



ENTITLEMENTS DIVISION
(619) 446-5460

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 255100
SCH No. 2011091045

SUBJECT: Citywide Pipeline Projects: COUNCIL APPROVAL to allow for the replacement, rehabilitation, relocation, point repair, new trenching, trenchless construction, and abandonment of water and/or sewer pipeline alignments and associated improvements such as curb ramps, sewer lateral connections, water service connections, manholes, new pavement/slurry, the removal and/or replacement of street trees and the removal and/or replacement of street lights. This environmental document covers the analysis for ~~five~~ four (4) near-term pipeline projects (Harbor Drive Pipeline, Water Group 949, ~~Sewer Group 787~~, Water Group 914, and Sewer/Water Group 732), as well as any subsequent future pipeline projects. The construction footprint for a typical pipeline project, including staging areas and other areas (such as access) would be located within the City of San Diego Public Right-of-Way (PROW) and/or within public easements and may include planned pipeline construction within private easements from the PROW to the service connection. A signed agreement between the City and the property owner would be required for work conducted on private property. Project types that would be included in the analysis contained herein would consist of sewer and water group jobs, trunk sewers, large diameter water pipeline projects, new and/or replacement manholes, new/or replacement fire hydrants, and other necessary appurtenances. All associated equipment would be staged within the existing PROW adjacent to the work areas. The near-term and future projects covered in the document would not impact *Sensitive Biological Resources* or *Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL)* as defined in the Land Development Code and would not encroach into the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Applicant: The City of San Diego Engineering and Capital Projects Department AND Public Utilities Department.

Update 10/20/2011

Revisions to this document have been made when compared to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (DMND) dated September 9, 2011. In response to the Comment Letter received from The California Department of Fish and Game, further description and graphics of Water Group 949 as it relates to the MHPA has been added to the Final MND. Please note that Sewer Group 787, which is adjacent to the MHPA, has been removed from the project description and is no longer covered in this MND.

The modifications to the FMND are denoted by ~~strikeout~~ and underline format. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, Section 15073.5 (c)(4), the addition of new information that clarifies, amplifies, or makes insignificant modification does not require recirculation as there are no new impacts and no new mitigation identified. An environmental document need only be recirculated when there is identification of new significant environmental impact or the addition of a new mitigation measure required to avoid a significant environmental impact. The addition

of corrected mitigation language within the environmental document does not affect the environmental analysis or conclusions of the MND.

Construction for the near-term and any future projects is anticipated to occur during the daytime hours Monday through Friday, but may occur during the weekend, if necessary. The contractor would comply with all applicable requirements described in the latest edition of the *Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction* (“GREENBOOK”) and the latest edition of the *City of San Diego Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction* (“WHITEBOOK”). The City’s supplement addresses unique circumstances to the City of San Diego that are not addressed in the GREENBOOK and would therefore take precedence in the event of a conflict. The contractor would also comply with the California Department of Transportation *Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones*. If the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) within a given project(s) vicinity is 10,000 ADT or greater, a traffic control plan would be prepared and implemented in accordance with the *City of San Diego Standard Drawings Manual of Traffic Control for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones*. For proposals subject to 10,000 ADT or less, traffic control may be managed through shop drawings during construction. Construction methods to be employed would consist of, but not be limited to:

Open Trenching: The open trench method of construction would be used for complete replacement and new alignment portions of the project. Trenches are typically four feet wide and are dug with excavations and similar large construction equipment.

Rehabilitation: Rehabilitation of alignment involves installing a new lining in old pipelines. The insertion is done through existing manhole access points and does not require removal of pavement or excavation of soils.

Abandonment: Pipeline abandonment activities would be similar to rehabilitation methods in that no surface/subsurface disturbance would occur. This process may involve slurry or grout material injected into the abandoned lines via manhole access. The top portion of the manhole is then typically removed and the remaining space backfilled and paved over.

Potholing: Potholing would be used to verify reconnection of laterals to main where lines would be raised or realigned (higher than existing depth, but still below ground) or to verify utility crossings. These “potholes” are made by using vacuum type equipment to open up small holes into the street of pavement.

Point Repairs: Point repairs include replacing a portion of a pipe segment by open trench excavation methods in which localized structural defects have been identified. Generally, point repairs are confined to an eight-foot section of pipe.

The following near term project(s) have been reviewed by the City of San Diego, Development Services Department (DSD) for compliance with the Land Development Code and have been determined to be exempt from a Site Development Permit (SDP) and/or a Coastal Development Permit (CDP). These projects would involve excavation in areas having a high resource sensitivity and potential for encountering archaeological and paleontological resources during construction related activities. Therefore, mitigation would be required to reduce potential significant impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources to below a level of significance. With respect to Storm Water, all projects would be reviewed for compliance with the City’s Storm Water Standards

Manual. All projects that are not-exempt from the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) would incorporate appropriate Permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) and construction BMPs into the project design(s) and during construction, as required. As such, all projects would comply with the requirement of the Municipal Storm Water Permit.

HARBOR DRIVE PIPELINE (PROJECT NO. 206100)

The Harbor Drive Pipeline includes the replacement of 4.4 miles of 16-inch cast iron (CI) and asbestos cement (AC) pipe that comprises the Harbor Drive 1st and 2nd Pipelines (HD-1 and HD-2) at a depth no greater than five (5) feet. Facility age and cast iron main replacement are the primary drivers for these projects, but due to the history of AC breaks in the area, approximately 1.0 mile of AC replacement is also included. The project is anticipated to be awarded in Fiscal Year 2013.

HD-1 and HD-2 were built primarily in the 1940's and 1950's and were made out of cast iron or asbestos cement and serve the western most part of the University Heights 390 Zone and the northern section of the Point Loma East 260 Zone. The pipelines also serve as redundancy to each other. Several segments were replaced by various City of San Diego Public Utilities Department projects throughout the years and those segments are not a part of the current scope. Previously replaced segments were 16 inch PVC, except for the bridge crossing which used 24-inch CMLC. The pipeline is located entirely within the PROW, will not require any easements, and is not adjacent to the MHPA or located within any designated historical districts. The following streets would be affected by this project: West Laurel, Pacific Highway, North Harbor Drive (within the roadway, under the bridge and within landscape areas), Nimitz Boulevard, Rosecrans Street, Evergreen Street, Hugo Street, Locust Street, Canon Street, Avenida De Portugal, and Point Loma Avenue.

Mitigation for the Harbor Drive Pipeline: Historical Resources (Archaeological Monitoring)

WATER GROUP 949 (PROJECT NO. 232719)

Water Group 949 would consist of the replacement and installation of 5.27 miles of water mains within the Skyline- Paradise Hills, University, Clairemont Mesa, Southeastern San Diego (Greater Golden Hills) community planning areas. 16,931 Linear Feet (LF) of 16-inch cast iron water mains would be replace-in-place with new 16-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe within the existing trench. The remaining 10,913 LF of new 16-inch PVC would be installed in new trenches. All work within Regents Road, Site 2 (Figure 8), adjacent to the MHPA would only occur within the developed footprint such as the paved right of way, and concrete sidewalk or slab areas. In addition, all work within 100 feet of the MHPA would observe mitigation such as but not limited to, bird breeding season measures, avoidance of discharge into the MHPA, and avoidance of direct lighting towards the MHPA areas. As such, no impacts to MHPA and/or sensitive resources would occur. The project would also include replacement and reinstallation of valves, water services, fire hydrants, and other appurtenances and would also included the construction of curb ramps, and street resurfacing. Traffic control measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction. Any street tree removal, relocation, and/or trimming would be done under the supervision of the City Arborist. All staging of construction equipment will be located outside of any potentially sensitive areas. The following streets and nearby alleyways would be affected by this project: Tuther Way, Cielo Drive, Woodman Street, Skyline Drive, Regents Road, Hidalgo Avenue, Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, Luna Avenue, B Street, F Street, Ash Street, 25th Street, and 27th Street.

Mitigation Required for Water Group 949: This project would require the implementation of MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines in the University and Clairemont Mesa Community Planning areas that are adjacent (within 100 feet) to the MHPA and Historical Resources (Built Environment) mitigation for the area of the project located within the Greater Golden Hill Historic District.

SEWER GROUP 787 (PROJECT NO. 231928)

Sewer Group 787 would consist of the replacement of 26,436 lineal feet (LF) of existing 16-inch east iron sewer pipe with new 16-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe within the existing trench. A total of 1,267 LF of new 16-inch PVC sewer alignment would be installed in new trenches. In addition, the project would abandon 1,606 LF of existing 16-inch east iron pipe. The proposed project would be installed by conventional excavation (open trench) in trenches from 3-5 feet deep. The project would affect the following streets and nearby alleyways: 42nd Street, Monroe Avenue, Edgware Road, Polk Avenue, Orange Avenue, Menlo Avenue, 47th Street, Dwight Street, Myrtle Avenue, Manzanita Place, Heather Street, Dahlia Street, Poplar Street, Columbine Street, Pepper Drive, Juniper Street, Marigold Street, Sumac Drive, 44th Street, Laurie Lane, and Roseview Place all within the City Heights and Kensington-Talmadge Community Planning Areas.

~~**Mitigation Required for Water Group 787: This project would require the implementation of MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines in the City Heights and Kensington-Talmadge Community Planning areas that are adjacent (within 100 feet) to the MHPA, Historical Resources (Archaeological and Paleontological Monitoring).**~~

WATER GROUP 914 (PROJECT NO. 233447)

Water Group 914 would consist of the replacement and installation of approximately 21,729 lineal feet (LF) of existing 6-inch, 8-inch and 12-inch cast iron pipes and 6-inch asphalt concrete pipes with new 8-inch, 12-inch and 16-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe. Also included would be the construction of two underground pressure regulator stations that measure 54 square-feet and 6.5 feet deep each. 17,472 LF would be located in existing trenches and 4,257 LF would be located in new trench lines. The proposed project would be installed by conventional excavation (open trench) in trenches from 3-5 feet deep. However two 300 LF parallel line sections (600 LF total) of the water alignment would be installed by trenchless methodology utilizing two (2) 40 square foot launch and receiver pits. The trenchless installation would occur at the intersection of Coronado Avenue and Ebers Street and is designed to avoid a recorded archaeological resource at this intersection. The trenchless methodology would employ directional underground boring that would install the pipe at a depth deeper than the recorded resource. In addition, a 4-inch AC water segment of approximately 520 LF located along Point Loma Avenue between Guizot Street and Santa Barbara Street will be abandoned in place. The project would affect the following streets and nearby alleyways: Point Loma Avenue, Santa Barbara Street, Bermuda Avenue, Pescadero Avenue, Cable Street, Orchard Avenue, Froude Street, Sunset Cliffs Boulevard, Savoy Circle, and Del Monte Avenue all within the Ocean Beach and Peninsula Community Planning Areas.

Mitigation for Water Group 914: Historical Resources (Archaeological Monitoring) and (Built Environment)

SEWER AND WATER GROUP 732 (PROJECT NO. 206610)

Sewer and Water Group Job 732 would consist of the installation of approximately 5,500 total linear feet (LF) of 8 inch Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) sewer pipe, and approximately 3,000 total linear feet (LF) of 12 inch PVC water pipe. Approximately, 1,035 LF of water pipe would be rehabilitated using trenchless technology in the same trench, with the remainder of the installation accomplished through open trenching. Related work would include construction of new manholes, replacement and re-plumbing of sewer laterals, installation of curb ramps, pavement restoration, traffic control, and storm water best management practices. Construction of the project would affect portions of the following streets and adjacent alleys in the Peninsula Community Plan area: Xenophon Street, Yonge Street, Zola Street, Alcott Street, Browning Street, Plum Street, Willow Street, Evergreen Street, Locust Street, and Rosecrans Street.

Mitigation Required for Sewer and Water Group 732: Historical Resources (Archaeological and Paleontological Monitoring).**SUBSEQUENT PIPELINE PROJECT REVIEW (LONG TERM)**

Applications for the replacement, rehabilitation, relocation, point repair, open trenching and abandonment of water and/or sewer pipeline alignments within the City of San Diego PROW as indicated in the Subject block above and in the Project Description discussion of the Initial Study would be analyzed for potential environmental impacts to Historical Resources (Archaeology, Paleontology and the Built Environment) and Land Use (MSCP/MHPA), and reviewed for consistency with this Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). Where it can be determined that the project is "consistent" with this MND and no additional potential significant impacts would occur pursuant to State CEQA Guideline § 15162 (i.e. the involvement of new significant environmental effects of a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects) or if the project would result in minor technical changes or additions, then an Addendum to this MND would be prepared pursuant to §15164. Where future projects are found not to be consistent with this MND, then a new Initial Study and project specific MND shall be prepared.

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

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the near term projects and any future subsequent projects could have a significant environmental effect in the following areas(s): Land Use (MSCP/MHPA Land Use Adjacency), Historical Resources (Built Environment), Historical Resources (Archaeology) and Paleontology. When subsequent projects are submitted to DSD, the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) will determine which of the project specific mitigation measures listed in Section V. would apply. Subsequent revisions in the project proposal create the specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration. Projects as revised now avoid or mitigate the potentially significant environmental effects previously identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report will not be required.

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

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

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP):

A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART I

Plan Check Phase (prior to permit issuance)

1. Prior to Bid Opening/Bid Award or beginning any construction related activity on-site, the Development Services Department (DSD) Director's Environmental Designee (ED) shall review and approve all Construction Documents (CD) (plans, specification, details, etc.) to ensure the MMRP requirements have been incorporated.
2. In addition, the ED shall verify that the MMRP Conditions/Notes that apply ONLY to the construction phases of this project are included VERBATIM, under the heading, "ENVIRONMENTAL/MITIGATION REQUIREMENTS."
3. These notes must be shown within the first three (3) sheets of the construction documents in the format specified for engineering construction document templates as shown on the City website:

<http://www.sandiego.gov/development-services/industry/standtemp.shtml>

4. The **TITLE INDEX SHEET** must also show on which pages the "Environmental/Mitigation Requirements" notes are provided.

B. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS – PART II

Post Plan Check (After permit issuance/Prior to start of construction)

1. **PRE CONSTRUCTION MEETING IS REQUIRED TEN (10) WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO BEGINNING ANY WORK ON THIS PROJECT.** The PERMIT HOLDER/OWNER is responsible to arrange and perform this meeting by contacting the CITY RESIDENT ENGINEER (RE) of the Field Engineering Division and City staff from MITIGATION MONITORING COORDINATION (MMC). Attendees must also include the Permit holder's Representative(s), Job Site Superintendent and the following consultants as necessary:

Biologist, Archaeologist, Native American Monitor, Historian and Paleontologist

Note: Failure of all responsible Permit Holder's representatives and consultants to attend shall require an additional meeting with all parties present.

