

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SAN DIEGO DISTRICT OFFICE
7575 METROPOLITAN DRIVE, SUITE 103
SAN DIEGO, CA 92108-4402
VOICE (619) 767-2370
FAX (619) 767-2384



W17b

Filed: 4/5/2026
180th Day: 10/2/2026
Staff: M. Escaron-SD
Staff Report: 5/21/2026*
Hearing Date: 6/10/2026

STAFF REPORT: REGULAR CALENDAR

Application No.: 6-26-0167

Applicant: California Department of Transportation

Location: State Route 75, San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge,
San Diego and Coronado, San Diego County

Project Description: Installation of a suicide deterrent system, including 8-ft.high wire mesh barrier on top of existing 34-in.high bridge guardrails, additional substructure maintenance walkways, replacement of Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras, and signage.

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions

STAFF NOTE

We can all help prevent suicide. The **988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline** provides 24/7, free and confidential support for people in distress, prevention and crisis resources for you or your loved ones, and best practices for professionals in the United States. For more information, you can visit <https://988lifeline.org/> or call/text 988 to chat with a counselor. **Survivors of Suicide Loss (SOSL)** provides ongoing, peer-led support groups for anyone who has lost a loved one to suicide. They offer survivors of suicide loss a place to be comfortable expressing themselves - a place to find support, comfort, resources, and hope in a judgment-free environment. SOSL is based in San Diego

*An updated version of the staff report was posted on 5/27/2026 to include the Table of Contents.

County, CA. Their mission is to provide support to suicide loss survivors while actively promoting suicide awareness and prevention. For more information, you can visit <https://www.soslsd.org>.

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) proposes construction of a suicide deterrent system on the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge, which connects the cities of San Diego and Coronado. The proposed deterrent system will consist of an 8-foot-high steel wire mesh barrier suspended between posts installed on top of the existing 34-inch-high concrete bridge guardrails. The barrier's mesh openings are 1-inch in size and are designed to prevent climbing over the existing bridge guardrails. In addition, system upgrades will include updated cameras systems, signage, and an expanded substructure maintenance walkway on the underside of the bridge.

Approximately four hundred people have died by suicide from the bridge since its construction in 1969. After the Golden Gate Bridge, the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge (bridge) is considered the second most frequently used bridge for suicide attempts in the United States. Suicide remains a large source of early mortality in the United States and California. Certain locations are magnets for suicide attempts, becoming landmarks for repeated or frequent suicides, even for those who live far away from the location.¹ Thus, a focus of recent suicide prevention efforts is on restricting access to such magnetic locations, as well as increasing suicide prevention tools at those locations (e.g. suicide hotlines). Deterrent systems such as the one proposed have been proven effective over the past three decades at bridges sites around the world.²

Located within the ecologically important San Diego Bay, the bridge is within the Pacific Flyway and has served as seasonal nesting habitat. Construction impacts will be temporary in nature and **Special Condition No. 3** requires a Nesting Bird Monitoring and Avoidance Plan to avoid impacts to nesting birds within the construction site. **Special Condition No. 4** requires various BMPs designed to prevent inadvertent chemical and debris spills.

The views from the bridge showcase the highly valued Southern California coastal landscape, featuring views of the San Diego Bay, Pacific Ocean, and coastline. Caltrans has selected a vertical barrier alternative designed to be 87 percent transparent to minimize impacts to views. However, visual impacts to the currently unimpeded views from the bridge cannot be entirely avoided. The proposed mesh barrier on top of the existing guardrail will impact coastal views to some degree. Although other alternatives were considered, including an under-bridge horizontal net system that would avoid most

¹ See e.g., Gross, et. al, "Suicide Tourism in Manhattan, New York City, 1990-2004," Journal of Urban Health (2007).

² Hemmer A, Meier P, Reisch T. Comparing different suicide prevention measures at bridges and buildings: lessons we have learned from a national survey in Switzerland. PLoS ONE. 2017;12(1):e0169625.

visual impacts, Caltrans determined the alternatives were aesthetically inferior or logistically infeasible relative to the selected alternative.

With regard to the under-bridge horizontal net alternative, because the bridge has no shoulders for emergency vehicle access, when a suicide attempt occurs, the standard emergency public safety response is to close the bridge entirely. Such closures are very impactful given the vital connection the bridge provides for coastal communities and coastal access, and the lack of efficient detours. An under-bridge horizontal design would result in highway closures for each suicide attempt for victim rescue operations, causing significant delays to and from the coast. Rescues carry substantial risk to first responders because of the difficulty involved in retrieving distressed individuals from great heights. Further, the bridge is uniquely located between US military facilities, making it critical infrastructure for military traffic to and from Coronado and San Diego.

To mitigate for visual impacts resulting from the barrier, Caltrans has agreed to **Special Condition No. 2** and will implement a Visual Mitigation Plan that features visual improvements on both ends of the bridge, including: 1) funding for new murals on four bridge columns and repainting a maintenance building to enhance the streetscape under the bridge in the neighborhood of Barrio Logan, or comparable visual improvements resulting from a community engagement process and 2) improving the views of San Diego Bay for pedestrians and bicyclists along the Bayshore Bikeway in Coronado through the reduction in height of an existing chain-link and barbed wire fence adjacent to the San Diego bay.

The proposed suicide barrier will save lives and improve public access by reducing bridge closures, thereby maintaining public access to and along the coast. Thus, Staff recommends that the Commission **approve** CDP 6-26-0167. The motion and resolution for this recommendation can be found on page 5. The standard of review is Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION	5
II. STANDARD CONDITIONS	5
III. SPECIAL CONDITIONS.....	6
IV. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS	11
A. Project Background and Description	11
B. Visual Resources	14
C. Biological Resources.....	20
D. Public Access and Recreation	22
E. Other	23
F. Local Coastal Planning.....	24
G. California Environmental Quality Act.....	24
APPENDIX A – SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS.....	25

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit 1- Project Vicinity Map](#)

[Exhibit 2- Project Location Map](#)

[Exhibit 3 -Visual Simulations From Bridge Deck](#)

[Exhibit 4- Visual Simulations From Shorelines](#)

[Exhibit 5- Substructure Maintenance Walkways](#)

[Exhibit 6- Proposed Mural Location Barrio Logan](#)

[Exhibit 7- Fence Replacement Coronado Shoreline](#)

[Exhibit 8- First Responder Letter of Support](#)

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION

Motion:

I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit 6-26-0167 pursuant to the staff recommendation.

