dredging along the western face of Berth 24-5 would be necessary for wharf construction. Construction of the pile-supported wharf, including the driving-in of new support piles and the casting of the wharf deck, and also for operations to accommodate deeper draft vessels, would require dredge removal of about 175,000 cu/yds of material, plus existing riprap, and would result in the replacement of a soft-bottom, shallow-water habitat with rock revetment. The construction of the wharf would result in the loss of this marine habitat due to the shallow effect of the wharf. Similar to the disposition of sediments dredged at Berth 24-1 and 24-2, a portion of the material would be used in the construction of the proposed

000095
 000133
 MINUTE PAGE

wharf as backland fill. The remaining material would either be disposed offshore or placed in the South San Diego Bay borrows and fills area.

Wharf Extension at Berth 24-5. The primary improvement of the proposed project is the construction of a 1,025-foot-long by 220-foot-wide wharf and bulkhead (75-foot-wide, pile-supported, marginal wharf) from the south end of Berth 24-4. This wharf will be designated Berth 24-5. The proposed wharf would be an extension of the existing wharf. The wharf would be constructed of six rows of 24-inch octagonal vertical concrete piles and one row of steel piles. It is estimated that it would take approximately 6 months to install about 325 wharf extension piles. Rock revetment would protect the slope underneath the wharf from scouring. The landside of the wharf would be retained with a cellular sheet pile bulkhead. The cellular bulkhead would be comprised of steel sheet piles forming cells approximately 55 ft in diameter. The piles would be driven into the underlying Bay Point geologic formation.

Once constructed, the wharf and associated backland would be paved with asphalt and be equipped with utilities. Three existing storm drains out falls would be extended to accommodate the new wharf.

1.3 PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED AND PROJECT OBJECTIVES

1.3.1 Project Need

The Port has experienced resurgence in its maritime cargo business over the last few years, which provided the impetus for the Port to prepare the Port of San Diego Marine Terminal Master Plan (Master Plan). As part of the Master Plan, the Port commissioned a study of the types and amounts of cargo that would be expected to move through the Port's two marine terminals through the year 2020. According to the forecasts contained in the study, the Port's maritime cargo business was projected to increase through the year 2020. The study forecasted the following increase in vehicle cargo tonnage for the Terminal.

CALENDAR PAGE	000096
MINUTE PAGE	000114

**National City Marine Terminal
Vehicle Forecast
(Thousand of Tons)**

	FY ¹ 96/97	FY 97/98	FY 98/99	Vehicles			AAGR ² (2000-2020)
				2000	2010	2020	
Cargo Forecast*	N/A	N/A	236	316	326	342	0.4%
Actual Volume**	168	230	321				


Source: *Booz-Allen & Hamilton, 1999;
 **Port of San Diego, Marine Operations, 2000.

- Notes: 1. Fiscal year
2. Average Annual Growth Rate
3. N/A = Not Available

As the table indicates, the amount of vehicle cargo actually handled by the Port at the Terminal last year exceeded the study's forecast. The 321,000 metric tons handled by the Port in fiscal year 1998/99 nearly reached the increased amount of vehicle cargo projected for the year 2010.

The actual and projected increase in vehicle cargo handling is not dependent on the development of the proposed project. The Terminal presently has the capacity to handle an additional 20,000 (approximately) metric tons of vehicle cargo in its present configuration. Nonetheless, the forecasts in the study indicate a need to improve the Port's cargo handling efficiency and ultimately to increase its cargo handling capacity.

Although the wharf extension will not increase cargo though, it will improve one of the Terminal's inherent operational inefficiencies by shortening the long drive off the ship to first point of rest. Current vehicle loading/off-loading operations at the Terminal occur primarily at Berths 24-2 and 24-3. Once offloaded, vehicles are then brought to a first point of rest near the vehicle processing facility. Development of Berth 24-5 will reduce the haul distance resulting in reduced costs per vehicle move because it will take less time to bring the vehicles to the first point of rest. This improvement will help maintain the Port's long-term viability as one of the premier automobile handling ports in the United States.