CONTACT INFORMATION:

- a) The PRIMARY POINT OF CONTACT is the RE at the **Field Engineering Division 858-627-3200**
- b) For Clarification of ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS, it is also required to call **RE and MMC at 858-627-3360**

2. MMRP COMPLIANCE: This Project, Project Tracking System (PTS) No. 255100, or for subsequent future projects the associated PTS No, shall conform to the mitigation requirements contained in the associated Environmental Document and implemented to the satisfaction of the DSD's ED, MMC and the City Engineer (RE). The requirements may not be reduced or changed but may be annotated (i.e. to explain when and how compliance is being met and location of verifying proof, etc.). Additional clarifying information may also be added to other relevant plan sheets and/or specifications as appropriate (i.e., specific locations, times of monitoring, methodology, etc)

Note:

Permit Holder's Representatives must alert RE and MMC if there are any discrepancies in the plans or notes, or any changes due to field conditions. All conflicts must be approved by RE and MMC BEFORE the work is performed.

- 3. OTHER AGENCY REQUIREMENTS:** Evidence that any other agency requirements or permits have been obtained or are in process shall be submitted to the RE and MMC for review and acceptance prior to the beginning of work or within one week of the Permit Holder obtaining documentation of those permits or requirements. Evidence shall include copies of permits, letters of resolution or other documentation issued by the responsible agency as applicable.
- 4. MONITORING EXHIBITS:** All consultants are required to submit, to RE and MMC, a monitoring exhibit on a 11x17 reduction of the appropriate construction plan, such as site plan, grading, landscape, etc., marked to clearly show the specific areas including the **LIMIT OF WORK**, scope of that discipline's work, and notes indicating when in the construction schedule that work will be performed. When necessary for clarification, a detailed methodology of how the work will be performed shall be included.
- 5. OTHER SUBMITTALS AND INSPECTIONS:** The Permit Holder/Owner's representative shall submit all required documentation, verification letters, and requests for all associated inspections to the RE and MMC for approval per the following schedule:

Document Submittal/Inspection Checklist

<i><u>Issue Area</u></i>	<i><u>Document submittal</u></i>	<i><u>Associated Inspection/Approvals/Note</u></i>
General	Consultant Qualification Letters	Prior to Pre-construction Mtg.
General	Consultant Const. Monitoring	Prior to or at Pre-Construction Mtg.
Biology	Biology Reports	Limit of Work Verification
Historical	Historical Reports	Historical observation (built envirnmt)
Archaeology	Archaeology Reports	Archaeology observation
Paleontology	Paleontology Reports	Paleontology observation
Final MMRP		Final MMRP Inspection

SPECIFIC MMRP ISSUE AREA CONDITIONS/REQUIREMENTS:

A. LAND USE [MULTIPLE SPECIES CONSERVATION PROGRAM (MSCP) For PROJECTS WITHIN 100 FEET OF THE MHPA]

I. Prior to Permit Issuance

- A. Prior to issuance of any construction permit, the DSD Environmental Designee (ED) shall verify the Applicant has accurately represented the project's design in the Construction Documents (CDs) that are in conformance with the associated discretionary permit conditions and Exhibit "A", and also the City's Multi-Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines for the Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), including identifying adjacency as the potential for direct/indirect impacts where applicable. In addition, all CDs where applicable shall show the following:
- 1. Land Development / Grading / Boundaries** –MHPA boundaries on-site and adjacent properties shall be delineated on the CDs. The ED shall ensure that all grading is included within the development footprint, specifically manufactured slopes, disturbance, and development within or adjacent to the MHPA..
 - 2. Drainage / Toxins** –All new and proposed parking lots and developed area in and adjacent to the MHPA shall be designed so they do not drain directly into the MHPA, All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials prior to release by incorporating the use of filtration devices, planted swales and/or planted detention/desiltation basins, or other approved permanent methods that are designed to minimize negative impacts, such as excessive water and toxins into the ecosystems of the MHPA.
 - 3. Staging/storage, equipment maintenance, and trash** –All areas for staging, storage of equipment and materials, trash, equipment maintenance, and other construction related activities are within the development footprint. Provide a note on the plans that states: *"All construction related activity that may have potential for leakage or intrusion shall be monitored by the Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative to ensure there is no impact to the MHPA."*
 - 4. Barriers** –All new development within or adjacent to the MHPA shall provide fencing or other City approved barriers along the MHPA boundaries to direct public access to appropriate locations, to reduce domestic animal predation, and to direct wildlife to appropriate corridor crossing. Permanent barriers may include, but are not limited to, fencing (6-foot black vinyl coated chain link or equivalent), walls, rocks/boulders, vegetated buffers, and signage for access, litter, and educational purposes.
 - 5. Lighting** – All building, site, and landscape lighting adjacent to the MHPA shall be directed away from the preserve using proper placement and adequate shielding to protect sensitive habitat. Where necessary, light from traffic or other incompatible uses, shall be shielded from the MHPA through the utilization of including, but not limited to, earth berms, fences, and/or plant material.
 - 6. Invasive Plants** – Plant species within 100 feet of the MHPA shall comply with the Landscape Regulations (LDC142.0400 and per table 142-04F, Revegetation and Irrigation Requirements) and be non invasive. Landscape plans shall include a note that states: *"The ongoing maintenance requirements of the property owner shall*

prohibit the use of any planting that are invasive, per City Regulations, Standards, guidelines, etc., within 100 feet of the MHPA.”

7. **Brush Management** –All new development adjacent to the MHPA is set back from the MHPA to provide the required Brush Management Zone (BMZ) 1 area (LDC Sec. 142.0412) within the development area and outside of the MHPA. BMZ 2 may be located within the MHPA and the BMZ 2 management shall be the responsibility of a HOA or other private entity.
8. **Noise-** Due to the site's location adjacent to or within the MHPA, construction noise that exceeds the maximum levels allowed shall be avoided, during the breeding seasons for protected avian species such as: *California Gnatcatcher (3/1-8/15)*; *Least Bell's vireo (3/15-9/15)*; and *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (5/1-8/30)*. If construction is proposed during the breeding season for the species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys shall be required in order to determine species presence/absence. When applicable, adequate noise reduction measures shall be incorporated. Upon project submittal EAS shall determine which of the following project specific avian protocol surveys shall be required.

COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER

NO CLEARING, GRUBBING, GRADING, OR OTHER CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL OCCUR BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND AUGUST 15, THE BREEDING SEASON OF THE COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER, UNTIL THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS HAVE BEEN MET TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY MANAGER:

- a. A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST (POSSESSING A VALID ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SECTION 10(a)(1)(A) RECOVERY PERMIT) SHALL SURVEY THOSE HABITAT AREAS WITHIN ADJACENT TO THE MHPA THAT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS EXCEEDING 60 DECIBELS [dB(A)] HOURLY AVERAGE FOR THE PRESENCE OF THE COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER. SURVEYS FOR THE COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER SHALL BE CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE PROTOCOL SURVEY GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED BY THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE WITHIN THE BREEDING SEASON PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY CONSTRUCTION. IF GNATCATCHERS ARE PRESENT, THEN THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE MET:

BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND AUGUST 15, NO CLEARING, GRUBBING, OR GRADING OF OCCUPIED GNATCATCHER HABITAT SHALL BE PERMITTED. AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE STAKED OR FENCED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; AND

1. BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND AUGUST 15, NO CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL OCCUR WITHIN ANY PORTION OF THE SITE WHERE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD RESULT IN NOISE LEVELS EXCEEDING 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF OCCUPIED GNATCATCHER HABITAT. AN ANALYSIS SHOWING THAT NOISE GENERATED BY CONSTRUCTION

ACTIVITIES WOULD NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF OCCUPIED HABITAT MUST BE COMPLETED BY A QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN (POSSESSING CURRENT NOISE ENGINEER LICENSE OR REGISTRATION WITH MONITORING NOISE LEVEL EXPERIENCE WITH LISTED ANIMAL SPECIES) AND APPROVED BY THE CITY MANAGER AT LEAST TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES DURING THE BREEDING SEASON, AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE STAKED OR FENCED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; OR

2. AT LEAST TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN, NOISE ATTENUATION MEASURES (e.g., BERMS, WALLS) SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED TO ENSURE THAT NOISE LEVELS RESULTING FROM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WILL NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF HABITAT OCCUPIED BY THE COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER. CONCURRENT WITH THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF NECESSARY NOISE ATTENUATION FACILITIES, NOISE MONITORING* SHALL BE CONDUCTED AT THE EDGE OF THE OCCUPIED HABITAT AREA TO ENSURE THAT NOISE LEVELS DO NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE. IF THE NOISE ATTENUATION TECHNIQUES IMPLEMENTED ARE DETERMINED TO BE INADEQUATE BY THE QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN OR BIOLOGIST, THEN THE ASSOCIATED CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL CEASE UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT ADEQUATE NOISE ATTENUATION IS ACHIEVED OR UNTIL THE END OF THE BREEDING SEASON (AUGUST 16).

* Construction noise monitoring shall continue to be monitored at least twice weekly on varying days, or more frequently depending on the construction activity, to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. If not, other measures shall be implemented in consultation with the biologist and the City Manager, as necessary, to reduce noise levels to below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, limitations on the placement of construction equipment and the simultaneous use of equipment.

- b. IF COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHERS ARE NOT DETECTED DURING THE PROTOCOL SURVEY, THE QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST SHALL SUBMIT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO THE CITY MANAGER AND APPLICABLE RESOURCE AGENCIES WHICH DEMONSTRATES WHETHER OR NOT MITIGATION MEASURES SUCH AS NOISE WALLS ARE NECESSARY BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND AUGUST 15 AS FOLLOWS:

1. IF THIS EVIDENCE INDICATES THE POTENTIAL IS HIGH FOR COASTAL CALIFORNIA GNATCATCHER TO BE PRESENT BASED ON HISTORICAL RECORDS OR SITE CONDITIONS, THEN CONDITION A.III SHALL BE ADHERED TO AS SPECIFIED ABOVE.
2. IF THIS EVIDENCE CONCLUDES THAT NO IMPACTS TO THIS SPECIES ARE ANTICIPATED, NO MITIGATION MEASURES WOULD BE NECESSARY.

LEAST BELL'S VIREO (State Endangered/Federally Endangered)

NO CLEARING, GRUBBING, GRADING, OR OTHER CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL OCCUR BETWEEN MARCH 15 AND SEPTEMBER 15, THE BREEDING SEASON OF THE LEAST BELL'S VIREO, UNTIL THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS HAVE BEEN MET TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY MANAGER:

- A. A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST (POSSESSING A VALID ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SECTION 10(a)(1)(A) RECOVERY PERMIT) SHALL SURVEY THOSE WETLAND AREAS THAT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS EXCEEDING 60 DECIBELS [dB(A)] HOURLY AVERAGE FOR THE PRESENCE OF THE LEAST BELL'S VIREO. SURVEYS FOR THE THIS SPECIES SHALL BE CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE PROTOCOL SURVEY GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED BY THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE WITHIN THE BREEDING SEASON PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION. IF THE LEAST BELL'S VIREO IS PRESENT, THEN THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE MET:

BETWEEN MARCH 15 AND SEPTEMBER 15, NO CLEARING, GRUBBING, OR GRADING OF OCCUPIED LEAST BELL'S VIREO HABITAT SHALL BE PERMITTED. AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE STAKED OR FENCED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; AND

BETWEEN MARCH 15 AND SEPTEMBER 15, NO CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL OCCUR WITHIN ANY PORTION OF THE SITE WHERE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD RESULT IN NOISE LEVELS EXCEEDING 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF OCCUPIED LEAST BELL'S VIREO OR HABITAT. AN ANALYSIS SHOWING THAT NOISE GENERATED BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF OCCUPIED HABITAT MUST BE COMPLETED BY A QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN (POSSESSING CURRENT NOISE ENGINEER LICENSE OR REGISTRATION WITH MONITORING NOISE LEVEL EXPERIENCE WITH LISTED ANIMAL SPECIES) AND APPROVED BY THE CITY MANAGER AT LEAST TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES DURING THE BREEDING SEASON, AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE STAKED OR FENCED

UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; OR

AT LEAST TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN, NOISE ATTENUATION MEASURES (e.g., BERMS, WALLS) SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED TO ENSURE THAT NOISE LEVELS RESULTING FROM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WILL NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF HABITAT OCCUPIED BY THE LEAST BELL'S VIREO. CONCURRENT WITH THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF NECESSARY NOISE ATTENUATION FACILITIES, NOISE MONITORING* SHALL BE CONDUCTED AT THE EDGE OF THE OCCUPIED HABITAT AREA TO ENSURE THAT NOISE LEVELS DO NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE. IF THE NOISE ATTENUATION TECHNIQUES IMPLEMENTED ARE DETERMINED

TO BE INADEQUATE BY THE QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN OR BIOLOGIST, THEN THE ASSOCIATED CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL CEASE UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT ADEQUATE NOISE ATTENUATION IS ACHIEVED OR UNTIL THE END OF THE BREEDING SEASON (SEPTEMBER 16).

* Construction noise monitoring shall continue to be monitored at least twice weekly on varying days, or more frequently depending on the construction activity, to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. If not, other measures shall be implemented in consultation with the biologist and the City Manager, as necessary, to reduce noise levels to below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, limitations on the placement of construction equipment and the simultaneous use of equipment.

- B. IF LEAST BELL'S VIREO ARE NOT DETECTED DURING THE PROTOCOL SURVEY, THE QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST SHALL SUBMIT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO THE CITY MANAGER AND APPLICABLE RESOURCE AGENCIES WHICH DEMONSTRATES WHETHER OR NOT MITIGATION MEASURES SUCH AS NOISE WALLS ARE NECESSARY BETWEEN MARCH 15 AND SEPTEMBER 15 AS FOLLOWS:
- I. IF THIS EVIDENCE INDICATES THE POTENTIAL IS HIGH FOR LEAST BELL'S VIREO TO BE PRESENT BASED ON HISTORICAL RECORDS OR SITE CONDITIONS, THEN CONDITION A.III SHALL BE ADHERED TO AS SPECIFIED ABOVE.
 - II. IF THIS EVIDENCE CONCLUDES THAT NO IMPACTS TO THIS SPECIES ARE ANTICIPATED, NO MITIGATION MEASURES WOULD BE NECESSARY.

SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER (Federally Endangered)

1. Prior to the first reconstruction meeting, the City Manager (or appointed designee) shall verify that the following project requirements regarding the southwestern willow flycatcher are shown on the construction plans:

NO CLEARING, GRUBBING, GRADING, OR OTHER CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL OCCUR BETWEEN MAY 1 AND SEPTEMBER 1, THE BREEDING SEASON OF THE SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER, UNTIL

THE FOLLOWING REQUIREMENTS HAVE BEEN MET TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CITY MANAGER:

- A. A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST (POSSESSING A VALID ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT SECTION 10(a)(1)(A) RECOVERY PERMIT) SHALL SURVEY THOSE WETLAND AREAS THAT WOULD BE SUBJECT TO CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS EXCEEDING 60 DECIBELS [dB(A)] HOURLY AVERAGE FOR THE PRESENCE OF THE SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER. SURVEYS FOR THIS SPECIES SHALL BE CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE PROTOCOL SURVEY GUIDELINES ESTABLISHED BY THE U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE WITHIN THE BREEDING SEASON PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF ANY CONSTRUCTION. IF THE SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER IS PRESENT, THEN THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS MUST BE MET:

BETWEEN MAY 1 AND SEPTEMBER 1, NO CLEARING, GRUBBING, OR GRADING OF OCCUPIED SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER HABITAT SHALL BE PERMITTED. AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE STAKED OR FENCED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; AND

BETWEEN MAY 1 AND SEPTEMBER 1, NO CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL OCCUR WITHIN ANY PORTION OF THE SITE WHERE CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD RESULT IN NOISE LEVELS EXCEEDING 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF OCCUPIED SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER HABITAT. AN ANALYSIS SHOWING THAT NOISE GENERATED BY CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WOULD NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF OCCUPIED HABITAT MUST BE COMPLETED BY A QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN (POSSESSING CURRENT NOISE ENGINEER LICENSE OR REGISTRATION WITH MONITORING NOISE LEVEL EXPERIENCE WITH LISTED ANIMAL SPECIES) AND APPROVED BY THE CITY MANAGER AT LEAST TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES. PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES DURING THE BREEDING SEASON, AREAS RESTRICTED FROM SUCH ACTIVITIES SHALL BE STAKED OR FENCED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF A QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST; OR AT LEAST TWO WEEKS PRIOR TO THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES, UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN,

NOISE ATTENUATION MEASURES (e.g., BERMS, WALLS) SHALL BE IMPLEMENTED TO ENSURE THAT NOISE LEVELS RESULTING FROM CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WILL NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE AT THE EDGE OF HABITAT OCCUPIED BY THE SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER. CONCURRENT WITH THE COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF NECESSARY NOISE ATTENUATION FACILITIES, NOISE MONITORING* SHALL BE CONDUCTED AT THE EDGE OF THE OCCUPIED HABITAT AREA TO ENSURE THAT NOISE LEVELS DO NOT EXCEED 60 dB(A) HOURLY AVERAGE. IF THE NOISE ATTENUATION TECHNIQUES IMPLEMENTED ARE DETERMINED TO BE INADEQUATE BY THE QUALIFIED ACOUSTICIAN OR BIOLOGIST, THEN THE ASSOCIATED CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES SHALL CEASE UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT ADEQUATE NOISE ATTENUATION IS ACHIEVED OR UNTIL THE END OF THE BREEDING SEASON (SEPTEMBER 1).

* Construction noise monitoring shall continue to be monitored at least twice weekly on varying days, or more frequently depending on the construction activity, to verify that noise levels at the edge of occupied habitat are maintained below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. If not, other measures shall be implemented in consultation with the biologist and the City Manager, as necessary, to reduce noise levels to below 60 dB(A) hourly average or to the ambient noise level if it already exceeds 60 dB(A) hourly average. Such measures may include, but are not limited to, limitations on the placement of construction equipment and the simultaneous use of equipment.

- B. IF SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER ARE NOT DETECTED DURING THE PROTOCOL SURVEY, THE QUALIFIED BIOLOGIST SHALL SUBMIT SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE TO THE CITY MANAGER AND APPLICABLE RESOURCE AGENCIES WHICH DEMONSTRATES WHETHER OR NOT MITIGATION MEASURES SUCH AS NOISE WALLS ARE NECESSARY BETWEEN MAY 1 AND SEPTEMBER 1 AS FOLLOWS:
 - I. IF THIS EVIDENCE INDICATES THE POTENTIAL IS HIGH FOR SOUTHWESTERN WILLOW FLYCATCHER TO BE PRESENT BASED ON HISTORICAL RECORDS OR SITE CONDITIONS, THEN CONDITION A.III SHALL BE ADHERED TO AS SPECIFIED ABOVE.
 - II. IF THIS EVIDENCE CONCLUDES THAT NO IMPACTS TO THIS SPECIES ARE ANTICIPATED, NO MITIGATION MEASURES WOULD BE NECESSARY.

II. Prior to Start of Construction

A. Preconstruction Meeting

The Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative shall incorporate all MHPA construction related requirements, into the project's Biological Monitoring Exhibit (BME).

The Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative is responsible to arrange and perform a focused pre-con with all contractors, subcontractors, and all workers involved in grading or other construction activities that discusses the sensitive nature of the adjacent sensitive biological resources.

III. During Construction

- A. The Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative, shall verify that all construction related activities taking place ~~within or~~ adjacent to the MHPA are consistent with the CDs, the MSCP/MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. The Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative shall monitor and ensure that:
1. **Land Development /Grading Boundaries** - The MHPA boundary and the limits of grading shall be clearly delineated by a survey crew prior to brushing, clearing, or grading. Limits shall be defined with orange construction fence and a siltation fence (can be combined) under the supervision of the Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative who shall provide a letter of verification to RE/MMC that all limits were marked as required. ~~Within or a~~ Adjacent to the MHPA, all manufactured slopes associated with site development shall be included within the development footprint.
 2. **Drainage/Toxics** - No Direct drainage into the MHPA shall occur during or after construction and that filtration devices, swales and/or detention/desiltation basins that drain into the MHPA are functioning properly during construction, and that permanent maintenance after construction is addressed. These systems should be maintained approximately once a year, or as often a needed, to ensure proper functioning. Maintenance should include dredging out sediments if needed, removing exotic plant materials, and adding chemical-neutralizing compounds (e.g. clay compounds) when necessary and appropriate.
 3. **Staging/storage, equipment maintenance, and trash** - Identify all areas for staging, storage of equipment and materials, trash, equipment maintenance, and other construction related activities on the monitoring exhibits and verify that they are within the development footprint. Comply with the applicable notes on the plans
 - 4 **Barriers** - New development adjacent to the MHPA provides city approved barriers along the MHPA boundaries
 5. **Lighting** - Periodic night inspections are performed to verify that all lighting adjacent to the MHPA is directed away from preserve areas and appropriate placement and shielding is used.
 6. **Invasives** - No invasive plant species are used ~~in or~~ adjacent (within 100 feet) to the MHPA ~~and that within the MHPA, all plant species must be native.~~
 7. **Brush Management** - BMZ1 is within the development footprint and outside of the MHPA, and that maintenance responsibility for the BMZ 2 located within the MHPA is identified as the responsibility of an HOA or other private entity.
 8. **Noise** – For any area of the site that is adjacent to ~~or within~~ the MHPA, construction noise that exceeds the maximum levels allowed, shall be avoided, during the breeding seasons, for protected avian species such as: *California Gnatcatcher* (3/1-8/15); *Least Bell's vireo* (3/15-9/15); and *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher* (5/1-8/30). If construction is proposed during the breeding season for the species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service protocol surveys will be required in order to determine species presence/absence. When applicable, adequate noise reduction measures shall

be incorporated.

IV. Post Construction

A. Preparation and Submittal of Monitoring Report

The Qualified Biologist/Owners Representative shall submit a final biological monitoring report to the RE/MMC within 30 days of the completion of construction that requires monitoring. The report shall incorporate the results of the MMRP/MSCP requirements per the construction documents and the BME to the satisfaction of RE/MMC.

B. HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY)

Prior to Permit Issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award

A. Entitlements Plan Check

1. Prior to permit issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring have been noted on the applicable construction documents through the plan check process.

B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD

1. Prior to Bid Award, the applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (HRG). If applicable, individuals involved in the archaeological monitoring program must have completed the 40-hour HAZWOPER training with certification documentation.
2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring of the project meet the qualifications established in the HRG.
3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant must obtain written approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

II. Prior to Start of Construction

A. Verification of Records Search

1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site specific records search (1/4 mile radius) has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from South Coastal Information Center, or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.
2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.
3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the 1/4 mile radius.

B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings

1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM)

and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.

- a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.
2. Acknowledgement of Responsibility for Curation (CIP or Other Public Projects)
The applicant shall submit a letter to MMC acknowledging their responsibility for the cost of curation associated with all phases of the archaeological monitoring program.
 3. Identify Areas to be Monitored
 - b. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Monitoring Exhibit (AME) (with verification that the AME has been reviewed and approved by the Native American consultant/monitor when Native American resources may be impacted) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits.
 - c. The AME shall be based on the results of a site specific records search as well as information regarding the age of existing pipelines, laterals and associated appurtenances and/or any known soil conditions (native or formation).
 - d. MMC shall notify the PI that the AME has been approved.
 4. When Monitoring Will Occur
 - a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
 - b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate conditions such as age of existing pipe to be replaced, depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
 5. Approval of AME and Construction Schedule
After approval of the AME by MMC, the PI shall submit to MMC written authorization of the AME and Construction Schedule from the CM.

III. During Construction

- A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching
 1. The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. **The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.**
 2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are

encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.

3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered that may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
 4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (**Notification of Monitoring Completion**), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.
- B. Discovery Notification Process
1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
 2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
 3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
 4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.
- C. Determination of Significance
1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.
 - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.
 - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) and obtain written approval of the program from MMC, CM and RE. ADRP and any mitigation must be approved by MMC, RE and/or CM before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. **Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.**
 - (1). Note: For pipeline trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, the PI shall implement the Discovery Process for Pipeline Trenching projects identified below under "D."
 - c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.

- (1). Note: For Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if the deposit is limited in size, both in length and depth; the information value is limited and is not associated with any other resource; and there are no unique features/artifacts associated with the deposit, the discovery should be considered not significant.
 - (2). Note, for Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if significance cannot be determined, the Final Monitoring Report and Site Record (DPR Form 523A/B) shall identify the discovery as Potentially Significant.
- D. Discovery Process for Significant Resources - Pipeline Trenching and other Linear Projects in the Public Right-of-Way
- The following procedure constitutes adequate mitigation of a significant discovery encountered during pipeline trenching activities or for other linear project types within the Public Right-of-Way including but not limited to excavation for jacking pits, receiving pits, laterals, and manholes to reduce impacts to below a level of significance:
1. Procedures for documentation, curation and reporting
 - a. One hundred percent of the artifacts within the trench alignment and width shall be documented in-situ, to include photographic records, plan view of the trench and profiles of side walls, recovered, photographed after cleaning and analyzed and curated. The remainder of the deposit within the limits of excavation (trench walls) shall be left intact.
 - b. The PI shall prepare a Draft Monitoring Report and submit to MMC via the RE as indicated in Section VI-A.
 - c. The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) the resource(s) encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines. The DPR forms shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center for either a Primary Record or SDI Number and included in the Final Monitoring Report.
 - d. The Final Monitoring Report shall include a recommendation for monitoring of any future work in the vicinity of the resource.

IV. Discovery of Human Remains

If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and no soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the provenance of the human remains; and the following procedures as set forth in CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken:

A. Notification

1. Archaeological Monitor shall notify the RE or BI as appropriate, MMC, and the PI, if the Monitor is not qualified as a PI. MMC will notify the appropriate Senior Planner in the Environmental Analysis Section (EAS) of the Development Services Department to assist with the discovery notification process.
2. The PI shall notify the Medical Examiner after consultation with the RE, either in person or via telephone.

B. Isolate discovery site

1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can

be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenience of the remains.

2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenience.
 3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.
- C. If Human Remains **ARE** determined to be Native American
1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, **ONLY** the Medical Examiner can make this call.
 2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.
 3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.
 4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
 5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:
 - a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission, OR;
 - b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, THEN
 - c. To protect these sites, the landowner shall do one or more of the following:
 - (1) Record the site with the NAHC;
 - (2) Record an open space or conservation easement; or
 - (3) Record a document with the County.
 - d. Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendants is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and items associated and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.
- D. If Human Remains are **NOT** Native American
1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.
 2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98).
 3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.

V. Night and/or Weekend Work

- A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract
 1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
 2. The following procedures shall be followed.
 - a. No Discoveries
In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.
 - b. Discoveries
All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV – Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.
 - c. Potentially Significant Discoveries
If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV-Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.
 - d. The PI shall immediately contact the RE and MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.
- B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
 1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
 2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

VI. Post Construction

- A. Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Historical Resources Guidelines (Appendix C/D) which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC via the RE for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring. **It should be noted that if the PI is unable to submit the Draft Monitoring Report within the allotted 90-day timeframe as a result of delays with analysis, special study results or other complex issues, a schedule shall be submitted to MMC establishing agreed due dates and the provision for submittal of monthly status reports until this measure can be met.**
 - a. For significant archaeological resources encountered during monitoring, the Archaeological Data Recovery Program or Pipeline Trenching Discovery Process shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
 - b. Recording Sites with State of California Department of Parks and Recreation
The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) any significant or potentially significant resources encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the South Coastal Information Center with the Final Monitoring Report.

2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI via the RE for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
 3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC via the RE for approval.
 4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
 5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Artifacts
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
 2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.
- C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
 2. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection C.
 3. The PI shall submit the Accession Agreement and catalogue record(s) to the RE or BI, as appropriate for donor signature with a copy submitted to MMC.
 4. The RE or BI, as appropriate shall obtain signature on the Accession Agreement and shall return to PI with copy submitted to MMC.
 5. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
- D. Final Monitoring Report(s)
1. The PI shall submit one copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report to the RE or BI as appropriate, and one copy to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC of the approved report.
 2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

C. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

I. **Prior to Permit Issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award**

- A. Entitlements Plan Check
 1. Prior to permit issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.
- B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD
 1. Prior to Bid Award, the applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the

project and the names of all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Paleontology Guidelines.

2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project.
3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

II. Prior to Start of Construction

A. Verification of Records Search

1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site specific records search has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from San Diego Natural History Museum, other institution or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.
2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.