Staff recommends a **YES** vote on the foregoing motion. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of Commissioners present.

Resolution:

The Commission hereby approves the Coastal Development Permit for the proposed project and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the development as conditioned will be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

II. STANDARD CONDITIONS

1. **Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment.** The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit, signed by the applicant or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.
2. **Expiration.** If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date on which the Commission voted on the application. Development shall be pursued in a diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.
3. **Interpretation.** Any questions of intent or interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director or the Commission.
4. **Assignment.** The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided assignee files with the Commission an affidavit accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.
5. **Terms and Conditions Run with the Land.** These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the applicant to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

III. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. **Revised Final Plans.** NO LESS THAN 30 DAYS PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION, the Permittee shall submit one electronic copy of Revised Final Plans to the Executive Director for review and written approval. The Plans shall be prepared by a licensed professional or professionals (i.e., geotechnical engineer, surveyor, etc.); be based on current professionally surveyed and certified topographic elevations for the project area; and include a graphic scale. The Plans shall be substantially in conformance with the proposed plans titled "San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge Suicide Deterrent" (CDP Application Attachments 7a-7d), received in the Coastal Commission's San Diego Coast District Office on March 6, 2026, except that they shall be modified as required below if necessary:
 - a. All publicly visible development shall be sited and designed to minimize visual intrusion, including through use of materials appropriate to the shoreline context that blend with the natural environment and existing improvements in the area.
 - b. Signs. All signs shall be clearly identified and shall be sited and designed: (1) to minimize their visibility in public views; (2) be of a unified design theme; and (3) to be subordinate to the natural setting, all to the maximum extent feasible; (4) Suicide Crisis Hotline signage shall include a provision for Spanish translations.

The permittee shall undertake development in conformance with the approved final plans unless the Commission amends this permit or the Executive Director provides a written determination that no amendment is legally required for any proposed minor deviations.

2. **Visual Mitigation Plan.** NO LESS THAN 60 DAYS PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION, the Permittee shall submit and obtain the Executive Director's review and written approval for a final Visual Mitigation Plan for the Barrio Logan community in San Diego and the City of Coronado. That plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:
 - a. Potential visual improvements in Barrio Logan shall include a combination of visual enhancements within Caltrans right-of-way, including, but not limited to, painting the Caltrans maintenance building, relocating a segment of Caltrans fence along the west side of Newton Avenue behind the four bridge columns, and providing funding and access to the eastern face of four bridge columns also located on the west side of Newton Avenue for community artwork ([Exhibit 6](#)). These visual improvements shall be selected in consultation with Barrio Logan community members and community advocacy groups that work with the community. Comparable visual improvements may be substituted for the identified measures, with the Executive Director's review and written approval.
 - b. Visual improvements in Coronado shall include the replacement of approximately 120 linear feet of 8-foot-high chain-link and barbed wire fence with a 3.5-to 4-foot-tall fence immediately north of the bridge abutment to improve bayfront views for pedestrians and cyclists along the Bayshore Bikeway. [Exhibit 7](#) depicts

a new chain-link fence; however, Caltrans shall evaluate the feasibility of alternative fencing options (e.g. post and cable, etc.) as part of the Visual Mitigation Plan.

- c. The Visual Mitigation Plan shall also include adequate maintenance provisions such that improvements can be maintained in their approved state for public use, including through ongoing repair, maintenance, or relocation if necessary to respond to shoreline erosion, for at least as long as any portion of the development approved under this CDP remains present. Additionally, the Visual Mitigation Plan shall include a summary report of the engagement process, all measures and avenues used to advertise and increase community awareness and involvement, and the feedback collected over the selection of visual improvements in the identified Barrio Logan project area. Once the Permittee has developed the plan for such improvements with the aforementioned elements, the Permittee shall submit the plan to the Executive Director for review and written approval prior to its implementation.
- d. All outreach described in this condition shall include a language-access element inclusive of non-English languages spoken in the community, including but not limited to Spanish, tailored to be culturally relevant, and written in plain language.
- e. All improvements shall be completed as soon as possible, but no later than October 31, 2028. The Executive Director may extend the deadline for good cause.

The permittee shall undertake development in conformance with the approved final plan unless the Commission amends this permit or the Executive Director provides a written determination that no amendment is legally required for any proposed minor deviations.

3. Nesting Bird Monitoring and Avoidance Plan. NO LESS THAN 60 DAYS PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION, the Permittee shall submit and obtain the Executive Director's review and written approval for a Nesting Bird Monitoring and Avoidance Plan that shall include, but not be limited to, the following provisions:

- a. If project activities occur during bird nesting season (i.e., January 15 through September 15 for raptors, or February 15 through September 15 for non-raptors), a qualified biologist, with experience conducting nesting surveys, shall survey for active nests no more than 72 hours prior to commencement of project activities, and once a week thereafter during construction, to detect any bird nesting activity within 500 feet of the project area. If an active songbird nest(s) is located within 300 feet of construction activities (or within 500 feet for raptors), the qualified biologist shall halt construction activities to enable the Permittee to employ best management practices (BMPs) to ensure that construction activities do not disturb or disrupt nesting activities. BMPs shall include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - I. No nests shall be removed or disturbed.