The wharf extension will not increase cargo-handling capacity. As mentioned earlier, the Terminal presently has the capacity to accommodate an additional 20,000 metric tons of cargo or 20,000 vehicles. Cargo handling capacity will not increase due to an inherent delay from when vehicles are offloaded from ship until they are transported throughout North America. Vehicles need a place to be "warehoused". At the Terminal, vehicles are first driven off the vessel and are parked. Then they wait "processing" which includes minor damage repair and accessories' installation. Next, vehicles are again moved to a third location where they are stored near the Terminal's rail facilities until cars or trucks are available to transport the vehicles to their ultimate destinations. The length of time needed to store vehicles varies from 72 hours to a few months. The inherent delay in moving vehicles from the ship to vehicle processing, and finally to Terminal departure, limits the number of vehicles which can be brought into the Terminal.

1.3.2 Project Objectives

The proposed project is intended to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Improve vehicle-handling efficiencies and reduce costs by reducing the "long-haul" distance of cargo to first point of rest;
2. Optimize use of existing land;
3. Construct needed infrastructure to serve the Terminal; and,
4. Accommodate vessel-berthing requirements on busy days where multiple vessels arrive.

SECTION 2

ENVIRONMENTAL PROCEDURES

2.1 LEAD AGENCY

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091, the Port is the lead agency for the purpose of preparing the EIR. The Port will have approval authority for the project.


The EIR is intended to provide the Port, and other public agency decision-makers, with the environmental documentation required to take informed discretionary action on the proposed project. These agencies will use the EIR as the basis for their discussions, to issue approvals and permits.

2.2 INTENDED USE OF THE EIR DOCUMENT

The Draft and Final EIRs have been prepared in accordance with CEQA Statutes and Guidelines, pursuant to Section 21151 of CEQA. The Port is the local lead agency for the project, and has supervised preparation of this EIR. The EIR is an informational document, which will inform and assist public agency decision makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects of the project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe alternatives to the project. The EIR is also intended to support the permitting process of all agencies whose discretionary approvals must be obtained for particular elements of this project.

2.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was distributed on August 31, 1999 via U.S. mail to agencies, community organizations, and other interested parties to solicit comments and inform the public of the proposed project. The NOP and comment letters received



in response to the NOP are contained in the EIR. The following is a list of those respondents who submitted comments in response to the NOP:


- Environmental Health Coalition
- U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries
- California Regional Water Quality Control Board
- Dixiline Lumber
- San Diego Archaeological Society
- California Department of Transportation
- California State Lands Commission
- California Department of Fish and Game

The Draft EIR has undergone an extensive public and agency review process, including submittal to the California State Clearinghouse and to various regulatory agencies. The Draft EIR was made available for public review in August 2000. The public comment period required by CEQA Guidelines section 15087 began on August 15, 2000, and ended on September 28, 2000. The Port received comments from organizations, businesses and public agencies. The comments and the Port District's responses to them are set forth in the Final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15088.) The Final EIR was prepared and made available for review on December 1, 2000. A public hearing concerning certification of the Final EIR was held by the Board of Port Commissioners of the Port District on December 12, 2000, at which interested persons were given an opportunity to comment on the Final EIR.

2.4 RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For the purpose of CEQA and the findings set forth below, the administrative record of the Port District's decision concerning certification of the Final EIR for the proposed project shall include the following:

- The Draft EIR (August, 2000)



- The Final EIR (November 2000)
- All appendices to the Draft EIR and the Final EIR
- All documents and other materials listed as "references" and/or incorporated by reference in the Draft EIR and Final EIR.
- All reports, applications, memoranda, maps, letters, and other documents prepared by the Port District's staff and consultants which are before the Board of Port Commissioners as determined by the Clerk.
- All documents or other materials submitted by interested persons and public agencies in connection with the Draft EIR and the Final EIR.
- The minutes, tape recordings and verbatim transcripts, if any, of the public hearing held on December 12, 2000, concerning the Final EIR and the proposed project.
- Matters of common knowledge to the Port District, including but not limited to the Port Master Plan.

The custodian of the documents and other materials comprising the administrative record of the Port District's decision concerning certifications of the Final EIR is the Clerk of the Board of Port Commissioners. The location of the administrative record is the Port District's office at 3165 Pacific Highway, San Diego, California 92112. (Pub. Res. Code § 21081.6 (a)(2).)