B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings

1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring, the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified paleontologist shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Paleontological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.
 - a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.
2. Acknowledgement of Responsibility for Curation (CIP or Other Public Projects)
The applicant shall submit a letter to MMC acknowledging their responsibility for the cost of curation associated with all phases of the paleontological monitoring program.
3. Identify Areas to be Monitored
 - a. Prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Monitoring Exhibit (PME) based on the appropriate construction documents (reduced to 11x17) to MMC for approval identifying the areas to be monitored including the delineation of grading/excavation limits. Monitoring shall begin at depths below 10 feet from existing grade or as determined by the PI in consultation with MMC. The determination shall be based on site specific records search data which supports monitoring at depths less than ten feet.
 - b. The PME shall be based on the results of a site specific records search as well as information regarding existing known soil conditions (native or formation).
 - c. MMC shall notify the PI that the PME has been approved.
- d. 4. When Monitoring Will Occur
 - a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
 - b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction

documents which indicate conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, presence or absence of fossil resources, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

5. Approval of PME and Construction Schedule
After approval of the PME by MMC, the PI shall submit to MMC written authorization of the PME and Construction Schedule from the CM.

III. During Construction

A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching

1. The monitor shall be present full-time during grading/excavation/trenching activities including, but not limited to mainline, laterals, jacking and receiving pits, services and all other appurtenances associated with underground utilities as identified on the PME that could result in impacts to formations with high and/or moderate resource sensitivity. **The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the PME.**
2. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as trenching activities that do not encounter formational soils as previously assumed, and/or when unique/unusual fossils are encountered, which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.
3. The monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSV). The CSV's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (**Notification of Monitoring Completion**), and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

B. Discovery Notification Process

1. In the event of a discovery, the Paleontological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching activities in the area of discovery and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.

C. Determination of Significance

1. The PI shall evaluate the significance of the resource.
 - a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required. The determination of significance for fossil discoveries shall be at the discretion of the PI.
 - b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit a Paleontological Recovery Program (PRP) and obtain written approval of the program from MMC, MC and/or RE. PRP and any mitigation must be approved by MMC, RE and/or CM before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume.

- (1). Note: For pipeline trenching projects only, the PI shall implement the Discovery Process for Pipeline Trenching projects identified below under "D."
 - c. If resource is not significant (e.g., small pieces of broken common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils) the PI shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a non-significant discovery has been made. The Paleontologist shall continue to monitor the area without notification to MMC unless a significant resource is encountered.
 - d. The PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that fossil resources will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.
 - (1). Note: For Pipeline Trenching Projects Only. If the fossil discovery is limited in size, both in length and depth; the information value is limited and there are no unique fossil features associated with the discovery area, then the discovery should be considered not significant.
 - (2). Note, for Pipeline Trenching Projects Only: If significance can not be determined, the Final Monitoring Report and Site Record shall identify the discovery as Potentially Significant.
- D. Discovery Process for Significant Resources - Pipeline Trenching Projects
- The following procedure constitutes adequate mitigation of a significant discovery encountered during pipeline trenching activities including but not limited to excavation for jacking pits, receiving pits, laterals, and manholes to reduce impacts to below a level of significance.
1. Procedures for documentation, curation and reporting
 - a. One hundred percent of the fossil resources within the trench alignment and width shall be documented in-situ photographically, drawn in plan view (trench and profiles of side walls), recovered from the trench and photographed after cleaning, then analyzed and curated consistent with Society of Invertebrate Paleontology Standards. The remainder of the deposit within the limits of excavation (trench walls) shall be left intact and so documented.
 - b. The PI shall prepare a Draft Monitoring Report and submit to MMC via the RE as indicated in Section VI-A.
 - c. The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms for the San Diego Natural History Museum) the resource(s) encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines. The forms shall be submitted to the San Diego Natural History Museum and included in the Final Monitoring Report.
 - d. The Final Monitoring Report shall include a recommendation for monitoring of any future work in the vicinity of the resource.

IV. Night and/or Weekend Work

- A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract
 1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
 2. The following procedures shall be followed.
 - a. No Discoveries

In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, The PI shall record the information on the CSVr and submit to MMC via the RE via fax by 8AM on the next business day.

- b. Discoveries
All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction.
 - c. Potentially Significant Discoveries
If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction shall be followed.
 - d. The PI shall immediately contact the RE and MMC, or by 8AM on the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.
- B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
- 1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
 - 2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.
- C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

V. **Post Construction**

- A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
- 1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Paleontological Guidelines which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC via the RE for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring.
 - a. For significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, the Paleontological Recovery Program or Pipeline Trenching Discovery Process shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
 - b. Recording Sites with the San Diego Natural History Museum
The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms) any significant or potentially significant fossil resources encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the San Diego Natural History Museum with the Final Monitoring Report.
 - 2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI via the RE for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
 - 3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC via the RE for approval.
 - 4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
 - 5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.
- B. Handling of Fossil Remains
- 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.
- C. Curation of artifacts: Deed of Gift and Acceptance Verification
- 1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains associated with the monitoring for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution.
 - 2. The PI shall submit the Deed of Gift and catalogue record(s) to the RE or BI, as appropriate for donor signature with a copy submitted to MMC.
 - 3. The RE or BI, as appropriate shall obtain signature on the Deed of Gift and shall return to PI with copy submitted to MMC.

4. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.
- D. Final Monitoring Report(s)
1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Final Monitoring Report to MMC (even if negative), within 90 days after notification from MMC of the approved report.
 2. The RE shall, in no case, issue the Notice of Completion until receiving a copy of the approved Final Monitoring Report from MMC which includes the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution.

D. HISTORICAL RESOURCES (BUILT ENVIRONMENT)

When a future project requires implementation of this mitigation measure, the following paragraph shall be included in the subsequent environmental document and applicable Historic District name, boundary and district guidelines, if applicable shall be inserted as noted below in [brackets]:

The project is located within the [[insert District name]] Historic District, bounded by [[enter District boundary]] All work within the District boundary must be consistent with the City's Historical Resources Regulations, the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards and the [[enter district guidelines if applicable]] District Design Guidelines. The following mitigation measures are required within the District boundary and shall ensure consistency with these regulations, Standards and guidelines.

- A. Prior to beginning any work at the site, a Pre Construction meeting that includes Historic Resources and MMC staff shall be held at the project site to review these mitigation measures and requirements within the District boundary.
- B. A Historic Sidewalk Stamp Inventory prepared by a qualified historic consultant or archaeologist and approved by HRB staff is required prior to the Pre-Construction (Pre-Con) meeting. The Inventory shall include photo documentation of all existing stamps within the project area keyed to a project site plan.
- C. Existing sidewalk stamps shall be preserved in place. Where existing sidewalk stamps must be impacted to accommodate right-of-way improvements, the following actions are required:
 1. A mold of the sidewalk stamp will be made to allow reconstruction of the stamp if destroyed during relocation.
 2. The sidewalk stamp shall be saw-cut to preserve the stamp in its entirety; relocated as near as possible to the original location; and set in the same orientation.
 3. If the sidewalk stamp is destroyed during relocation, a new sidewalk stamp shall be made from the mold taken and relocated as near as possible to the original location and set in the same orientation.
- D. No new sidewalk stamps shall be added by any contactor working on the project.
- E. Existing historic sidewalk, parkway and street widths shall be maintained. Any work that requires alteration of these widths shall be approved by Historic Resources staff.
- F. Existing historic curb heights and appearance shall be maintained. Any work that requires alteration of the existing height or appearance shall be approved by Historic Resources staff.

- G. Sections of sidewalk which may be impacted by the project shall be replaced in-kind to match the historic color, texture and scoring pattern of the original sidewalks. If the original color, scoring pattern or texture is not present at the location of the impact, the historically appropriate color, texture and scoring pattern found throughout the district shall be used.
- H. Truncated domes used at corner curb ramps shall be dark gray in color.
- I. Existing historic lighting, such as acorn lighting shall remain. New lighting shall be consistent with existing lighting fixtures, or fixtures specified in any applicable District Design Guidelines.
- J. Existing mature street trees shall remain. New street trees shall be consistent with the prevalent mature species in the District and/or species specified in any applicable District Design Guidelines.
- K. Any walls located within the right-of-way or on private property are considered historic and may not be impacted without prior review and approval by Historic Resources staff.

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

United States Government

- Fish and Wildlife Service (23)
- MCAS Miramar (13)
- Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest (8)

State of California

- Department of Fish and Game (32A)
- State Clearing House (46)
- Resources Agency (43)
- Native American Heritage Commission (56)
- State Historic Preservation Officer (41)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (44)
- Water Resources (45)
- Water Resources Control Board (55)
- Coastal Commission (48)
- Caltrans District 11 (31)

County of San Diego

- Department of Environmental Health (75)
- Planning and Land Use (68)
- Water Authority (73)

City of San Diego

- Office of the Mayor (91)
- Council President Young, District 4 (MS 10A)
- Councilmember Lightner, District 1 (MS 10A)
- Councilmember Faulconer, District 2 (MS 10A)
- Councilmember Gloria, District 3 (MS 10A)
- Councilmember DeMaio, District 5 (MS 10A)

Councilmember Zapf, District 6 (MS 10A)
Councilmember Emerald, District 7 (MS 10A)
Councilmember Alvarez, District 8 (MS 10A)
Historical Resource Board (87)
City Attorney (MS 56A)
 Shannon Thomas (MS 93C)
Engineering and Capital Projects
 Marc Cass (MS 908A)
 Allison Sherwood (MS 908A)
 Matthew DeBeliso (MS 908A)
 Akram Bassyouni (MS 908A)
 Michael Ninh (MS 908A)
 Roman Anissi (MS 908A)
 Daniel Tittle (MS 908A)
Development Services Department
 Myra Herrmann (MS 501)
 Kristen Forburger (MS 401)
 Jeanne Krosch (MS 401)
 Kelley Stanco (MS 501)
Library Dept.-Gov. Documents MS 17 (81)
 Balboa Branch Library (81B)
 Beckwourth Branch Library (81C)
 Benjamin Branch Library (81D)
 Carmel Mountain Ranch Branch (81E)
 Carmel Valley Branch Library (81F)
 City Heights/Weingart Branch Library (81G)
 Clairemont Branch Library (81H)
 College-Rolando Branch Library (81I)
 Kensington-Normal Heights Branch Library (81K)
 La Jolla/Riford branch Library (81L)
 Linda Vista Branch Library (81M)
 Logan Heights Branch Library (81N)
 Malcolm X Library & Performing Arts Center (81O)
 Mira Mesa Branch Library (81P)
 Mission Hills Branch Library (81Q)
 Mission Valley Branch Library (81R)
 North Clairemont Branch Library (81S)
 North Park Branch Library (81T)
 Oak Park Branch Library (81U)
 Ocean Beach Branch Library (81V)
 Otay Mesa-Nestor Branch Library (81W)
 Pacific Beach/Taylor Branch Library (81X)
 Paradise Hills Branch Library (81Y)
 Point Loma/Hervey Branch Library (81Z)
 Rancho Bernardo Branch Library (81AA)
 Rancho Peñasquitos Branch Library (81BB)
 San Carlos Branch Library (81DD)
 San Ysidro Branch Library (81EE)
 Scripps Miramar Ranch Branch Library (81FF)

Serra Mesa Branch Library (81GG)
Skyline Hills Branch Library (81HH)
Tierrasanta Branch Library (81II)
University Community Branch Library (81JJ)
University Heights Branch Library (81KK)
Malcolm A. Love Library (457)

Other Interested Individuals or Groups

Community Planning Groups

Community Planners Committee (194)
Balboa Park Committee (226 + 226A)
Black Mountain Ranch –Subarea I (226C)
Otay Mesa - Nestor Planning Committee (228)
Otay Mesa Planning Committee (235)
Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee (248)
Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee (259)
Serra Mesa Planning Group (263A)
Kearny Mesa Community Planning Group (265)
Linda Vista Community Planning Committee (267)
La Jolla Community Planning Association (275)
City Heights Area Planning Committee (287)
Kensington-Talmadge Planning Committee (290)
Normal Heights Community Planning Committee (291)
Eastern Area Planning Committee (302)
North Bay Community Planning Group (307)
Mira Mesa Community Planning Group (310)
Mission Beach Precise Planning Board (325)
Mission Valley Unified Planning Organization (331)
Navajo Community Planners Inc. (336)
Carmel Valley Community Planning Board (350)
Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board (361)
Greater North Park Planning Committee (363)
Ocean Beach Planning Board (367)
Old Town Community Planning Committee (368)
Pacific Beach Community Planning Committee (375)
Pacific Highlands Ranch – Subarea III (377A)
Rancho Peñasquitos Planning Board (380)
Peninsula Community Planning Board (390)
Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board (400)
Sabre Springs Community Planning Group (406B)
Sabre Springs Community Planning Group (407)
San Pasqual - Lake Hodges Planning Group (426)
San Ysidro Planning and Development Group (433)
Scripps Ranch Community Planning Group (437)
Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee (439)
Skyline - Paradise Hills Planning Committee (443)
Torrey Hills Community Planning Board (444A)
Southeastern San Diego Planning Committee (449)
Encanto Neighborhoods Community Planning Group (449A)

College Area Community Council (456)
Tierrasanta Community Council (462)
Torrey Highlands – Subarea IV (467)
Torrey Pines Community Planning Group (469)
University City Community Planning Group (480)
Uptown Planners (498)

Town/Community Councils - PUBLIC NOTICE ONLY

Town Council Presidents Association (197)
Harborview Community Council (246)
Carmel Mountain Ranch Community Council (344)
Clairemont Town Council (257)
Serra Mesa Community Council (264)
Rolando Community Council (288)
Oak Park Community Council (298)
Webster Community Council (301)
Darnell Community Council (306)
La Jolla Town Council (273)
Mission Beach Town Council (326)
Mission Valley Community Council (328 C)
San Carlos Area Council (338)
Ocean Beach Town Council, Inc. (367 A)
Pacific Beach Town Council (374)
Rancho Penasquitos Community Council (378)
Rancho Bernardo Community Council, Inc. (398)
Rancho Penasquitos Town Council (383)
United Border Community Town Council (434)
San Dieguito Planning Group (412)
Murphy Canyon Community Council (463)

Other Interested Individuals or Groups


San Diego Unified Port District (109)
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (110)
San Diego transit Corporation (112)
San Diego Gas & Electric (114)
Metropolitan Transit Systems (115)
San Diego Unified School District (125/132)
San Ysidro Unified School District (127)
San Diego Community College District (133)
The Beach and Bay Beacon News (137)
Sierra Club (165)
San Diego Canyonlands (165A)
San Diego Natural History Museum (166)
San Diego Audubon Society (167)
Jim Peugh (167A)
California Native Plant Society (170)
San Diego Coastkeeper (173)
Endangered Habitat League (182 and 182A)
South Coastal Information Center @ San Diego State University (210)