- II. Attenuating visual and noise disturbance using appropriate screens, sound walls, or their functional equivalent.
 - III. The permittee's qualified biologist shall be present onsite daily during construction activities to enforce any necessary buffers and monitor active nests and breeding birds for signs of distress or abnormal behavior.
 - IV. The qualified biologist shall have the ability to halt construction at any time if deemed necessary to protect nesting birds. Construction may resume when the qualified biologist determines construction activities will not impact nesting birds.
- b. Results of nesting bird surveys, ambient noise surveys, and any follow-up construction avoidance measures shall be documented in monthly reports by the qualified biologist and submitted to the Executive Director within 30 days of the survey or implementation of avoidance measures. Survey results shall include a map that depicts the location(s) of any active nests identified, the associated buffer zones, and a narrative that describes the survey details (e.g., dates, methods), survey results, outcomes of bird nesting efforts within the buffer areas (e.g., hatch, fledge, failure, unknown) and measures proposed to avoid disturbance of nesting birds.

The permittee shall undertake development in conformance with the approved final plan unless the Commission amends this permit or the Executive Director provides a written determination that no amendment is legally required for any proposed minor deviations.

- 4. Construction Plan.** NO LESS THAN 30 DAYS PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION, the Permittee shall submit one electronic copy of a Construction Plan to the Executive Director for review and written approval. The Construction Plan shall, at a minimum, include the following:
- a. Construction Areas. The Plan shall identify the specific location of all construction areas, all staging areas, and all construction access corridors in site plan view. All such areas within which construction activities or staging are to take place shall be sited to avoid and to minimize impacts on coastal resources.
 - b. Construction Methods. The Plan shall specify the construction methods to be used, including all methods to be used to keep construction areas separated from public use areas and to minimize interruption to public use, and including verification that equipment operation and equipment and material storage will not significantly degrade public views during construction, all to the maximum extent feasible.
 - c. Construction BMPs. The Plan shall identify the type and location of all construction best management practices that will be implemented during construction to protect coastal resources, including at a minimum all of the following:

- I. **Runoff Protection.** BMPs will also be implemented to prevent debris, materials, or equipment from entering San Diego Bay. BMPs will include fiber rolls placed near drainage inlets; street sweeping after drilling activities to prevent fugitive metal and concrete dust; and a tie-off system to contain tools and other equipment or materials.
- II. **Erosion and Sediment Controls.** All erosion and sediment controls shall be in place prior to the commencement of construction as well as at the end of each workday.
- III. **Equipment washing, refueling, and servicing** shall take place at an appropriate off-site and inland location away from riparian habitat on an existing hard surface area (e.g., a road) or on an area where collection of wastewater and other materials is facilitated. All construction equipment shall also be inspected and maintained at a similarly sited inland location to prevent leaks and spills of hazardous materials at the project site.
- IV. **Good Housekeeping.** The construction site shall maintain good construction housekeeping controls and procedures at all times (e.g., clean up all leaks, drips, and other spills immediately; keep materials covered and out of the rain, including covering exposed piles of soil and wastes; dispose of all wastes properly, place trash receptacles on site for that purpose, and cover open trash receptacles during wet weather; remove all construction debris from the project site; etc.).
- V. **Construction Material Storage.** All construction materials and equipment shall be stored in non-habitat areas, except for necessary erosion and sediment controls or construction area boundary fencing area, which are allowed only where such controls or fencing are placed as close to the work area as feasible and are minimized in their extent.
- VI. **The use of temporary erosion and sediment control products** (such as fiber rolls, erosion control blankets, mulch control netting, and silt fences) that incorporate plastic netting (such as polypropylene, nylon, polyethylene, polyester, or other synthetic fibers) shall be avoided, to minimize wildlife entanglement and plastic debris pollution.

The permittee shall undertake development in conformance with the approved final plan unless the Commission amends this permit or the Executive Director provides a written determination that no amendment is legally required for any proposed minor deviations.

- 5. Other Agency Approvals.** NO LESS THAN 30 DAYS PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION, the Permittee shall submit, for the review and written approval of the Executive Director, a copy of a valid permit, letter of permission, or evidence that no permit is necessary from all other entities with review authority over the proposed project. The Permittee shall inform the Executive Director of any changes to the project required by any other such authorizations.

Any such changes shall not be incorporated into the project until the Permittee obtains an amendment to this CDP, unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required for any proposed minor deviations.

- 6. Future Permitting.** Any and all future proposed development related to this project or this CDP shall be subject to the Coastal Commission's continuing CDP jurisdiction. This CDP authorizes limited future repair, maintenance, and improvement development that is determined by the Executive Director to: 1) fall within the overall scope and intent of this CDP; 2) be consistent with the City of Coronado and the City of San Diego LCPs as applicable; and 3) not have any significant adverse impacts to coastal resources. Any development that the Executive Director determines does not meet such criteria shall require a separate CDP or a CDP amendment, as directed by the Executive Director.
- 7. Assumption of Risks.** By acceptance of this permit, the permittee acknowledges and agrees (i) that the site may be subject to hazards, including but not limited to: waves, storms, flooding, erosion, and earth movement, many of which will worsen with future sea level rise; (ii) to assume the risks to the permittee and the property that is the subject of this permit of injury and damage from such hazards in connection with this permitted development; (iii) to unconditionally waive any claim of damage or liability against the Commission, its officers, agents, and employees for injury or damage from such hazards; and (iv) to indemnify and hold harmless the Commission, its officers, agents, and employees with respect to the Commission's approval of the project against any and all liability, claims, demands, damages, costs (including costs and fees incurred in defense of such claims), expenses, and amounts paid in settlement arising from any injury or damage due to such hazards.
- 8. Liability for Costs and Attorneys' Fees.** The Permittee shall reimburse the Coastal Commission in full for all Coastal Commission costs and attorneys' fees (including but not limited to such costs/fees that are: (1) charged by the Office of the Attorney General; and/or (2) required by a court that the Coastal Commission incurs in connection with the defense of any action brought by a party other than the Permittee against the Coastal Commission, its officers, employees, agents, successors and assigns challenging the approval or issuance of this CDP, the interpretation and/or enforcement of CDP conditions, or any other matter related to this CDP. The Permittee shall reimburse the Coastal Commission within 60 days of being informed by the Executive Director of the amount of such costs/fees. The Coastal Commission retains complete authority to conduct and direct the defense of any such action against the Coastal Commission. By acceptance of this CDP and its terms and conditions, the Permittee irrevocably agrees to this obligation, which shall be continuing in nature and remain in full force and effect regardless of whether this CDP approval is invalidated as the result of the litigation contemplated by this condition or otherwise changed in any way.