CALENDAR PAGE	000101
MINUTE PAGE	000119

SECTION 3

FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

3.1 PURPOSE

CEQA requires the Port to make written findings of fact for each significant environmental impact identified in the Final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091.) The purpose of these findings is to restate systematically the significant effects of the project on the environment identified in the Final EIR, and determine the feasibility of mitigation measures and project alternatives identified in the Final EIR which would avoid or substantially lessen those significant effects. Once the Port has adopted sufficient measures to avoid a significant impact, the Port does not need to adopt every mitigation measure brought to its attention or identified in the Final EIR (POSD, 1994). If significant impacts remain after application of all feasible mitigation measures, the Port must review the alternatives identified in the Final EIR and determine whether they are feasible. These findings set forth the reasons, and the evidence in support of, the Port's determinations.

3.2 TERMINOLOGY

A "finding" is a written statement made by the Port, which explains how it dealt with each significant impact and alternative, identified in the Final EIR. Each finding contains an ultimate conclusion regarding each significant impact, substantial evidence supporting the conclusion, and an explanation of how the substantial evidence supports the conclusion.

For each significant effect identified in the Final EIR, the Port is required by CEQA to make a written finding reaching one or more of the following conclusions:

CALENDAR PAGE	000102
MINUTE PAGE	000120

1. That changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effect;
2. That the changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be adopted by that other agency.
3. Specific legal, economic, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR. (CEQA Guidelines § 15091 (a).)

A mitigation measure or an alternative is considered "feasible" if it is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors, as well as considerations for employment of highly trained workers. (CEQA Guidelines § 15364.)


A public agency may reject mitigation measures or environmentally superior alternatives as infeasible if they frustrate the agency's ability to meet the objectives of a project. (CEQA Guidelines § 15126 (d)(5).)

3.3 LEGAL EFFECT

To the extent these findings conclude mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded or withdrawn, the Port hereby binds itself and any other responsible parties, to implement those mitigation measures. These findings are not only informational, but constitute a binding set of obligations upon the Port and responsible agencies, which will take effect if and when the Port adopts a resolution certifying the Final EIR.

3.4 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

In adopting these findings, the Port also adopts mitigation monitoring and reporting program pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21801.6.



designed to ensure the project complies with the mitigation measures identified below during implementation of the proposed project. The program is set forth in the "National City Marine Terminal Improvements Project Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program," which is adopted by the Port District concurrently with these findings and is incorporated herein by this reference.

CALENDAR PAGE	000104
MINUTE PAGE	000122

SECTION 4

FINDINGS REGARDING DIRECT SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

The proposed project will result in direct significant environmental effects with respect to Biota and Habitats, Marine Water and Sediment Quality, and Seismic/Geological Hazards. These significant environmental effects, and the mitigation measures identified to avoid or substantially lessen them, are discussed in detail in the Final EIR. A summary of significant impacts and mitigation measures for the proposed project is set forth in the Final EIR.


Set forth below are the findings regarding the direct potential significant impacts of the project. The findings incorporate by reference the discussion of potential significant impacts and mitigation measures contained in the Final EIR. The Final EIR is referred to in the findings below as the "EIR."

Biota and Habitats

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact to 1.13 acres of shallow subtidal and 3.30 acres of intertidal habitat, including an estimated 0.94 acres of eelgrass beds, would result from the extension of the proposed wharf.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact to the shallow subtidal habitat, intertidal habitat and eelgrass beds will be mitigated to a level below significance by the creation of 3.3 acres of intertidal and 1.13 acres of shallow water habitats at a location adjacent to the existing marsh on the D Street fill, south



Sweetwater Flood Control Channel. Prior to the creation of the mitigation site, a final revegetation design plan would be prepared and submitted for review and approval to permitting agencies (CDFG, ACOE), USFWS and the NMFS. In addition, a pre-construction eelgrass survey would be completed to determine the exact real cover of habitat impacted by the wharf extension and the resultant amount of eelgrass that would be transplanted. Both of these mitigation measures would be completed prior to or concurrent with project construction.