San Diego Historical Society (211)
Carmen Lucas (206)
Clint Linton (215b)
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
Save Our Heritage Organization (214)
Ron Christman (215)
Louie Guassac (215A)
San Diego County Archaeological Society (218)
Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)
Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)
Native American Distribution (NOTICE ONLY 225A-T)
San Diego Historical Society (211)
Theresa Acerro (230)
Unified Port of San Diego (240)
Centre City Development Corporation (242)
Centre City Advisory Committee (243)
Balboa Avenue CAC (246)
Theresa Quiros (294)
Fairmount Park Neighborhood Association (303)
John Stump (304)
San Diego Baykeeper (319)
Debbie Knight (320)
Mission Hills Heritage (497)

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

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

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


Myra Herrmann, Senior Planner
Development Services Department

September 14, 2011
Date of Draft Report

October 24, 2011
Date of Final Report

Analysts: J. Szymanski/M. Herrmann

Attachments:

Figure 1 - Harbor Drive Pipeline Location Map

Figure 2 - Water Group 949 Site 1 Location Map

Figure 3- Water Group 949 Site 2 Location Map

Figure 4- Water Group 949 Site 3 Location Map

Figure 5- Sewer Group 787 Location Map

Figure 6- Water Group 914 Location Map

Figure 7- Sewer and Water Group 732 Location Map

Figure 8- Water Group 949-Site 2 with the MHPA

Initial Study Checklist



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
 Governor's Office of Planning and Research
 State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Ken Alex
 Director

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

CALIFORNIA STATE CLEARING HOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT (10/14/2011)

October 14, 2011

Jeffrey Szymanski
 City of San Diego
 1222 First Avenue, MS-501
 San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Citywide Pipeline Projects 2011
 SCH#: 2011091045

Dear Jeffrey Szymanski:


The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Mitigated Negative Declaration to selected state agencies for review. On the enclosed Document Details Report please note that the Clearinghouse has listed the state agencies that reviewed your document. The review period closed on October 13, 2011, and the comments from the responding agency-(ies) is (are) enclosed. If this comment package is not in order, please notify the State Clearinghouse immediately. Please refer to the project's ten-digit State Clearinghouse number in future correspondence so that we may respond promptly.

Please note that Section 21104(c) of the California Public Resources Code states that:

"A responsible or other public agency shall only make substantive comments regarding those activities involved in a project which are within an area of expertise of the agency or which are required to be carried out or approved by the agency. Those comments shall be supported by specific documentation."

These comments are forwarded for use in preparing your final environmental document. Should you need more information or clarification of the enclosed comments, we recommend that you contact the commenting agency directly.

This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process.

Sincerely,


Scott Morgan
 Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
 cc: Resources Agency

1. Comment acknowledged no response is necessary.

SCH# 2011091045
Project Title Citywide Pipeline Projects 2011
Lead Agency San Diego, City of

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

CALIFORNIA STATE CLEARING HOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT (10/14/2011)

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Type MND Mitigated Negative Declaration

Description Council Approval to allow the replacement, rehabilitation, relocation, point repair, new trenching, trenchless construction, and abandonment of water and/or sewer alignments and associated improvements such as curb ramps, sewer lateral connections, water service connections, manholes, new pavement/slurry, the removal and/or replacement of street trees and the removal and/or replacement of street lights. The construction footprint, including staging areas and other areas (such as access) should be located within the City of San Diego Public Right-of-Way and/or within public easements. The proposal may include planned pipeline construction within private easements from the PROW to the service connection. A signed agreement between the City and the property owner would be required for work conducted on private property. Project types that would be included in the analysis contained herein would consist of sewer and water group jobs, trunk sewers, large diameter water pipeline projects, manholes and other necessary appurtenances. All associated equipment would be staged in existing right-of-ways adjacent to the proposed work areas." The proposed project would not impact Sensitive Biological Resources or Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) as defined by the Land Development Code and would not encroach into the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Applicant: The City of San Diego Engineering and Capital Projects Department AND Public Utilities Department.

Lead Agency Contact

Name Jeffrey Szymanski
Agency City of San Diego
Phone 619 446 5324
email
Address 1222 First Avenue, MS-501
City San Diego **State** CA **Zip** 92101

Project Location

County San Diego
City San Diego
Region
Lat / Long
Cross Streets Citywide
Parcel No.
Township **Range** **Section** **Base**

Proximity to:

Highways
Airports
Railways
Waterways
Schools
Land Use Citywide

Project Issues Archaeologic-Historic; Landuse; Other Issues

Reviewing Agencies Resources Agency; California Coastal Commission; Department of Fish and Game, Region 5; Office of Historic Preservation; Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Caltrans, Division of Aeronautics; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 11; CA Department of Public Health; State Water Resources Control Board, Division of Financial Assistance; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 9; Native American Heritage Commission; Public Utilities Commission

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

Date Received 09/14/2011 Start of Review 09/14/2011 End of Review 10/13/2011

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

CALIFORNIA STATE CLEARING HOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT (10/14/2011)

This page has been intentionally left blank.

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 11
PLANNING DIVISION
4050 TAYLOR STREET, MS 240
SAN DIEGO, CA 92110
PHONE (619) 688-6960
FAX (619) 688-4299
TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



Flex your power!
Be energy efficient!

RECEIVED
SEP 29 2011
STATE CLEARING HOUSE

Clear
10/27/11
Q

September 28, 2011

Mr. Jeffrey Szymanski
City of San Diego Development Services Center
1222 First Avenue MS 501
San Diego, CA 92101

11-SD-Var
PM Varjous
Citywide Pipeline Projects 2011
SCH# 2011091045

Dear Mr. Szymanski:

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the North-South District Interconnection System Project (Project). The project is identified in the MND to cross State Route 52 (SR-52) and State Route 94 (SR-94). Caltrans would like to submit the following comments:

Any work performed within Caltrans Right-of-Way (R/W) will require an approved encroachment permit by Caltrans. All Caltrans standards for utility encroachments shall be met.

Additionally, any work performed within Caltrans R/W must provide an approved final environmental document including the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) determination addressing any environmental impacts within the Caltrans' R/W, and any corresponding technical studies. If these materials are not included with the encroachment permit application, the applicant will be required to acquire and provide these to Caltrans before the permit application will be accepted. Identification of avoidance and/or mitigation measures will be a condition of the encroachment permit approval as well as procurement of any necessary regulatory and resource agency permits.

Additional information regarding encroachment permits may be obtained by contacting the Caltrans Permits Office at (619) 688-6158. Early coordination with Caltrans is strongly advised for all encroachment permit.

If you have any questions on the comments Caltrans has provided, please contact Marisa Hampton of the Development Review Branch at (619) 688-6954.

Sincerely,

JACOB ARMSTRONG, Chief
Development Review Branch

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (9/28/2011)


2. The comment letter has been forwarded to the applicant department and it is acknowledged that any work conducted within the Caltrans R/W will require an approved encroachment permit by Caltrans.
3. The applicant department acknowledges that they must provide the certified CEQA document to Caltrans prior to the approval of an encroachment permit.

6

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

5 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 853-0251
Fax (916) 857-5390
Web Site www.nahc.ca.gov
na_nhc@pacbell.net

clear
10/13/2011
e



September 27, 2011

Mr. Jeffrey Szymanski, Environmental Planner
City of San Diego Development Services Department
1222 First Avenue, MS 501
San Diego, CA 92101

Re: SCH#2011091045; CEQA Notice of Completion; proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the "Citywide Pipeline Projects 2011, City Project No. 255100," located in the City of San Diego, San Diego County, California.

Dear Mr. Szymanski:

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), the State of California 'Trustee Agency' for the protection and preservation of Native American cultural resources pursuant to California Public Resources Code §21070 and affirmed by the Third Appellate Court in the case of EPIC v. Johnson (1985: 170 Cal App. 3rd 604). The NAHC wishes to comment on the proposed project.

This letter includes state and federal statutes relating to Native American historic properties of religious and cultural significance to American Indian tribes and interested Native American individuals as 'consulting parties' under both state and federal law. State law also addresses the freedom of Native American Religious Expression in Public Resources Code §5097.9.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA – CA Public Resources Code 21000-21177, amendments effective 3/18/2010) requires that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, that includes archaeological resources, is a 'significant effect' requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) per the CEQA Guidelines defines a significant impact on the environment as 'a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of physical conditions within an area affected by the proposed project, including ... objects of historic or aesthetic significance.' In order to comply with this provision, the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on these resources within the 'area of potential effect (APE), and if so, to mitigate that effect. The NAHC Sacred Lands File (SLF) search resulted as follows: **Native American cultural resources were identified** in several areas of the City of San Diego.

The NAHC 'Sacred Sites,' as defined by the Native American Heritage Commission and the California Legislature in California Public Resources Code §§5097.94(a) and 5097.96. Items in the NAHC Sacred Lands Inventory are confidential and exempt from the Public Records Act pursuant to California Government Code §6254 (r).

Early consultation with Native American tribes in your area is the best way to avoid unanticipated discoveries of cultural resources or burial sites once a project is underway. Culturally affiliated tribes and individuals may have knowledge of the religious and cultural significance of the historic properties in the project area (e.g. APE). We strongly urge that you

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION (9/29/2011)

4. Comment noted. Staff acknowledges that Native American cultural resources have been identified within several areas of the City of San Diego. Archaeological and Native American monitoring has been included as mitigation within the MND and would preclude a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources.
5. Comment noted. The draft MND was sent to all individuals on the recommended list from the NAHC, with the exception of the Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Council. This new group will be included in the distribution of the final MND and will also added to the City's list for distribution of draft environmental documents which include a discussion of archaeological and/or Native American cultural resources.

4.

5.

7
make contact with the list of Native American Contacts on the attached list of Native American contacts, to see if your proposed project might impact Native American cultural resources and to obtain their recommendations concerning the proposed project. Pursuant to CA Public Resources Code § 5097.95, the NAHC requests that the Native American consulting parties be provided pertinent project information. Consultation with Native American communities is also a matter of environmental justice as defined by California Government Code §65040.12(e). Pursuant to CA Public Resources Code §5097.95, the NAHC requests that pertinent project information be provided consulting tribal parties. The NAHC recommends *avoidance* as defined by CEQA Guidelines §15370(a) to pursuing a project that would damage or destroy Native American cultural resources and Section 2183.2 that requires documentation, data recovery of cultural resources.

21
Consultation with tribes and interested Native American consulting parties, on the NAHC list, should be conducted in compliance with the requirements of federal NEPA and Section 106 and 4(f) of federal NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470 *et seq.*), 36 CFR Part 800.3 (f) (2) & .5, the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CSQ, 42 U.S.C 4371 *et seq.* and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001-3013) as appropriate. The 1992 *Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* were revised so that they could be applied to all historic resource types included in the National Register of Historic Places and including cultural landscapes. Also, federal Executive Orders Nos. 11593 (preservation of cultural environment), 13175 (coordination & consultation) and 13007 (Sacred Sites) are helpful, supportive guides for Section 106 consultation. The aforementioned Secretary of the Interior's *Standards* include recommendations for all 'lead agencies' to consider the historic context of proposed projects and to "research" the cultural landscape that might include the 'area of potential effect.'


7
Confidentiality of "historic properties of religious and cultural significance" should also be considered as protected by California Government Code §6254(r) and may also be protected under Section 304 of the NHPA or at the Secretary of the Interior discretion if not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. The Secretary may also be advised by the federal Indian Religious Freedom Act (cf. 42 U.S.C., 1996) in issuing a decision on whether or not to disclose items of religious and/or cultural significance identified in or near the APEs and possibility threatened by proposed project activity.

8
Furthermore, Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, California Government Code §27491 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 provide for provisions for accidentally discovered archeological resources during construction and mandate the processes to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a project location other than a 'dedicated cemetery'.

9
To be effective, consultation on specific projects must be the result of an ongoing relationship between Native American tribes and lead agencies, project proponents and their contractors, in the opinion of the NAHC. Regarding tribal consultation, a relationship built around regular meetings and informal involvement with local tribes will lead to more qualitative consultation tribal input on specific projects.

If you have any questions about this response to your request, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 653-6251.

6. Please see Response to Comment 5. In addition, the MND includes mitigation requirements that would require the preparation of background research including a ¼ mile radius archaeological record search at the South Coastal Information Center prior to the commencement of construction. The record search of the surrounding area would provide the historic context and inform the consultant of the cultural landscape for the APE of the project.
7. Comment acknowledged.
8. Please see Section III and IV of the MMRP under Historical Resources (Archaeology). Mitigation measures are in place in case of discovery of human remains and archaeological resources during construction that would ensure compliance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, California Government Code §27491 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5
9. Comment noted. The City has gone to great efforts to establish and maintain productive working relationships with the Native American community.

Sincerely,


Dave Singleton
Program Analyst

Cc: State Clearinghouse

Attachment: Native American Contact List

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION (9/29/2011) continued

This page has been left intentionally left blank.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION (9/29/2011) continued

Jamul Indian Village
Kenneth Meza, Chairperson
P.O. Box 612 Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Jamul, CA 91935
amulrez@sctdv.net
(619) 669-4785
(619) 669-48178 - Fax

Inaja Band of Mission Indians
Rebecca Osuna, Spokesperson
2005 S. Escondido Blvd. Diegueno
Escondido, CA 92025
(760) 737-7628
(760) 747-8568 Fax

Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians
Mark Romero, Chairperson
P.O. Box 270 Diegueno
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
mesagrandeband@msn.com
(760) 782-3818
(760) 782-9092 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Steve Banegas, Spokesperson
1095 Barona Road Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Lakeside, CA 92040
(619) 742-5587 - cell
(619) 742-5587
(619) 443-0681 FAX

This page has been left intentionally left blank.

Kumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation
Paul Cuero
38190 Church Road, Suite 5 Diegueno/ Kumeyaay
Campo, CA 91906
(619) 478-9046
(619) 478-9505
(619) 478-5818 Fax

Ewilaapaayp Tribal Office
Will Micklin, Executive Director
4054 Willows Road Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Alpine, CA 91901
wmicklin@leaningrock.net
(619) 445-6315 - voice
(619) 445-9126 - fax

Kwaaymii Laguna Band of Mission Indians
Carmen Lucas
P.O. Box 775 Diegueno -
Pine Valley, CA 91962
(619) 709-4207

Ewilaapaayp Tribal Office
Michael Garcia, Vice Chairperson
4054 Willows Road Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Alpine, CA 91901
michaeltg@leaningrock.net
(619) 445-6315 - voice
(619) 445-9126 - fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed CH#2011091045; CEQA Notice of Completion; proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Citywide Pipelines Projects 2011; located in the City of San Diego; San Diego California.