IV. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. Project Background and Description

Project Background

Spanning San Diego Bay, the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge, constructed in 1969, links the cities of San Diego and Coronado ([Exhibit 1](#)). The 2.12-mile-long bridge provides 5 travel lanes, conveying 83,000 vehicles per day. The bridge superstructure and roadway are supported by 30 twin-columned concrete piers. The center span of the bridge has a clearance of 200 feet over the main shipping channel between the northern and southern portions of San Diego Bay. Architecturally distinct and an area landmark, the bridge functions to carry Highway 75 over the bay and has no median, shoulders, bike lanes, or sidewalks. With 5 lanes in total, Caltrans operates a moveable median barrier to modify the number of lanes in a direction from 2 to 3, depending on the traffic demands throughout the day and night. The bridge has 34-inch-high concrete guardrails.



Figure 1: Existing Bridge Conditions

Approximately four hundred people have died by suicide at the bridge since its construction. After the Golden Gate Bridge, it is considered the second most frequently used bridge for suicide attempts in the United States. Although Caltrans has implemented deterrent measures, including installation of 4-inch-long spikes along the bridge guardrails and crisis hotline signage, suicides have continued from the bridge.

Highway 75 is part of the Strategic Highway Network, providing essential defense access and ensuring continuity of emergency mobility for personnel and equipment

during both peacetime and wartime operations. Because the bridge has no shoulders to accommodate emergency vehicle access, when a suicide attempt occurs, the standard emergency public safety response is to close the bridge entirely. Full bridge closures force all traffic to reroute via Silver Strand Boulevard. This detour adds 23 miles and 30 to 60 minutes of travel time per vehicle, affecting residents, visitors, beach users, and military personnel traveling to and from Naval bases in Coronado and San Diego.

Project Description

Caltrans is proposing to install a physical suicide deterrent system on the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge, State Route 75, between Post Mile 20.1 in San Diego and Post Mile 22.3 in Coronado. The barrier would be installed along both the northbound and southbound sides of the bridge, extending from just southeast of the Glorietta Toll Plaza to just southwest of the Interstate 5-State Route 75 (I-5/SR-75) interchange ([Exhibit 2](#)). The deterrent system consists of an 8-foot-high mesh barrier composed of brushed steel wire mesh with approximately 1-inch openings that is designed to prevent climbing over the existing 34-inch-high concrete bridge guardrails. The mesh barrier would be installed on top of the concrete guardrails with anchored discrete metal plates and 8.5-foot-tall support posts. Tension cables would suspend and maintain the position of the mesh barrier. At the top of the mesh, the tension cables will be topped with wire spikes spaced every four inches. The mesh would be offset 8 inches behind the existing bridge guardrails and is designed to be 87 percent visually permeable ([Exhibit 3](#)).



Figure 2: Proposed Bridge Conditions

To support ongoing maintenance and structural inspections, new substructure maintenance walkways will be added to the existing network of substructure walkways beneath the bridge deck.

A total of 20 Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras will be installed at 10 locations, with two CCTV cameras per location to provide complete visual coverage and increased

analytical coverage of the bridge. All CCTV cameras will be mounted on existing light poles. At five locations, the existing single-camera systems will be removed and replaced with new two-camera systems. At the remaining five new locations, new two-camera systems will be added to existing light poles.

Minor upgrades will also be made to the Transportation Management System (TMS) elements at the Glorietta Toll Plaza, the Bridge, and the (I-5)/SR-75 Interchange. New Vehicle Detection Systems would be installed at the I-5/SR-75 Interchange and the Glorietta Toll Plaza.

Existing signs at 24 locations would either be removed, relocated, or repositioned to prevent conflicts with the vertical barrier installation. Relocated signs will either be installed outside of the barrier limits, attached to existing light poles, or mounted on posts within the barrier limits.

Construction Schedule, Phasing and Staging

Construction is scheduled to begin in October 2026 and conclude approximately two years from the start, with 550 working days. The work would be divided into two phases, all within Caltrans right-of-way. Phase 1 would focus on installing the vertical deterrent fencing, CCTV camera systems, and signage on the northbound side of the bridge, while Phase 2 would replicate these activities on the southbound side. Each phase is expected to take approximately 12 months. The moveable median barrier would be used to always provide at least one available lane for traffic flow in each direction.

Staging and laydown areas are planned within the Caltrans right-of-way, in Coronado at the Glorietta Toll Plaza and beneath the bridge in the Caltrans maintenance yard, and in San Diego at the Caltrans maintenance yard beneath the bridge. The heavy equipment required for this work includes, but is not limited to, attenuator vehicles, boom trucks, crane trucks, flat-bed safe working platform trailers, and small handheld tools.

Jurisdiction

The proposed project includes components that are located within the cities of San Diego and Coronado certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) jurisdictions, as well as components within the retained jurisdiction of the Coastal Commission. Prior to construction of the bridge on November 22, 1966, the Port of San Diego relinquished jurisdiction within the footprint of the bridge for Caltrans right-of-way. Thus, a separate CDP from the Port is not required.