Biota and Habitats


Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact from increases in turbidity in the project vicinity during dredging and filling activities resulting in reduced foraging opportunities for sensitive diving waterbirds if dredge activities occurred between April 1 and September 15.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact to sensitive waterbird species will be mitigated to a level below significance by installing and maintaining silt screens around all dredge and construction vessels to minimize turbidity during construction activities.

Biota and Habitats

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact from an increase in noise affecting endangered least terns foraging success in the project area during the nesting season.



Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact to sensitive waterbird species will be mitigated to a level below significance by scheduling pile-driving activities to occur outside the endangered least tern nesting season (April 1 to September 15). In addition, potential significant impact to sensitive waterbird species will be mitigated to a level below significance by implementing and maintaining silt screens around all dredge and construction vessels to minimize turbidity during construction activities.

Biota and Habitats

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact from project operations adversely affecting least terns through effects related to night lighting. Night lighting could increase predation on the terns by species that normally hunt during daylight hours. The proposed light standards could also provide new perching locations for predatory birds.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact to sensitive waterbird species will be mitigated to a level below significance by using directional lighting and directing the lights toward the wharf apron while shielding the lights similar to those currently operating on the Terminal. When nighttime operations do occur, limit lighting to only the lights required for safe terminal operations. In addition, anti-perching devices would be installed on top of the lights to limit predatory bird perching or nesting.

CALENDAR PAGE	000107
MINUTE PAGE	000125

Marine Water and Sediment Quality

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact from resuspended sediments resulting in reduced water clarity and dissolved oxygen levels.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact to marine water quality will be mitigated to a level below significance by installing and maintaining silt screens around all dredge and construction vessels, dredge sites and pile-driving sites to minimize turbidity during construction activities.

Marine Water and Sediment Quality

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact to marine water quality from the re-suspension of sediments during construction resulting in water column concentrations of copper and zinc that exceed EPA criteria.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact to marine water quality will be mitigated to a level below significance by disposing of sediments removed from Sites 2-7, 9 and 13 either at the in-bay borrow pit site, offshore at the LA-5 site, or use as engineered fill behind the new bulkhead. For Site 8 and Sites 10-12, dispose of sediments either at LA-5 or use as engineered fill behind the new bulkhead.

000108
CALENDAR PAGE 000126
MINUTE PAGE 000126

Marine Water and Sediment Quality

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact to marine water quality from the uncontrolled filling of the wharf extension with contaminated sediments during construction activities.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact to marine water quality will be mitigated to a level below significance by using sediments removed from Site 1 as engineered fill behind the new bulkhead. In addition, impacts would be further mitigated by complying with ACOE, RWQCB, CCC and EPA permit conditions related to dredge material disposal, discharge of liquids from dredge spoils, and monitoring and reporting activities.

Marine Water and Sediment Quality

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact to marine water quality from the accidental release of petroleum products from construction vessels and/or from onshore fueling locations.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact to marine water quality will be mitigated to a level below significance by placing an impervious berm around surface storm drains during construction activities. Also, any petroleum storage facilities at the project site will be located at least 50 feet from the edge of the wharf and

MINUTE PAGE

000109

000127

storm drains. In addition, written assurances will be submitted to confirm that all construction vessels and cargo vessels are in compliance with California State Office of Spill Prevention and Response (OSPR) regulations related to petroleum and hazardous material response and recovery.

Seismic/Geological Hazards

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant impact from a major seismic event could result in strong ground motion and could cause damage to structures in the project area, including planned facilities at the project site.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant impact from a major seismic event will be mitigated to a level below significance by engineering critical structures and the associated land area during the design phase of the proposed project in accordance with building code standards for seismic safety. In addition, foundations for buildings, slopes and building structures would incorporate earthquake-resistant designs that meet or exceed those required by building codes.

CALENDAR PAGE	000110
MINUTE PAGE	000128

SECTION 5


FINDINGS REGARDING CUMULATIVE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

CEQA requires a lead agency to evaluate the cumulative impacts of a proposed project. (CEQA Guidelines § 15130(a).) Cumulative impacts are those which are considered significant when viewed in connection with the impacts of other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects. (CEQA Guidelines § 15355.) Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

The EIR analyzes cumulative impacts by compiling a list of past, present and reasonably anticipated future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including projects outside the agency's jurisdiction. (CEQA Guidelines § 15130(b)(1)(A).) The list of "past, present and reasonably anticipated future projects" should include related projects, which already have been constructed, are presently under construction, are approved but not yet under construction, and are not yet approved but are under environmental review at the time the draft EIR is completed. (CEQA Guidelines § 15130 [Discussion].) The list must include not only projects under review by the lead agency, but also those under review by other relevant public agencies.