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION (9/29/2011) continued

ona Group of the Capitan Grande
vin Romero, Chairperson
15 Barona Road Diegueno
Reside , CA 92040
@barona-nsn.gov
9) 443-6612
-443-0681

Sycuan Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Danny Tucker, Chairperson
5459 Sycuan Road Diegueno/Kumeyaay
El Cajon , CA 92021
ssilva@sycuan-nsn.gov
619 445-2613
619 445-1927 Fax

Posta Band of Mission Indians
endolyn Parada, Chairperson
Box 1120 Diegueno/Kumeyaay
ulevard , CA 91905
arada@lapostacasino.
9) 478-2113
-478-2125

Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians
Anthony R. Pico, Chairperson
PO Box 908 Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Alpine , CA 91903
jrothauff@viejas-nsn.gov
(619) 445-3810
(619) 445-5337 Fax

This page has been left intentionally left blank.

n Pasqual Band of Mission Indians
an E. Lawson, Chairperson
Box 365 Diegueno
lley Center, CA 92082
anl@sanpasqualband.com
0) 749-3200
0) 749-3876 Fax

Kumeyaay Cultural Historic Committee
Ron Christman
56 Viejas Grade Road Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Alpine , CA 92001
(619) 445-0385

ay Nation of Santa Ysabel
gil Perez, Spokesman
Box 130 Diegueno
nta Ysabel, CA 92070
andietaylor@yahoo.com
0) 765-0845
0) 765-0320 Fax

Campo Kumeyaay Nation
Monique LaChappa, Chairperson
36190 Church Road, Suite 1 Diegueno/Kumeyaay
Campo , CA 91906
miachappa@campo-nsn.gov
(619) 478-9046
(619) 478-5818 Fax

ist is current only as of the date of this document.

ution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code,
n 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

ist is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed
#2011091045; CEQA Notice of Completion; proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Citywide Pipelines Projects 2011; located
City of San Diego; San Diego California.

Jai Nation of Santa Ysabel
Jill Linton, Director of Cultural Resources
P.O. Box 507
Santa Ysabel, CA 92070
jlinton73@aol.com
(760) 803-5694
jlinton73@aol.com

Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee
Bernice Paipa, Vice Spokesperson
P.O. Box 1120
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 478-2113

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION (9/29/2011) continued

Manzanita Band of the Kumeyaay Nation
Meroy J. Elliott, Chairperson
P.O. Box 1302
Boulevard, CA 91905
(619) 766-4930
(619) 766-4957 - FAX

Kumeyaay Diegueno Land Conservancy
M. Louis Guassac
P.O. Box 1992
Alpine, CA 91903
lguassac@onebox.com
(619) 952-8430


Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Council
Frank Brown, Coordinator
240 Brown Road
Alpine, CA 91901
FIREFIGHTER69TFF@AOL.
COM
(619) 884-8437

This page has been left intentionally left blank.

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

The distribution of this list does not relieve any person of the statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed CH#2011091045; CEQA Notice of Completion; proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Citywide Pipelines Projects 2011; located in the City of San Diego; San Diego California.



State Water Resources Control Board

OCT 10 2011

Jeffrey Szymanski, Associate Planner
 City of San Diego, Development Services Department
 1222 First Avenue MS 501
 San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Szymanski,

IS/MND) FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO (CITY); CITYWIDE PIPELINE PROJECTS 2011
 (PROJECT); SAN DIEGO COUNTY; STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO.2011091045

We understand the City maybe pursuing Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) financing for this Project. As a funding agency and a State agency with jurisdiction by law to preserve, enhance, and restore the quality of California's water resources, the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) is providing the following information for the environmental document prepared for the Project.

10 Please provide us with the following documents applicable to the proposed Project: (1) 2 copies of the draft and final IS/MND, (2) the resolution adopting/certifying the IS/MND making California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) findings, (3) all comments received during the review period and the City's response to those comments, (4) the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and (5) the Notice of Determination filed with the Governor's Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse. In addition, we would appreciate notices of any hearings or meetings held regarding environmental review of any projects to be funded by the State Water Board.

The State Water Board, Division of Financial Assistance, is responsible for administering CWSRF funds. The primary purpose for the CWSRF Program is to implement the Clean Water Act and various state laws by providing financial assistance for wastewater treatment facilities necessary to prevent water pollution, recycle water, correct nonpoint source and storm drainage pollution problems, and provide for estuary enhancement, and thereby protect and promote health, safety and welfare of the inhabitants of the state. The CWSRF Program provides low-interest funding equal to one-half the most recent State General Obligation Bond Rates with a 20-year term. Applications are accepted and processed continuously. Please refer to the State Water Board's CWSRF website at www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/grants_loans/srf/index.shtml.

The CWSRF Program is partially funded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and requires additional "CEQA-Plus" environmental documentation and review. Four enclosures are included that further explain the environmental review process and some additional federal requirements in the CWSRF Program. The State Water Board is required to consult directly with agencies responsible for implementing federal environmental laws and regulations. Any environmental issues raised by federal agencies or their representatives will need to be resolved prior to State Water Board approval of a CWSRF funding commitment for the proposed Project.

10. This comment does not address the adequacy of the CEQA document; therefore no response is necessary. The comment letter has been forwarded to the applicant City Department that is preparing the "CEQA-Plus" materials required for the CWSRF Program.

It is important to note that prior to a CWSRF funding commitment, projects are subject to provisions of the Federal Endangered Species Act, and must obtain Section 7 clearance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and/or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for any potential effects to special status species. Please be advised that the State Water Board will consult with USFWS, and/or NMFS regarding all federal special status species the Project has the potential to impact if the Project is to be funded under the CWSRF Program.

The City will need to identify whether the Project will involve any direct effects from construction activities or indirect effects, such as growth inducement, that may affect federally listed threatened, endangered, or candidate species that are known, or have a potential to occur on-site, in the surrounding areas, or in the service area, and to identify applicable conservation measures to reduce such effects.

In addition, CWSRF projects must comply with federal laws pertaining to cultural resources, specifically Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The State Water Board has responsibility for ensuring compliance with Section 106 and the State Water Board's Cultural Resources Officer (CRO) must consult directly with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). SHPO consultation is initiated when sufficient information is provided by the CWSRF applicant. Please contact the CRO, Ms. Cookie Hirn, at (916) 341-5690, to find out more about the requirements, and to initiate the Section 106 process if the City decides to pursue CWSRF financing. Note that the City will need to identify the Area of Potential Effects (APE), including construction and staging areas and the depth of any excavation. The APE is three-dimensional and includes all areas that may be affected by the Project. The APE includes the surface area and extends below ground to the depth of any Project excavations. The records search request should be made for an area larger than the APE. The appropriate area varies for different projects but should be drawn large enough to provide information on what types of sites may exist in the vicinity.

Other federal requirements pertinent to the Project under the CWSRF Program include the following:


- A. Compliance with the federal Clean Air Act: (a) Provide air quality studies that may have been done for the Project; and (b) if the Project is in a nonattainment area or attainment area subject to a maintenance plan; (i) provide a summary of the estimated emissions (in tons per year) that are expected from both the construction and operation of the Project for each federal criteria pollutant in a nonattainment or maintenance area, and indicate if the nonattainment designation is moderate, serious, or severe (if applicable); (ii) if emissions are above the federal de minimis levels, but the Project is sized to meet only the needs of current population projections that are used in the approved State Implementation Plan for air quality, quantitatively indicate how the proposed capacity increase was calculated using population projections.
- B. Compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act: identify whether the Project is within a coastal zone and the status of any coordination with the California Coastal Commission.
- C. Protection of Wetlands: Identify any portion of the proposed Project area that may contain areas that should be evaluated for wetlands or U.S. waters delineation by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), or require a permit from the USACE, and identify the status of coordination with the USACE.
- D. Compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act: List any birds protected under this Act that may be impacted by the Project and identify conservation measures to minimize impacts

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD (9/10/2011)

This page has been left intentionally left blank.

The State Water Board has no comments at this time. Thank you for the opportunity to review the City's IS/MND. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (916) 341-5855 or akashkoli@waterboards.ca.gov, or Terry Singleton at (916) 341-5686 or TSingleton@waterboards.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Ahmad Kashkoli
Environmental Scientist

cc: State Clearinghouse w/o enclosures
(Re: SCH# 2011091045)
P. O. Box 3044
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

bcc: Lisa Lee, DFA
Cookie Hirn, DFA
Ahmad Kashkoli, DFA
Pete Mizera, DFA

Enclosures (4)

1. SRF & CEQA-Plus Requirements
2. Quick Reference Guide to CEQA Requirements for State Revolving Fund Loans
3. Instructions and Guidance for "Environmental Compliance Information"
4. Basic Criteria for Cultural Resources Reports

STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD (9/10/2011)

This page has been left intentionally left blank



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
Governor's Office of Planning and Research
State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Edmund G. Brown Jr.
Governor



Ken Alex
Director

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

CALIFORNIA STATE CLEARING HOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT (10/14/2011)

October 14, 2011

Jeffrey Szymanski
City of San Diego
1222 First Avenue, MS-501
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Citywide Pipeline Projects 2011
SCH#: 2011091045


Dear Jeffrey Szymanski:

11. The enclosed comment (s) on your Mitigated Negative Declaration was (were) received by the State Clearinghouse after the end of the state review period, which closed on October 13, 2011. We are forwarding these comments to you because they provide information or raise issues that should be addressed in your final environmental document.

12. The California Environmental Quality Act does not require Lead Agencies to respond to late comments. However, we encourage you to incorporate these additional comments into your final environmental document and to consider them prior to taking final action on the proposed project.

Please contact the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions concerning the environmental review process. If you have a question regarding the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number (2011091045) when contacting this office.

Sincerely,


Scott Morgan
Director, State Clearinghouse

Enclosures
cc: Resources Agency

11. The City acknowledges that the comment letter from The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) was received after the end of the state review period ended.
12. The City responses to the CDFG comment letter are included herein.




RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME (10/13/2011)

October 11, 2011

Mr. Jeffery Szymanski
City of San Diego
Development Services Center
1222 First Avenue, MS 501
San Diego, CA 92101



Subject: Comments on the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for Citywide Pipeline Projects, City of San Diego, San Diego County, California (Project No. 255100; SCH #2011091045)

Dear Mr. Szymanski:

The Department of Fish and Game (Department) has reviewed the above-referenced draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND), dated September 14, 2011. The comments provided herein are based on information provided in the draft MND, our knowledge of sensitive and declining vegetation communities in the County of San Diego, and our participation in regional conservation planning efforts.

The following statements and comments have been prepared pursuant to the Department's authority as Trustee Agency with jurisdiction over natural resources affected by the project (CEQA Guidelines §15386) and pursuant to our authority as a Responsible Agency under CEQA Guidelines Section 15381 over those aspects of the proposed project that come under the purview of the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code §2050 et seq.) and Fish and Game Code Section 1600 et seq. The Department also administers the Natural Community Conservation Planning Program (NCCP). The City of San Diego (City) participates in the NCCP program by implementing its approved Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan.

The proposed project covers five near-term pipeline projects (Harbor Drive Pipeline, Water Group 949, Sewer Group 787, Water Group 914, and Sewer/Water Group 732), as well as any subsequent future pipeline projects. The project description specifies that the construction footprint for a typical pipeline project, including staging areas and other areas (such as access) would be located within City Public Right-of-Way (PROW) and/or within public easements and may include planned pipeline construction with private easements from the PROW to the service connection. The types of projects evaluated in the analysis consists of sewer and water group jobs, trunk sewers, large diameter water pipeline projects, manholes and other necessary appurtenances. The project scope defines that all associated equipment would be staged in existing PROW adjacent to the proposed work area(s). The project analysis concludes that no impact would occur to Sensitive Biological Resources or Environmentally Sensitive Lands as defined by the Land Development Code and the project would not encroach into the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA).

This page has been left intentionally left blank.

We offer our recommendations and comments to assist the City in avoiding, minimizing, and adequately mitigating project related impacts to biological resources, and to ensure that the project is consistent with ongoing regional habitat planning efforts.

- 3.
1. The initial study references that along with the environmental analysis that covers the five near-term pipeline projects, any subsequent future pipeline projects would be reviewed for consistency with the analysis covered in the Citywide Pipeline Project MND. Further, the initial study states "Where it can be determined that the project is "consistent" with the MND and no additional potential significant impacts would occur pursuant to State CEQA Guideline §15162 (i.e., the involvement of new significant environmental effects of a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects) or if the project would result in minor technical changes or additions, then an Addendum to this MND would be prepared pursuant to §15164. Where future projects are found not to be consistent with this MND, then a new Initial Study and project specific MND shall be prepared." From a substantive and procedural context of CEQA, the Department considers the application of all forthcoming analysis covering "any subsequent future pipeline projects" as tiering upon the project MND; consequently we consider the City's environmental determination problematic. Lacking supplemental guidance from the lead agency, the Department interprets this approach as essentially "tiering" upon this MND as all similar types of "future pipeline projects" will be processed under an addendum to the adopted document. If it is the City's intent to tier upon this MND and apply it to those future pipeline projects, we would focus attention to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15152(b) and Public Resources Code, Sections 21093-21094, which defines tiering as being appropriate when the sequence of analysis is from an environmental impact report (EIR) prepared for a general plan, policy, or program to an EIR or negative declaration for another plan, policy or program of lesser scope, or to a site-specific EIR or negative declaration. Additionally, we would highlight Public Resources Code, Section 21166 which precludes any future projects with significant impact from tiering.

Based on the relevant CEQA sections cited above, the City's approach to essentially "tier" upon this MND has not been fully supported in the analysis. The presumption provided in the initial study is that at the time when the City can determine that any forthcoming project is "consistent" with the baseline analysis provided in the project MND, any subsequent CEQA analysis/processing would be limited to preparing an Addendum to this MND. In contrast, when considering CEQA Guidelines, Section 15162(a), we believe that it has been misapplied as currently explained in the processing guidance provided in this MND (i.e., §15162 is being applied to cover future projects when clearly the intent of §15162 is limited to a single project). Therefore, we request that the City reevaluate the statutory mandates under the CEQA and the circumstances for when any subsequent future pipeline projects could be processed from an adopted environmental document.