Section 30601.3 of the Coastal Act authorizes the Commission to process a consolidated CDP application (when certain criteria are satisfied) for the entirety of a proposed project that would otherwise require separate CDPs. Consolidated permitting is allowed if the applicant, the local government, and Executive Director (or Commission) consent to the combined action, and when public participation in review of the application is not impaired. In this case, the cities of San Diego and Coronado submitted emails, dated June 25, 2025, and July 7, 2025, respectively, consenting to the Commission processing a consolidated CDP for the proposed project. In this case,

as discussed directly below, Caltrans has done extensive public engagement for the project, which is reflected in the record of the project, and participation will not be impaired because all members of the public are able to join the Commission's hybrid/virtual hearing on this project.

The standard of review for a consolidated CDP application submitted pursuant to Section 30601.3(a) are the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act, with the Cities of San Diego and Coronado LCPs used as guidance.

Additionally, approvals from other local, state, or federal permitting authorities may still be required, for example, an encroachment permit would be needed from the Port of San Diego for the removal of a portion of the fence along the Coronado shoreline once the Visual Mitigation Plan is approved by the Executive Director. Therefore, **Special Condition No. 5** requires the Permittee to obtain all other local, state or federal permits that may be necessary for any aspect of the proposed project.

Public Outreach

Two sets of public open house meetings were held for the draft San Diego Coronado Bay Bridge Physical Suicide Deterrent System Feasibility Study Report. Each open house meeting was held on each side of the bridge to better serve the neighboring community of Barrio Logan within the City of San Diego and the neighboring communities in the City of Coronado. The first set of meetings was held on August 9 and 10, 2017, before the study concepts were developed, and the second on November 14 and 15, 2017, after many of the concepts were identified.

The Draft Feasibility Study Report was published on the Caltrans website with an electronic comment form on March 19, 2018. Stakeholders and interested community members were informed, via press release, e-mail, and social media that the Draft Feasibility Study Report was open for review and commenting for 15 days until April 3, 2018. The Final Feasibility Study Report was published in May 2018.

An advertisement was posted in the San Diego Union Tribune on June 11, 2020, in English and on June 13, 2020, in Spanish, for the Notice of Preparation of the Joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment and Public Scoping Meeting for the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge Suicide Deterrent Project. The advertisements were also posted on the same dates listed above on the San Diego Union Tribune website. Both English and Spanish advertisements and English and Spanish Notices of Preparation were posted on the project website. A public scoping meeting was held on June 25, 2020. The public review period for the Mitigated Negative Declaration (for CEQA compliance) was from January 31, 2022 to March 1, 2022. The virtual public meeting was held on February 10, 2022, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m., via the Zoom platform.

B. Visual Resources

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act states:

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural landforms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas...

Section 30604 (h) of the Coastal Act states:

When acting on a coastal development permit, the issuing agency, or the commission on appeal, may consider environmental justice, or the equitable distribution of environmental benefits throughout the state.

Chapter 4 Urban Design Element Goals of the Barrio Logan LCP state:

A community that is connected with the San Diego Bay waterfront and the surrounding communities of Logan Heights, National City, and Downtown San Diego.

An enhanced visual environment as seen and experienced throughout the community.

Policy 2.1.3 Barrio Logan LCP states:

Work with underrepresented and disenfranchised community members to ensure they are meaningfully involved in the decision-making process.

Policy 2.1.10 Barrio Logan LCP states:

Incorporate features that improve the livability and enjoyment of the community into public facilities, such as additional trees, vegetation, and living walls.

Policy 2.1.4. Promote social equality and environmental justice including the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of people of all races, cultures, and incomes as part of the implementation of the community plan.

- a. Consider environmental, justice, and where applicable, the equitable distribution of environmental benefits.
- b. Encourage inclusive public engagement in decision-making processes.
- c. Prioritize efforts to engage low-income households and individuals with Limited English Proficiency.

Policy 4.1.1 Barrio Logan LCP states:

Require new development to design street frontages with architectural and landscape interest, and provide high quality street-facing building exteriors, to create a visually appealing streetscape.

Policy B6 of the City of Coronado Land Use Plan states:

Maintain high standards for visual aesthetics and preserve these scenic qualities as recreational resources.

Policy H2 of the City of Coronado Land Use Plan states:

Consider and protect as a resource of public importance the scenic and visual qualities of the community.

Policy H.2 of the City of Coronado's LCP states:

Require that permitted development be sited and designed to safeguard existing public views to and along the ocean and bay shores of Coronado, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.

Policy H.5 of the City of Coronado's LCP states:

Reaffirm the Scenic Highway Element of the City's General Plan which designates the Silver Strand and San Diego Coronado Bay Bridge portions of State Highway 75 as Scenic Highway, and the Scenic Highway Modifying Chapter of the City's Zoning Ordinance which regulates land use adjoining Scenic Highways.

The Coastal Act provides that the scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas are resources of public importance that must be protected, and that new development is required to protect public views and designed to be visually compatible with the surrounding area. In highly scenic areas, such as the viewshed in which the site is located, proposed development is also required to be subordinate to the character of its setting.

The San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge is designated a State Scenic Highway because of the expansive and iconic views drivers have of San Diego Bay, downtown, and the Pacific coastline. The proposed project would install an 8-foot-high mesh barrier on top of the existing 34-inch-high concrete guardrails, resulting in a total barrier height of approximately 11-ft.-high, and thus, would interrupt the views of the San Diego Bay and ocean. Moreover, as the dominant structure spanning the bay, the bridge has clean mid-century modern lines, a low-profile guardrail, and light posts as its tallest vertical elements. Because of its length and location, the bridge is visible from many coastal vantage points and, as such, any significant alteration of the appearance of the bridge could impact visual resources throughout the San Diego Bay.

Alternatives

Caltrans evaluated numerous barrier alternatives to address public safety on the bridge. These alternatives can be generally categorized as horizontal barriers and vertical barriers.