5.1 Cumulative Projects

The Draft and Final EIRs considered 13 past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects within the National City and San Diego Bay areas in evaluating the cumulative impacts of the Project. These projects are listed in Section 4 (Cumulative Environmental Impacts) of the Draft and Final EIRs.



5.2 Cumulative Significant Effects

The findings below identify each of the cumulative significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures adopted to substantially lessen or to avoid them. The findings incorporate by reference the analysis of cumulative significant impacts contained in the Draft and Final EIRs.

Biota and Habitats

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant cumulative impact to marine biota and habitats as a result of the long-term loss of surface water area and associated water habitat from project construction activities.


Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant cumulative impacts to marine biota and habitats will be mitigated to a level below significance by the creation of new habitats prescribed as part of project design.

Biota and Habitats

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant cumulative impact to marine biota and habitats as a result of the short-term increase in turbidity in noise levels from the cumulative construction activities. These increases could potentially result in reduced foraging opportunities for marine biota.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.




Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant cumulative impacts from the proposed project and related projects to marine biota will be mitigated to a level below significance by scheduling in-water activities (e.g. pile-driving activities, dredging and deepening) to occur outside the endangered least tern nesting season (April 1 to September 15). In addition, potential significant impact to sensitive waterbird species will be mitigated to a level below significance by installing and maintaining silt screens around all dredge and construction vessels to minimize turbidity during construction activities.

Marine Water and Sediment Quality

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies a potentially significant cumulative impact to marine water quality resulting from in-water activities (e.g. dredging, deepening, piling installation) from the proposed project and related projects resuspending sediments resulting in reduced water clarity and dissolved oxygen levels.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant cumulative impacts to marine water quality will be mitigated to a level below significance as a result of each project, including the proposed project, installing and maintaining silt screens around all dredge and construction vessels, dredge sites and pile-driving sites. The installation and maintenance of silt screens would minimize turbidity during construction activities.



Meteorology and Air Quality

Potentially Significant Impact: The EIR identifies potentially significant cumulative impacts to air quality from construction-related emissions from the proposed project and related projects.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15091 (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: The potential significant cumulative impacts to air quality will be mitigated to a level below significance as a result of each project, including the proposed project, implementing the relevant APCD requirements (e.g. fugitive dust controls) during construction activities. The implementation of air emission controls would reduce criteria air emissions during construction activities.

CALENDAR PAGE	000114
MINUTE PAGE	000132


SECTION 6

FINDINGS REGARDING PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In preparing and adopting findings, a lead agency need not necessarily address the feasibility of both mitigation measures and environmentally superior alternatives when contemplating the approval of a project with significant environmental impacts. Where the significant impacts can be mitigated to a level of insignificance solely by the adoption of mitigation measures, the lead agency has no obligation in drafting its findings to consider the feasibility of environmentally superior alternatives, even if their impacts would be less severe than those of the project as mitigated. Accordingly, in adopting the findings concerning alternatives for the proposed project, the Port considers only those significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided or substantially lessened through mitigation.

If there are no feasible project alternatives, the lead agency must adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations with regard to the project pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines section 15093. If there is a feasible alternative to the project, the lead agency must decide whether it is environmentally superior to the proposed project. The lead agency must consider in detail only those alternatives which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project; however, the lead agency must consider alternatives capable of eliminating significant environmental impacts even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives. (CEQA Guidelines § 15126(d).)

These findings contrast and compare the alternatives where appropriate in order to demonstrate that the selection of the finally approved project has substantial environmental, planning, fiscal and other benefits. In rejecting certain alternatives, the Port has examined the finally approved proposed project objectives and weighed the ability of the various alternatives to meet the objectives. The Port believes the proposed National City Marine Terminal Improvements Project best meet the project objectives.




with the least environmental impact. The specific objectives considered by the Port are stated in Section 1.3.2.