- 4.
2. The biological resources analysis determined that for those five near-term projects that are located within the public right-of-way no significant project-related impacts on biological resources would occur. Compliance with CEQA is predicated on a complete and accurate description of the "environmental setting" that may be affected by the proposed project. We feel there is limited information in adequately defining (1) over-all width of the PROW (e.g., are there areas of the PROW that extend outside existing paved roadways); (2) proximity to environmentally sensitive lands to the PROW; and (3) accurate environmental baseline conditions of all proposed staging areas (which should include a qualified biologist evaluating those existing site conditions). Absent a complete and accurate description of the existing physical conditions in and around all of the projects, we believe relying on the current environmental determination in this MND could result in an incomplete or inaccurate

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME (10/13/2011) continued

13. The discussion within CEQA Guidelines section 15152(B) discusses tiering documents in terms of EIRs; however, the section does not definitively state that tiering documents require the preparation of an EIR and often times the term EIR is used universally to refer to MNDs and NDs. (See also Guidelines section 15152 (b): "Agencies are encouraged to tier the environmental analyses which they prepare for separate but related projects ...") Please refer to CEQA Guidelines section 15064 (Determining the Significance of the Environmental Effects Caused by a Project) which clearly states when the preparation of an EIR would be required. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15064(a)(1) a draft EIR is prepared when there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment. Guidelines section 15064 (j)(3) also provides: "(3) If the lead agency determines there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, the lead agency shall prepare a negative declaration (*Friends of B Street v. City of Hayward* (1980) 106 Cal. App. 3d 988).

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15063 the City conducted an Initial Study of the Citywide Pipeline project and it was determined that the project, with mitigation, would not result in significant unmitigated impacts and an MND was prepared.

In addition, the comment letter from CDFG states that Public Resources Code, section 21166 precludes future projects with significant impacts from tiering. As mentioned above, an Initial Study was conducted and significant impacts were not identified which could not be mitigated to below a level of significance.

The MND analyzes Citywide pipeline projects on a "programmatic" level (i.e., as a whole at a broad level of detail), but also analyzes the proposed projects on a site-specific basis where appropriate. As stated in the draft MND subsequent pipeline projects located within the developed public right of way will be reviewed and where it can be determined that the project is consistent with the MND pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15162 any necessary CEQA document will be prepared or if the project would result in minor technical changes or additions, then an Addendum to this MND would be prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15164. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15162 the Lead Agency has the ability to analyze proposed projects with previously certified environmental documents and neither CEQA Guidelines sections 15162 or 15164 limit the application to an individual project. In fact, CEQA Guidelines section 15162 (b) states: "If changes to a project or its circumstances occur or new information becomes available after adoption of a negative declaration, the lead agency shall prepare a subsequent EIR if required under subdivision (a). Otherwise the lead agency shall determine whether to prepare a subsequent negative declaration, an addendum, or no further documentation."

The City has utilized this procedure numerous times in the past without challenge. We note that CDFG has used the programmatic MND procedure in the past as well. However, we welcome your additional input on this issue as we continue to evaluate the statutory mandates under CEQA and the circumstances for when any subsequent future pipeline projects could be processed from an approved environmental document as you requested we do in your October 11, 2011 comment letter.

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME (10/13/2011) continued

analysis of project-related environmental impacts by the City. Also, the initial study discusses that near-term projects may be located in close proximity to, or adjacent to the City's MHPA, but not within the MHPA. The CEQA is intended to foster informed public decision making, therefore we believe that it would have been appropriate to include corresponding figures in the initial study that depict the MHPA boundaries in relationship to all of the anticipated construction-related activities. There is the intent provided in the MND to avoid any direct, indirect and cumulatively significant impacts to environmentally sensitive lands, however whether there is sufficient information provided in the environmental analysis to demonstrate that condition remains in question. Additionally, in evaluating the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines that were provided in the MND, there are a number of referrals for development within or adjacent to the MHPA. If it is correct that the near-term projects would entirely avoid the MHPA then it appears appropriate for the mitigation language to specifically state that condition.

15. 3. The initial study identifies that construction for the near-term projects is anticipated to occur during the daytime hours. Should there be any potential for construction activities to occur during evening hours then the mitigation measures that are currently provided in the MND for addressing indirect effects to MHPA preserve lands should be revised to include conditions that specify that all auxiliary construction-related lighting shall be shielded in proximity to the MHPA.

The Department requests the opportunity to review any revision to MND prior to finalization to ensure that the comments and recommendations, contained herein, are adequately addressed. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the MND for this project and to assist the City in further minimizing and mitigating project impacts to biological resources. If you have questions or comments regarding this letter, please contact Paul Schlitt of the Department at (858) 637-5510.

Sincerely,



Edmund Pert
Regional Manager
South Coast Region

cc: State Clearinghouse, Sacramento
Patrick Gower, USFWS, Carlsbad
Paul Schlitt, San Diego

14. The MND and Initial Study Checklist have been updated to include a thorough description of the projects that are adjacent to the MHPA. In addition, a graphic have been added for Group Job 949 - Site 2 which depicts the project location in relation to the MHPA. The Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (LUAGL) provides additional assurances that development adjacent to the MHPA would not result in direct or indirect edge effects from construction related activities. No projects have been or will be implemented under this MND which are within the MHPA. The LUAGL measures would be implemented when a pipeline project is within 100 feet from the edge of the MHPA and would be monitored for compliance by a qualified biological consultant. The MHPA LUAGL measures in the MND have been modified to eliminate references to "within the MHPA." Please note however, that many existing paved public right-of-ways may cross over areas mapped within the MHPA but would not result in any direct impacts to the MHPA. Please note that Sewer Group 787, which is adjacent to the MHPA, has been removed from this project.
15. Please see section A. I. 5. of the Land Use MMRP in the MND which requires adequate shielding to protect sensitive habitat. In addition, section A. III. A. 3. of the Land Use MMRP in the MND requires that periodic night inspections be conducted to verify that all lighting adjacent to the MHPA be directed away from the Preserve.



San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

Environmental Review Committee

5 October 2011

To: Mr. Jeffrey Szymanski
Development Services Department
City of San Diego
1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501
San Diego, California 92101

Subject: Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration
Citywide Pipeline Project -- 2011
Project No. 255100

Dear Mr. Szymanski:


I have reviewed the subject DMND on behalf of this committee of the San Diego County Archaeological Society.

Based on the information in the DMND and initial study, we have the following comments:

16. 1. It is not clear why Water Group 949 does not include archaeological monitoring mitigation measures for some or all of the portions where the line is installed in new trenches.
17. 2. The last sentence of cultural resources mitigation measure IV.5.d appears to be missing one or more words. The portion in question currently reads "...appropriate treatment measures the human remains and buried with Native American human remains..."

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment upon this DMND.

Sincerely,


James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson
Environmental Review Committee

cc: SDCAS President
File

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

SAN DIEGO COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, INC (10/5/2011)

16. Water Group 949 would be located in three different areas within the City of San Diego: Skyline-Paradise Hills, University/Clairemont Mesa, and Greater Golden Hill/ Barrio Logan. New trenching would only occur in the Clairemont Mesa area, and existing previously excavated trenches would be utilized in the Greater Golden Hill/Barrio Logan and Skyline-Paradise Hills areas of the City. The University/Clairemont Mesa area is not located on the City of San Diego's Historical Sensitivity Map and therefore archaeological monitoring would not be required for this project segment. As mentioned previously, the existing trenches would be utilized in the other areas where native soils have already been disturbed. Therefore, archaeological monitoring would not be required in these areas.
17. Comment noted. Staff has reviewed the section from the MMRP and determined that the language in subsection "d" came directly from the Public Resources Code and three words were somehow omitted when this section of the City MMRP was created. The missing words have been added to section IV.C.5.d of the archaeological MMRP and shown in underline format. The master MMRP has been updated and EAS staff have been notified of the revision for future environmental documents.

RINCON BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS

Culture Committee

P.O. Box 68 - Valley Center 92082 - (760) 297-2621 (760) 297-2629 fax



RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

September 28, 2011

RINCON BAND OF LUISEÑO INDIANS (9/28/2011)

To whom it may concern

On behalf of the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians, I have received your letter. We thank you for informing us of the projects you propose and for including us in your research for cultural resource identification on the property. However the area is not in the Luiseno Tribe's territory. We highly recommend that you seek the assistance of the tribes that are located in the area of potential effect.

Although the Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians does not have cultural significance in this area; we would like to recommend the following guidelines. The first recommendation is to contact the tribes in the territory to receive instructions on how to handle any findings appropriately according to their custom and tradition. Second to have Native American site monitors on site to identify artifacts that may be found during any ground disturbance in order to have the artifacts handled with dignity and respect; should human remains be discovered follow the California Resource Code 5097.98 and the procedures in this section.


Once again thank you for informing of your project and keeping Native Americans informed of these projects. We wish you success in your endeavors and hope the project is completed with the satisfaction of all parties involved.

Sincerely,

Rose Duro
Rincon Culture Committee Chair

- 18. Comment noted. Please see Response to Comment 5. The draft MND was sent to all individuals on the recommended list from the NAHC, with the exception of the Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Council, this group will be included in the distribution of the final MND.
- 19. Please see section B of the General Requirements of the MND and Section A. 1. of the Historical Resources section of the MMRP which requires Native American monitors to be present on-site during all construction related activities.

Bo Mazzetti Tribal Chairman	Stephanic Spencer Vice Chairwoman	Charlie Kolb Council Member	Steve Stallings Council Member	Laurie Gonzales Council Member
--------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------



Citywide Pipeline Projects-Project No. 255100


Harbor Drive Pipeline / Project No. 206100

City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE
No. 1

LOCATION MAP / ORTHO PHOTOGRAPHY MAP

WATER GROUP JOB 949 SITE 1



SENIOR ENGINEER
RANIA AMEN
(619)-533-5482

PROJECT MANAGER
AKRAM BASSYOUNI
(619) 533-6902

PROJECT ENGINEER
CECILIA MARISTELA
(619) 533-7420



Project Implementation & Technical Services (PITS)
CIP Preliminary Engineering & Program Coordination



Legend

 Water Group Job 949 Site 1



No Scale


S:\PITS\PITS-CIP-Preliminary-Engineering-and-Program-Coordination\Drawing\Water & Sewer Projects\Water Projects\Water Group Job 949 Site 1\CIP Tracking\Location Maps



Citywide Pipe Line Project- Project No. 255100

Water Group 949 Site 1/Project No. 232719

FIGURE
No. 2



Citywide Pipeline Project-Project No. 255100

Water Group 949 Site 2/Project No. 232719

**FIGURE
No. 3**



LOCATION MAP/ ORTHO PHOTOGRAPHY MAP
WATER GROUP JOB 949 SITE 3


SENIOR ENGINEER
 RANIA AMEN
 (619)-533-5492

PROJECT MANAGER
 AKRAM BASSYOUNI
 (619) 533-6902

PROJECT ENGINEER
 CECILIA MARISTELA
 (619) 533-7420



Project Implementation & Technical Services (PITS)
 CIP Preliminary Engineering & Program Coordination



Legend

— Water Group Job 949 Site 3



No Scale

S:\PITS\PITS-CIP-Preliminary-Engineering-and-Program-Coordination\Drafting\Water & Sewer Projects\Water Projects\Water Group Job 949 Site 3\CIP Tracking\Location Maps



**Citywide Pipeline Project-Project No.
 255100**
 Water Group 949 Site 3/Project No. 232719

**FIGURE
 No. 4**

Sewer Group 787

SENIOR ENGINEER
Carl Spier
619-533-5126


PROJECT MANAGER
Regan Owen
619-533-5205

PROJECT ENGINEER
Matthew DeBeliso
619-533-5286

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICER
HOTLINE
619-533-4207



Public Works Dept



Legend


- ■ ■ Sewer_Group_787
- Sewer_Group_787_Abandonment



THE MATERIALS ARE PROVIDED WITHOUT WARRANTY OF ANY KIND. THE ENGINEER HAS REVIEWED THE INFORMATION PROVIDED AND HAS NOT CONDUCTED A FIELD SURVEY OF THE PROJECT. THE ENGINEER'S LIABILITY IS LIMITED TO THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY HIMSELF OR HIS FIRM. THE USER OF THIS INFORMATION SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING NECESSARY PERMITS AND FOR OBTAINING THE NECESSARY INFORMATION FROM THE SANITATION DISTRICT. THE USER OF THIS INFORMATION SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING NECESSARY PERMITS AND FOR OBTAINING THE NECESSARY INFORMATION FROM THE SANITATION DISTRICT. THE USER OF THIS INFORMATION SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING NECESSARY PERMITS AND FOR OBTAINING THE NECESSARY INFORMATION FROM THE SANITATION DISTRICT.



Citywide Pipeline Project-Project No. 255100
Sewer Group 787 /Project No. 231928




**WATER GROUP 914
WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT**

SENIOR ENGINEER
WENDY GAMBOA
(619) 235-1971

PROJECT ENGINEER
ROBERTO VEJAR-PARRA
(619) 533-5402

PROJECT MANAGER
MICHAEL NINH
(619) 533-7443

PUBLIC INFORMATION
HOTLINE
(619) 533-4207




OCEAN BEACH / PENINSULA
LEGEND

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 02



WBS NO.: B-00125 (W)

- REPLACE IN PLACE EXIST. WATER MAIN
- PROP. NEW WATER MAIN
- PROP. TRENCHLESS WATER
- PROP. NEW PRESSURE REGULATOR STATION (PRS)
- EXISTING WATER MAINS



Citywide Pipeline Projects-Project No.
255100
Water Group 914 /Project No. 233447

FIGURE
No. 6




PROJECT ENGINEER
DANIEL TITTLE
☎ 533-7468

SENIOR ENGINEER
CARL SPIER
☎ 533-5126

PROJECT MANAGER
HUNG HUYNH
☎ 235-1979

SEWER & WATER MAIN
REPLACEMENT
GROUP 732
SITE MAP



NOTE: SEWER MAINS
TYPICAL METHODS 4, 459.38'
TRENCHLESS APPROX 1, 035.62'

- LEGEND:
- WATER MAIN REPLACEMENT
 - - - SEWER MAIN REPLACEMENT
 - WATER & SEWER MAIN REPLACEMENT

06-21-11 OEM




Citywide Pipeline Projects-Project No.