Horizontal Net System. A horizontal net system, like the one installed on the Golden Gate Bridge, was considered. This option would have extended a steel net approximately twenty feet below the bridge deck. While it would avoid adding visual elements at eye level for drivers, Caltrans did not select this as the preferred alternative due to serious concerns raised by local first responders, including the California Highway Patrol, local police and fire departments, and the Port of San Diego Harbor Police. A below-deck design would not prevent suicide attempts over the bridge guardrails. With each attempt, there are significant injuries associated with falls into these nets. Negotiating with, rescuing, and retrieving individuals from a horizontal net would still require a full closure of the entire bridge. A horizontal net would also demand more personnel resources, endanger first responders during rescues involving uncooperative individuals, and potentially cause additional injuries from falls into the net. These concerns were formally substantiated in a letter from the City of San Diego on behalf of its Fire-Rescue and Police departments ([Exhibit 8](#)). Further, the bridge is uniquely located between US military facilities, making it critical infrastructure for military traffic to and from Coronado and San Diego. Thus, as part of the National Strategic Highway Network, Caltrans has concluded that the horizontal net design is not an acceptable alternative because it would lead to bridge closures that result in impacts to the nation's military readiness.

Additionally, the bridge has an existing system of substructure maintenance walkways located under the bridge deck ([Exhibit 5](#)). A horizontal net system could increase security vulnerabilities by inadvertently creating access to the underside of the bridge. A horizontal net could allow someone to climb from the deck around the girders and gain access to the interior of the bridge. Because the bridge is one continuous structure, tampering with or damaging critical components poses an unacceptable vulnerability to the bridge's overall security.

Finally, Caltrans cites that the horizontal net design would create constant maintenance access conflicts and significantly increased maintenance costs. For example, ongoing painting operations use cranes from the bridge deck to lower materials over the side of the bridge and then onto maintenance platforms. Horizontal netting would directly obstruct the path of the crane load to and from the maintenance platform.

Overall, Caltrans found that a horizontal design was not a feasible option for a suicide deterrent system in the context of the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge, and this conclusion appears to be supported by the available evidence and analysis.

Vertical Barriers. Caltrans studied several vertical barrier design alternatives affixed to the top of the existing bridge guardrails, including wire mesh fences, pivoting wire mesh fences, sliding vertical cable system fences, reverse folding wave fences, vertical nets, and horizontal cable fences. For supplemental information see Sections 1.5 to 1.7 (pages 16-29) of the [Final IS/MND](#) (June 2022).² Caltrans ultimately chose the vertical mesh barrier as the preferred alternative. The other vertical barrier alternatives were

² Available at <https://dot.ca.gov/-/media/dot-media/district-11/documents/coronado-bridge/sr11-sd-cor-bay-br-suic-det-f-1143063-0622-a11y.pdf>.

eliminated, in part because they were inconsistent with state standards for rehabilitation of historic structures and would include additional visual impacts. Most required larger, visually prominent posts and brackets, reduced transparency, or created a distracting flickering effect for drivers. Caltrans found the vertical mesh design to be consistent with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act's Standards for Rehabilitation. Commission Staff finds that the selected alternative is the least visually intrusive of the analyzed vertical alternatives.

Although the proposed barriers will incur visual impacts, the design has been optimized with 87 percent transparency, never creating a solid visual barrier or obstruction. The mesh and its posts are small in scale compared to the bridge's columns, girders, and light poles, and they follow the same lines as the existing guardrail. The materials match the gray tone of the bridge with a brushed finish to reduce glare. This design preserves the bridge's overall form and historic appearance. Views of the bay and skyline would remain largely intact for travelers, with moderate localized changes to immediate views from the roadway. The largely transparent barrier is also not anticipated to significantly impact visual resources from the locations throughout the San Diego Bay that the bridge is visible.

Installation of upgraded CCTV cameras will not impact coastal views because they will be mounted on existing luminaires, above the eyeline of motorists. Existing signs at 24 locations would either be removed, relocated, or repositioned to prevent conflicts with the vertical barrier installation, and installed outside of the barrier limits, attached to existing light poles, or mounted on posts within the barrier limits. Replaced signs will not impact coastal views beyond the existing condition. The expanded substructure maintenance walkway will not impact coastal views toward ([Exhibit 4](#)) or from the bridge as they will be located beneath the bridge deck, in the space between the bridge deck and the bottom of the bridge deck supports.

Overall, the project is generally sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas to the greatest extent feasible. However, there will be impacts to views from the bridge to the ocean and bay, and views of the bridge itself will be altered by the barrier. As compensatory mitigation for these impacts, Commission staff have worked with Caltrans to develop a proposed Visual Mitigation Plan. **Special Condition No. 2** requires a final proposal and implementation of this mitigation plan to offset the visual impacts that will result from the project. Visual mitigation is proposed on both the San Diego and Coronado sides of the bridge.

On the east side of the project, the bridge touchdown is located within Barrio Logan, one of San Diego's oldest and most culturally-rich urban neighborhoods. In past actions, the Commission has generally considered Barrio Logan as an environmental justice community³; similarly, the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment

³ In this staff report, "environmental justice community" refer to low-income communities, communities of color, and other populations with higher exposure and/or sensitivity to adverse project impacts due to historical marginalization, discriminatory land use practices, and/or less capacity to mitigate adverse impacts.

identified Barrio Logan as a disadvantaged community having some of the highest pollution burdens and experiencing socioeconomic vulnerabilities, including high levels of linguistic isolation.⁴ From historic beginnings in the latter part of the 19th century, Barrio Logan has a long history as a working-class Mexican-American neighborhood and has played a vital role in the San Diego's development. In the 1960s, the construction of the San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge and its connection to Interstate 5 fragmented the community into smaller areas that were cut off from each other and included residential displacement. These events, along with other impacts on the social and physical health of the residents, sparked a neighborhood revolt that shaped the creation of Chicano Park during the early 1970s. This community activism spread to include murals depicting elements of Chicano culture on the Caltrans bridge columns.⁵ The park and its iconic community murals, represent collective empowerment of its residents in spite of historic disenfranchisement.