The EIR examined a reasonable range of on-site and off-site alternatives to determine whether they could meet the proposed project's objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening one or more of the proposed project's unavoidable significant impacts. These findings also considered the feasibility of each alternative. In determining the feasibility of alternatives, the lead agency may take into account factors such as whether the alternative could be accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time in light of economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries, and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative sites. (CEQA Guidelines §§ 15126(d)(5)(A), 15364.)

The EIR concluded that the National City Marine Terminal will not result in potential significant adverse impacts after the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures. Nonetheless, a number of alternatives (discussed in Section 5) were identified in the EIR. The following sections summarize the feasibility of these alternatives as a means to reduce or avoid the significant adverse impacts associated with the Project.

No Project Alternative

Description of Alternative: The no project alternative is an alternative required to be evaluated by CEQA Guidelines section 15126(d)(2). The no project alternative would maintain the status quo and prevent implementation of the proposed project. It would eliminate all potential impacts associated with the proposed project construction and operation at the proposed site. Environmental conditions under the no project alternative would be equivalent to those identified as existing conditions in the EIR.



Finding: Specific economic, social or other considerations makes infeasible the no project alternative identified in the EIR.

Fact in Support of Finding: The no project alternative would avoid impacts associated with the project, however, there are no significant adverse project impacts associated with the project with the implementation of the prescribed mitigation measures. Moreover, the objectives of the project identified in Section 1.3 would not be realized, and the Terminal site would continue to be underutilized for uses such as Neobulk and Breakbulk commodities. The Port would not be able to gain efficiencies in handling cargo demand due to limitations in existing facilities and infrastructure.

The Port finds that the design of the project and the adoption of the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will mitigate all potential significant environmental impacts of the project. The Port finds that, although the no project alternative would avoid contributing to the cumulative impacts in the project area, the no project alternative is infeasible because it would not attain any of the project objectives and would not provide the Port and the region with any of the project benefits.

Alternative Site

Description of Alternative: The alternative of implementing the proposed wharf extension at a site other than the Terminal was considered. The only other marine terminal that could possibly accommodate the type of operations occurring at the Terminal is the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal (TAMT).

Finding: Specific economic, social or other consideration makes infeasible the alternative facility design identified in the EIR

Fact in Support of Findings: Based on the type of uses currently devoted and proposed at the TAMT, impacts of implementing the proposed project would be greater than those

000117
MINUTE PAGE 000135


expected at the Terminal. For example, moving the operations at the NCMT (import and export of automobiles and lumber) to the TAMT (import and export of bulk cargoes such as cement, soda ash, paper, etc) would result in incompatibilities and inefficiencies. Moreover, moving operations from the NCMT and relocating them to the TAMT could result in some existing TAMT operations being displaced or require relocation to other sites.

Potential environmental impacts, including those to biological resources, associated with project development at the TAMT are expected to be greater than those from the proposed NCMT project site. Other impacts that could be expected during construction include possible alteration of biological habitat, increase in air and noise emissions, inconsistencies and incompatibilities with existing land uses and land use guidance plan, and increased traffic on the transportation network (land and water). These impacts, coupled with those expected from operation, are expected to increase over those expected for the proposed project. In summary, this alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because it would not substantially avoid or reduce any of the significant impacts identified as part of the proposed project.

Alternative Facility Design

Description of Alternative: An alternative facility design was considered during the project design phase. The alternative design featured a similar pile-supported wharf structure; however, a rock dike and a short, pre-cast concrete wall at the back of the proposed wharf to retain the backland was proposed. The alternative design would require the removal of loose foundation soils beneath the dike alignment to ensure seismic stability. The design would also require substantial removal of the existing hydraulic fills to form a stable cut slope on the landslide of the excavation.

Finding: Specific economic, social or other consideration makes infeasible the alternative facility design identified in the EIR.



Fact in Support of Finding: The alternative facility design would require substantially more materials to be dredged and rock to be imported to the site, whereas, the selected option stabilizes the soils in-place. This alternative is not considered environmentally superior to the proposed project because it would not substantially avoid or reduce any of the significant impacts identified as part of the proposed project. For example, this alternative would potentially cause greater impacts involving water quality, biology and geology than the proposed project because of physical effects of the alternative facility design. Since this alternative would not reduce any significant impacts to a level below significance, it was rejected from further consideration in the EIR.

The Port District further finds that all potential significant environmental impacts of the Project will be mitigated by the design of the proposed project and the adoption of the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

CALENDAR PAGE	000129
MINUTE PAGE	000137

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

This Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) supplements the National City Marine Terminal Improvements Project Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) which was prepared by the Port of San Diego. The Draft EIR dated August 2000 and the Final EIR dated November 2000 are incorporated by reference in this document.

Assembly Bill 3180 codified as Section 21081.6 of the Public Resource Code, requiring public agencies to set up mitigation monitoring or reporting programs became effective January 1, 1989. The purpose of these programs is to ensure compliance with mitigation measures adopted in order to mitigate or avoid significant environmental effects identified in Environmental Impact Reports and Negative Declarations, prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), for projects. Referencing that statute:

When making the findings required by subdivision (a) of Section 21081 or when adopting a negative declaration pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (c) of Section 21080, the public agency shall adopt a reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program shall be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation. For those changes which have been required or incorporated into the project at the request of an agency having jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by this project, that agency shall, if so requested by the lead or responsible agency, prepare and submit a proposed reporting or monitoring program.

Pursuant to the requirement of AB 3180, the Port is obligated by statute to establish a program to monitor project compliance with those mitigation measures adopted as conditions of project approval for the purpose of mitigating significant environmental effects.

This section contains the MMRP and accompanying reporting actions that are needed to verify completion of individual mitigation measures (or discrete phases of complex mitigation measures) for the National City Marine Terminal Improvements project.

Information contained within the following MMRP identifies the issue area, the mitigation measures, the monitoring requirement, the agency responsible for mitigation implementation, the timeframe of mitigation, the completion requirement, the agency responsible for verification, and date of completion. The columns entitled "Issue Area" and "Mitigation Measure(s)" correspond to the issues and mitigation measures identified within the EIR. In response to public comments, several of the Draft EIR mitigation measures have been clarified or refined in the Final EIR to provide more detail. The "Monitoring Requirement" column explains the action which the responsible jurisdiction shall undertake (i.e., preparation and completion of studies, review of designs and/or consultation with appropriate agencies). The column "Responsible for Mitigation"

000120
CALENDAR PAGE
000138
MINUTE PAGE

Implementation" identifies the agency or entity (organization) responsible for implementing, monitoring, and reporting of all mitigation within their respective jurisdictions. The "Timeframe of Mitigation" column explains the time in which the mitigation shall take place (i.e., prior to construction activities). The "Completion Requirement" column requires written evidence to prove that the mitigation measure has been completed. The "Agency Responsible for Verification" column identifies the agency responsible for verifying that a mitigation measure is complete. As the lead agency for the project, the Port shall take the lead in this role.

CALENDAR PAGE	000121
MINUTE PAGE	000139

National City Marine Terminal
Improvements Project
Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program