To mitigate view impacts incurred by the proposed project, Caltrans proposes to make four bridge columns available for new murals and provide funding to support creation of the murals, which will be implemented in partnership with community members and groups, such as the Chicano Park Steering Committee. Additionally, an existing chain-link fence will be relocated behind the columns and the Caltrans maintenance trailer fronting Newton Avenue will be painted to enhance the Newton Avenue streetscape ([Exhibit 6](#)). Overall, these murals and maintenance yard improvements, in collaboration with the community, will enhance the visual character of the streetscape, and supports the iconic living walls in Barrio Logan. **Special Condition No. 2** supports these efforts by cementing the ongoing partnership and funding for additional murals with the submittal of a Visual Mitigation Plan. Caltrans has and will continue to engage with Barrio Logan's community to develop and fund new living wall designs.

On the Coronado side of the bridge, the bridge touches down over the Bayshore Bikeway, a multimodal trail for bicyclists and pedestrians around San Diego Bay. Currently this section of the Bikeway has partially blocked coastal views because of an 8-foot-high security fence originally intended to prevent access to the bridge. Caltrans proposes the replacement of this existing chain-link and barbed wire fence ([Exhibit 7](#)) to improve San Diego Bay and downtown views for Bayshore Bikeway users. The existing fence extends from the maintenance access gate for Pier 2 to the maintenance access gate near Coronado Tidelands Park Beach. Caltrans proposes to remove the existing fence and replace it with a low-profile fence that will be 3.5- to 4-feet high to maintain safety requirements for Bayshore Bikeway users. [Exhibit 7](#) depicts a new chain-link fence; however, Caltrans is required to evaluate the feasibility of alternative fencing options (e.g. post and cable, etc.) as part of the Visual Mitigation Plan. A small portion of the fence proposed for removal is located outside the Caltrans right-of-way, within the jurisdiction of the Port of San Diego. Caltrans will obtain approval from the Port, in

⁴ Linguistic isolation reflects the percentage of households where no one over the age 14 speaks English well, based on 2019-2023 data from the Draft CalEnviroScreen 5.0.

⁵ An on-line guide to these murals prepared by the Chicano Park Steering Committee is available here: <https://chicanoparkmuseum.org/murals/>.

accordance with **Special Condition No. 2**. Overall, this will improve coastal views and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas for multimodal and other users on Coronado Island. Additionally, **Special Condition No. 1** requires submittal of revised final plans ensuring that new development blends in with the natural environment and that Suicide Crisis Hotline signage include Spanish translations.

Thus, as conditioned, the project is sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas to the greatest extent feasible, is generally visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and includes compensatory mitigation to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. Therefore, the proposed project is consistent with Section 30251 of the Coastal Act.

C. Biological Resources

Section 30230 of the Coastal Act states:

Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.

Section 30231 of the Coastal Act states:

The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of wastewater discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interference with the surface water flow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

The San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge sits above San Diego Bay but is otherwise surrounded by dense urban development on the San Diego side and residential/commercial development with some developed parkland on the Coronado Island side. San Diego Bay is listed under the Clean Water Act as an impaired water body. The creeks in the watershed are highly affected by urban runoff, such as contaminants from roadways, industry, and other urban sources. San Diego Bay supports key beneficial uses including recreation, fish and shellfish consumption, habitats and ecosystems, and navigation, but ongoing issues with bacteria, metals, and sediment contamination require management and restoration efforts to protect public health and the environment.

Project Impacts to Water Quality

Construction of the barrier involves construction work above, or adjacent to, coastal bay waters, and could therefore pose a risk to water quality from accidental spills of chemicals, solids, construction waste, petroleum products from construction equipment and/or vehicles, concrete waste, sanitary wastes from portable toilets, and any other chemicals used for construction such as coolants used for equipment and/or concrete curing compounds. There are no anticipated impacts to wetlands from the project or project staging and no proposed fill, diking, or dredging in wetlands or coastal waters.

Caltrans has proposed numerous Best Management Practices (BMPs) as part of the project. To ensure that Caltrans implements these and other construction-phase BMPs, **Special Condition No. 4** requires robust implementation of BMPs designed to protect water quality and aquatic resources. BMPs would include implementation of a Debris Containment and Collection Plan per Caltrans 2025 Standard Specifications, placement of fiber rolls near inlets, and street sweeping after drilling activities to remove fugitive metal and concrete dust from the bridge deck. The Commission finds that the project, as conditioned, will maintain and enhance the biological productivity, quality, and functional capacity of coastal waters and wetlands consistent with the requirements of Sections 30230, 30231, and 30233 of the Coastal Act.

Protection for Birds

San Diego Bay provides crucial habitat for hundreds of bird species, supporting over two hundred different kinds within the San Diego Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Its salt marshes, mudflats, and open waters provide essential feeding, resting, and nesting grounds for shorebirds, waterfowl, and endangered species like the California least tern, light-footed Ridgway's rail, and western snowy plover. As a key stop along the Pacific Flyway, the bay offers critical sanctuary for millions of migratory birds traveling between Alaska and Patagonia each spring and fall.

The average daily traffic volume on the bridge is 83,000 vehicles. Although birds fly around the bridge, the constant noise and vibration from the vehicles deters most birds from using the bridge as habitat. However, over the years, a pair of peregrine falcons (*Falco peregrinus anatum*) has successfully nested on the San Diego side of the bridge. **Special Condition No. 3** requires a Nesting Bird Monitoring and Avoidance Plan to ensure that construction of the barrier will protect the falcons and other migratory birds, nests, and/or eggs within the construction site.

Upon design review and consultation with resource agency partners, Commission Ecology staff has determined that the wire mesh design combined with existing lighting on the bridge during low light periods is unlikely to cause avian collision or entanglement. It is anticipated that the 13 percent non-permeability in the design specification will create enough visual presence for birds to perceive and avoid the barrier during flight.

Through the implementation of the avoidance and minimization measures described herein, the Commission finds that the project, as conditioned, is consistent with the biological resource policies of Section 30230, 30231, and 30240 of the Coastal Act.

D. Public Access and Recreation

Section 30210 of the Coastal Act states:

In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

Section 30212(a) of the Coastal Act states:

Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where: (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, (2) adequate access exists nearby, or, (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. A dedicated accessway shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway.

Section 30213 of the Coastal Act states, in part:

Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.

Section 30223 of the Coastal Act states:

Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreation uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible.

The San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge provides critical access to numerous recreational locations along Coronado Island and the South San Diego Bay, as well as access to multiple coastal recreational areas in the greater San Diego region. Suicide attempts result in full bridge closures to the Highway 75 bridge crossing. The only feasible detour is 23 miles long and adds 30 to 60 minutes of commute time, increasing traffic and impacts to coastal access to the San Diego Bay and the Pacific Ocean. The proposed project represents an improvement in coastal public access because the implementation of the project will result in fewer bridge closures.

To minimize impacts to traffic on this critical infrastructure bridge during the two-year construction phase, work will be conducted during nighttime hours, and at least one traffic lane would remain open at all times to maintain traffic flow, thus, avoiding prime beach use times and further minimizing impacts to public access.

Public access impacts resulting from work associated with the implementation of the Visual Mitigation Plan in Barrio Logan and Coronado would be minimal and offset through implementation of a detour signage plan for pedestrians and cyclists, if needed.

Collectively, therefore, the proposed changes would improve public access, by reducing bridge closures, thereby providing a public safety benefit to a transportation facility that provides coastal access for the region. Additionally, the improvement of San Diego Bay views along the Bayshore Bikeway through the replacement of the chain-link and barbed wire fence ([Exhibit 7](#)) represents a multi-modal public access benefit along the Bayshore Bikeway in Coronado.

In conclusion, the Commission finds that the project will not impact public access to and along the coast. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed development, as conditioned, will not have an adverse impact on public access to the coast or to nearby recreational facilities and is consistent with Sections 30210, 30212, 30213, and 30223.

E. Other

The project site presents complicated coastal resource issues and is the site of past Commission approvals as well as this CDP, and the Commission finds that it is critical that any future development associated with the approved development be considered in that context. Thus, **Special Condition No. 6** provides that all future proposed development related to this project and/or this CDP shall be subject to the Coastal Commission's continuing CDP jurisdiction. At the same time, the Commission also recognizes that there may be limited/minor repair, maintenance and improvement development that can be covered under this CDP, provided the Executive Director determines it to: 1) fall within the overall scope and intent of this CDP; 2) be consistent with the City of Coronado and the City of San Diego LCPs; and 3) not have any significant adverse impacts to coastal resources. Any development that the Executive Director determines does not meet such criteria shall require its own CDP authorization.

In terms of recognizing and assuming the hazard risks for shoreline development, the Commission's experience in evaluating proposed development in areas subject to hazards has been that development has continued to occur despite periodic episodes of heavy storm damage and other such occurrences, as well as more steady erosion and other coastal hazards, all as may be exacerbated by sea level rise. Separate from its impact on coastal resources directly, development in such dynamic environments is also susceptible to damage due to such long-term and episodic processes. Though Caltrans has designed the proposed project to reduce vulnerability to coastal hazards, it is not possible to remove all associated risk associated with the uncertainties of natural hazards. **Special Condition No. 7** requires Caltrans to assume the risks of geologic hazards – as well as all risks more generally – for the project and to acknowledge that the proposed project is subject to potential risks.

Moreover, given the possibility that third parties would bring an action against the Commission as a result of the failure of the development to withstand hazards, as well as for any other risks of litigation, **Special Condition No. 8** stipulates that the Commission is not liable for damage as a result of approving the permit for development and requires Caltrans to indemnify the Commission in the event of a future lawsuit.

F. Local Coastal Planning

Section 30604(a) also requires that a coastal development permit shall be issued only if the Commission finds that the permitted development will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. In this case, such a finding can be made.

The San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge connects the municipalities of San Diego and Coronado, both of which have certified LCPs, and portions of the bridge pass through areas within the Port's jurisdiction, which has a certified Port Master Plan. A portion of the site is located within the Coastal Commission's area of original jurisdiction and portions are located in areas with certified LCPs where the local jurisdictions have requested the Commission review a consolidated CDP, thus the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act are the standard of review with the Cities of San Diego and Coronado certified LCPs used as guidance. As conditioned, the proposed development is consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and with the Cities' certified LCPs. Therefore, approval of the proposed development will not prejudice the ability of the Cities of San Diego or Coronado to continue to implement their certified LCPs.

G. California Environmental Quality Act

Section 13096 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations requires that a specific finding be made in conjunction with Coastal Development Permit applications showing the application to be consistent with any applicable requirements of CEQA. Public Resources Code, Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) prohibits a proposed development from being approved if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect that the activity may have on the environment.

Caltrans, acting as the lead agency under CEQA, certified the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum for the project in June 2022, finding the project will not have a significant environmental impact (State Clearinghouse No. 2020060290). The Coastal Commission's review and analysis of land use proposals has been certified by the Secretary of the Natural Resources Agency as being the functional equivalent of environmental review under CEQA (Section 15251(c)). The Commission has reviewed the relevant coastal resource issues with the proposed project and has identified appropriate and necessary modifications to address adverse impacts to such coastal resources. All above findings are incorporated herein in their entirety by reference.

As such, there are no additional feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse environmental effects which approval of the proposed project, as conditioned, would have on the environment within the meaning of CEQA. Thus, if so conditioned, the proposed project will not result in any significant environmental effects for which feasible mitigation measures have not been employed consistent with CEQA Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A).

APPENDIX A – SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS

San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge Suicide Deterrent Project, Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, Caltrans, June 2022

San Diego-Coronado Bay Bridge Suicide Deterrent Project, Addendum to the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration, Caltrans, June 2022