Environmental Category and Associated Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Monitoring Requirement	Responsible for Mitigation Implementation	Time Frame of Mitigation	Completion Requirement	Agency Responsible for Verification	Date of Completion
<p>Alteration or loss of 13 acres of shallow subtidal and 330 acres of intertidal habitats, including an estimated 0.94 acres of eelgrass beds could result from the extension of the wharf</p>	<p>Schedule pile-driving activities to occur outside the endangered least tern nesting season (April 1 to September 15).</p>	<p>Consult with USFWS to confirm that construction activities will occur outside the least tern nesting season.</p>	<p>Port</p>	<p>Prior to any construction work</p>	<p>Confirmation that USFWS was notified about and consulted with regarding construction activities.</p>	<p>Port/USFWS</p>	
<p>Loss, in conjunction with turbidity, would potentially affect endangered least terns foraging success in the project area during the nesting season</p>	<p>A pre-construction eelgrass survey will be conducted to determine the exact area cover of habitat impacted by the wharf extension. It is estimated that 0.94 acres of eelgrass will be impacted. This eelgrass must be transplanted in San Diego Bay sufficient to achieve a 1:1 replacement ratio (approximately 1.13 acres of eelgrass). Prior to or concurrent with project construction, create 3.3 acres of intertidal and 1.13 acres of shallow water habitats. The proposed mitigation site is located on the south side of the Sweetwater Flood Control Channel adjacent to an existing marsh on the D Street Fill.</p>	<p>Preparation and implementation of eelgrass survey and mitigation plan consistent with the Southern California Eelgrass Mitigation Policy, and approved by the ACOE with discretionary approval from NMFS, USFWS, CDFG. Field inspection and monitoring to ensure mitigation plan success.</p>	<p>Port</p>	<p>Prior to any construction work</p>	<p>Written evidence that the survey and plan has been approved by the ACOE, NMFS, and USFWS. The Port shall provide a status report annually for five (5) years to the applicable agencies with information on success criteria, monitoring results, and actions taken for failed mitigation goals.</p>	<p>Port</p>	
		<p>Preparation and implementation of a detailed Mitigation Plan for the proposed mitigation site by the Port, and review/approval of the plan by CDFG, ACOE, USFWS, and NMFS. Field inspection and monitoring shall be completed to determine effectiveness and ensure Mitigation Plan success.</p>	<p>The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Prior to or concurrent with project construction</p>	<p>Written evidence that the Mitigation Plan has been approved by the CDFG, ACOE, USFWS, and NMFS. The Port shall provide a status report annually for seven (7) years to the applicable agencies with information on the progress of the mitigation effort including success criteria, monitoring results and actions taken for failed mitigation goals.</p>	<p>Port/CDFG/ACOE/USFWS/NMFS</p>	

CALENDAR PAGE 000122
MINUTE PAGE 000140

National City Marine Terminal
Improvements and Reporting Program
Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program

Environmental Category and Associated Impact	Mitigation Measure(s)	Monitoring Requirement	Responsible for Mitigation Implementation	Time Frame of Mitigation	Completion Requirement	Agency Responsible for Verification	Date of Completion
<p>Short-term increases in turbidity in the vicinity during dredging and filling activities would result in reduced foraging opportunities for sensitive diving waterbirds, especially least tern and brown pelican. If dredge activities occurred from April 1 to September 15.</p>	<p>Use of silt screens around all construction vessels to minimize turbidity.</p>	<p>Install and maintain silt screens around all locations where in-water construction activities are occurring. Field inspection and monitoring shall be completed to determine effectiveness and to ensure mitigation success.</p>	<p>The person responsible for installing the silt curtain is the construction contractor. The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p>	<p>Prior to any in-water construction work.</p>	<p>Certify that silt screens were installed and maintained during the entire in-water construction phase.</p>	<p>Port</p>	
<p>In case, in conjunction with turbidity, would potentially affect endangered least terns foraging areas in the project area during the nesting season. Direct lighting could adversely affect the least terns through direct lighting. Night lighting could increase predation on terns by species that normally hunt during daylight hours. Light standards of 100 foot tall (130 foot tall) could provide new nesting localities for terns, birds.</p>	<p>Use directional (shielded) lighting on all lights proposed for the wharf extension and project improvements and install anti-perching devices on top to limit predatory bird perching or nesting. Direct lights toward the wharf apron. When nighttime operations do occur, limit lighting to only the lights required for safe terminal operations.</p>	<p>The lighting system proposed for the new wharf extension shall be designed with shielding equipment and installed in a way that the light generated is directed toward the wharf apron. Install anti-perching devices on poles. Field inspection and monitoring shall be completed to determine effectiveness and ensure mitigation success.</p>	<p>The person responsible for installing the lighting system is the construction contractor. The person responsible for mitigation implementation is the Port's engineer responsible for construction of the proposed project.</p>	<p>During final design phase and prior to any construction work.</p>	<p>Certify that the lighting systems installed at the Terminal have been designed to the minimum standards and requirements for safe marine terminal operations. Certify that the lighting systems have been shielded and that the lights have been directed toward the wharf apron. Lastly, certify that anti-perching devices have been installed on all of the light poles. Confirmation that consultation between the USFWS and the Port has resulted in the review and approval of the proposed lighting system. Field inspection and monitoring to determine effectiveness and to ensure mitigation success.</p>	<p>Port/USFWS</p>	

CALENDAR PAGE
MINUTE PAGE
000123
000141