255100

Water and Sewer Group 732/Project No. 206610

FIGURE

No. 7



Citywide Pipeline Project-Project No. 255100

Water 949 Site 2/ Project No. 232719

City of San Diego – Development Services Department

FIGURE
No. 8

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. Project Title/Project number: Citywide Pipeline Projects
2. Lead agency name and address: City of San Diego, Development Services Department, 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101.
3. Contact person and phone number: Jeff Szymanski, Associate Planner, 619-446-5324
4. Project location: Near-term and future projects would be located within various public right-of-ways (PROW) within any community planning areas in the City of San Diego. All project sites and areas of potential affect would not support *Sensitive Biological Resources* as defined in the Land Development Code (LDC) §143.0110. Project locations may be within the State Coastal Zone and/or within the City of San Diego's Coastal Zone and/or within Designated Historic Districts. Project locations and the associated areas of potential affect may be adjacent to, but not encroach into the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Specific locations for near-term projects analyzed in this document are included below under Item 8 – Description of Project.
5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address: City of San Diego, Engineering & Capital Projects Department, ~~City of San Diego Public Utilities Department - Water Department and City of San Diego Metropolitan Waste Water Division (MWWDD).~~
6. General Plan designation: City of San Diego Public Right-of-Way (PROW) land is not a designated land use in the General Plan. However, Right-of-Way is categorized as Road/Freeways/Transportation Facilities in the General Plan.
7. Zoning: Near-term and future projects would take place within various Public Right-of-ways and public easements within the City of San Diego. Adjacent zoning may include, but would not be limited to Open Space, Residential, Agricultural, Commercial, and Industrial.
8. Description of project (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to, later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.): COUNCIL APPROVAL to allow for the replacement, rehabilitation, relocation, point repair, new trenching, trenchless construction, and abandonment of water and/or sewer pipeline alignments and associated improvements such as curb ramps, sewer lateral connections, water service connections, manholes, new pavement/slurry, the removal and/or replacement of street trees and the removal and/or replacement of street lights. This environmental document covers the analysis for ~~five~~ four (~~5~~) (4) near-term pipeline projects (Harbor Drive Pipeline, Water Group 949, ~~Sewer Group 787~~, Water Group 914, and Sewer/Water Group 732), as well as any subsequent future pipeline projects. The construction footprint for a typical pipeline project, including staging areas and other areas (such as access) would be located within the City of San Diego Public Right-of-Way (PROW) and/or within public easements and may include planned pipeline construction within private easements from the PROW to the service connection. A signed agreement between the City and the property owner would be required for work conducted on private property. Project types that would be included in the analysis contained herein would consist of sewer and water group jobs, trunk sewers, large diameter water pipeline

projects, new and/or replacement manholes, new/or replacement fire hydrants, and other necessary appurtenances. All associated equipment would be staged within the existing PROW adjacent to the work areas. The near-term and future projects covered in the document would not impact *Sensitive Biological Resources* or *Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL)* as defined in the Land Development Code and would not encroach into the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA).

Construction for the near-term and any future projects is anticipated to occur during the daytime hours Monday through Friday, but may occur during the weekend, if necessary. The contractor would comply with all applicable requirements described in the latest edition of the *Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction ("GREENBOOK")* and the latest edition of the *City of San Diego Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction ("WHITEBOOK")*. The City's supplement addresses unique circumstances to the City of San Diego that are not addressed in the GREENBOOK and would therefore take precedence in the event of a conflict. The contractor would also comply with the California Department of Transportation *Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones*. If the Average Daily Traffic (ADT) within a given project(s) vicinity is 10,000 ADT or greater, a traffic control plan would be prepared and implemented in accordance with the *City of San Diego Standard Drawings Manual of Traffic Control for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones*. For proposals subject to 10,000 ADT or less, traffic control may be managed through shop drawings during construction. Construction methods to be employed would consist of, but not be limited to:

Open Trenching: The open trench method of construction would be used for complete replacement and new alignment portions of the project. Trenches are typically four feet wide and are dug with excavations and similar large construction equipment.

Rehabilitation: Rehabilitation of alignment involves installing a new lining in old pipelines. The insertion is done through existing manhole access points and does not require removal of pavement or excavation of soils.

Abandonment: Pipeline abandonment activities would be similar to rehabilitation methods in that no surface/subsurface disturbance would occur. This process may involve slurry or grout material injected into the abandoned lines via manhole access. The top portion of the manhole is then typically removed and the remaining space backfilled and paved over.

Potholing: Potholing would be used to verify reconnection of laterals to main where lines would be raised or realigned (higher than existing depth, but still below ground) or to verify utility crossings. These "potholes" are made by using vacuum type equipment to open up small holes into the street of pavement.

Point Repairs: Point repairs include replacing a portion of a pipe segment by open trench excavation methods in which localized structural defects have been identified. Generally, point repairs are confined to an eight-foot section of pipe.

The following near term project(s) have been reviewed by the City of San Diego, Development Services Department (DSD) for compliance with the Land Development Code and have been determined to be exempt from a Site Development Permit (SDP) and/or a Coastal Development Permit (CDP). These projects would involve excavation in

areas having a high resource sensitivity and potential for encountering archaeological and paleontological resources during construction related activities. Therefore, mitigation would be required to reduce potential significant impacts to archaeological and paleontological resources to below a level of significance. With respect to Storm Water, all projects would be reviewed for compliance with the City's Storm Water Standards Manual. All projects that are not-exempt from the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP) would incorporate appropriate Permanent Best Management Practices (BMPs) and construction BMPs into the project design(s) and during construction, as required. As such, all projects would comply with the requirement of the Municipal Storm Water Permit.

HARBOR DRIVE PIPELINE (PROJECT NO. 206100)

The Harbor Drive Pipeline includes the replacement of 4.4 miles of 16-inch cast iron (CI) and asbestos cement (AC) pipe that comprises the Harbor Drive 1st and 2nd Pipelines (HD-1 and HD-2) at a depth no greater than five (5) feet. Facility age and cast iron main replacement are the primary drivers for these projects, but due to the history of AC breaks in the area, approximately 1.0 mile of AC replacement is also included. The project is anticipated to be awarded in Fiscal Year 2013.

HD-1 and HD-2 were built primarily in the 1940's and 1950's and were made out of cast iron or asbestos cement and serve the western most part of the University Heights 390 Zone and the northern section of the Point Loma East 260 Zone. The pipelines also serve as redundancy to each other. Several segments were replaced by various City of San Diego Public Utilities Department projects throughout the years and those segments are not a part of the current scope. Previously replaced segments were 16 inch PVC, except for the bridge crossing which used 24-inch CMLC. The pipeline is located entirely within the PROW, will not require any easements, and is not adjacent to the MHPA or located within any designated historical districts. The following streets would be affected by this project: West Laurel, Pacific Highway, North Harbor Drive (within the roadway, under the bridge and within landscape areas), Nimitz Boulevard, Rosecrans Street, Evergreen Street, Hugo Street, Locust Street, Canon Street, Avenida De Portugal, and Point Loma Avenue.

WATER GROUP 949 (PROJECT NO. 232719)

Water Group 949 would consist of the replacement and installation of 5.27 miles of water mains within the Skyline- Paradise Hills, University, Clairemont Mesa, Southeastern San Diego (Greater Golden Hills) community planning areas. 16,931 Linear Feet (LF) of 16-inch cast iron water mains would be replace-in-place with new 16-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe within the existing trench. The remaining 10,913 LF of new 16-inch PVC would be installed in new trenches All work within Regents Road, Site 2 (Figure 8), adjacent to the MHPA would only occur within the developed footprint such as the paved right of way, and concrete sidewalk or slab areas. In addition, all work within 100 feet of the MHPA would observe mitigation such as but not limited to bird breeding season measures, avoidance of discharge to the MHPA, and avoidance of direct lighting towards the MHPA areas. As such, no impacts to MHPA and/or sensitive resources would occur. The project would also include replacement and reinstallation of valves, water services, fire hydrants, and other appurtenances and would also included the construction of curb ramps, and street resurfacing. Traffic control

measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented during construction. Any street tree removal, relocation, and/or trimming would be done under the supervision of the City Arborist. All staging of construction equipment will be located outside of any potentially sensitive areas. The following streets and nearby alleyways would be affected by this project: Tuther Way, Cielo Drive, Woodman Street, Skyline Drive, Regents Road, Hidalgo Avenue, Clairemont Mesa Boulevard, Luna Avenue, B Street, F Street, Ash Street, 25th Street, and 27th Street.

SEWER GROUP 787 (PROJECT NO. 231928)

Sewer Group 787 would consist of the replacement of 26,436 lineal feet (LF) of existing 16-inch cast iron sewer pipe with new 16-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe within the existing trench. A total of 1,267 LF of new 16-inch PVC sewer alignment would be installed in new trenches. In addition, the project would abandon 1,606 LF of existing 16-inch cast iron pipe. The proposed project would be installed by conventional excavation (open trench) in trenches from 3-5 feet deep. The project would affect the following streets and nearby alleyways: 42nd Street, Monroe Avenue, Edgware Road, Polk Avenue, Orange Avenue, Menlo Avenue, 47th Street, Dwight Street, Myrtle Avenue, Manzanita Place, Heather Street, Dahlia Street, Poplar Street, Columbine Street, Pepper Drive, Juniper Street, Marigold Street, Sumac Drive, 44th Street, Laurie Lane, and Roseview Place all within the City Heights and Kensington Talmadge Community Planning Areas.

WATER GROUP 914 (PROJECT NO. 233447)

Water Group 914 would consist of the replacement and installation of approximately 21,729 lineal feet (LF) of existing 6-inch, 8-inch and 12-inch cast iron pipes and 6-inch asphalt concrete pipes with new 8-inch, 12-inch and 16-inch polyvinyl chloride (PVC) pipe. Also included would be the construction of two underground pressure regulator stations that measure 54 square-feet and 6.5 feet deep each. 17,472 LF would be located in existing trenches and 4,257 LF would be located in new trench lines. The proposed project would be installed by conventional excavation (open trench) in trenches from 3-5 feet deep. However two 300 LF parallel line sections (600 LF total) of the water alignment would be installed by trenchless methodology utilizing two (2) 40 square foot launch and receiver pits. The trenchless installation would occur at the intersection of Coronado Avenue and Ebers Street and is designed to avoid a recorded archaeological resource at this intersection. The trenchless methodology would employ directional underground boring that would install the pipe at a depth deeper than the recorded resource. In addition, a 4-inch AC water segment of approximately 520 LF located along Point Loma Avenue between Guizot Street and Santa Barbara Street will be abandoned in place. The project would affect the following streets and nearby alleyways: Point Loma Avenue, Santa Barbara Street, Bermuda Avenue, Pescadero Avenue, Cable Street, Orchard Avenue, Froude Street, Sunset Cliffs Boulevard, Savoy Circle, and Del Monte Avenue all within the Ocean Beach and Peninsula Community Planning Areas.

SEWER AND WATER GROUP 732 (PROJECT NO. 206610)

Sewer and Water Group Job 732 would consist of the installation of approximately 5,500 total linear feet (LF) of 8 inch Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) sewer pipe, and approximately

3,000 total linear feet (LF) of 12 inch PVC water pipe. Approximately, 1,035 LF of water pipe would be rehabilitated using trenchless technology in the same trench, with the remainder of the installation accomplished through open trenching. Related work would include construction of new manholes, replacement and re-plumbing of sewer laterals, installation of curb ramps, pavement restoration, traffic control, and storm water best management practices. Construction of the project would affect portions of the following streets and adjacent alleys in the Peninsula Community Plan area: Xenophon Street, Yonge Street, Zola Street, Alcott Street, Browning Street, Plum Street, Willow Street, Evergreen Street, Locust Street, and Rosecrans Street.

SUBSEQUENT PIPELINE PROJECT REVIEW (LONG TERM)

Applications for the replacement, rehabilitation, relocation, point repair, open trenching and abandonment of water and/or sewer pipeline alignments within the City of San Diego PROW as indicated in the Subject block above and in the Project Description discussion of the Initial Study would be analyzed for potential environmental impacts to Historical Resources (Archaeology, Paleontology and the Built Environment) and Land Use (MSCP/MHPA), and reviewed for consistency with this Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). Where it can be determined that the project is "consistent" with this MND and no additional potential significant impacts would occur pursuant to State CEQA Guideline § 15162 (i.e. the involvement of new significant environmental effects of a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified effects) or if the project would result in minor technical changes or additions, then an Addendum to this MND would be prepared pursuant to §15164. Where future projects are found not to be consistent with this MND, then a new Initial Study and project specific MND shall be prepared.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting. Briefly describe the project's surroundings: The scope of the MND is city-wide and future projects would be located within the Right-of-Way, which is categorized as Road/Freeways/Transportation Facilities in the General Plan. Surrounding land uses would vary depending on the location proposed.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

I) AESTHETICS – Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Near-term or future projects would involve the replacement, rehabilitation, relocation, point repair, new trenching, and abandonment of water and/or sewer alignments and associated improvements such as curb ramps, pedestrian ramps, lateral connections, manholes all located below the existing PROW. It is not anticipated that removal and/or replacement of street trees and the removal and/or replacement of street lights; therefore scenic vistas would not be impacted.

- b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Near-term or future projects may involve work that could affect street trees, historic buildings or a scenic state highway; however, any work of this type would be reviewed by qualified historical staff to ensure that construction related activities not impact the integrity of the any scenic resources. Additionally, any associated street improvements, if located within a historic district, would be required to comply with the mitigation measures incorporated in Section V of this MND.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Please see I.b.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

The scope of development for near-term and/or future projects would predominantly be located below existing grade, with the possible exception of any associated street improvements (e.g. curb ramps, pedestrian ramps, street trees, etc.). The removal and/or replacement of street lights within any particular project alignment would not create a new source of substantial light or glare. Additionally, no associated street improvements would involve the use of highly reflective materials. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to create substantial light or glare impacts.

II) AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project:

- a) Converts Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Near-term and/or future pipeline alignments would be located within the developed PROW which would not be classified as farmland by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). Any adjacent areas in agricultural production would not be affected by near-term and/or future pipeline projects. Therefore, the project in and of itself would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

Please see II.a

- c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 1220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

The public right of way and land surrounding any near-term and/or future pipeline alignments is not zoned as forest land as all areas are within the urbanized boundaries of the City of San Diego. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land.

- d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The project is located within the developed public right of way and the land surrounding any near-term and/or future pipeline alignments is not designated forest land as all areas are within the urbanized boundaries of the City of San Diego. Therefore, the project would not convert forest land to a non-forest use.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The project would not involve a change in land use and would not impact farmland or forestland.

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

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Near-term and/or future pipeline alignments would not involve any future actions that would generate air quality emissions as a result of the proposed use (e.g. vehicle miles traveled, etc). However, emission would occur during the construction phase of the project and could increase the amount of harmful pollutants entering the air basin. The emissions would be minimal and would only occur temporarily during construction. Additionally, the construction equipment typically involved in water/sewer projects is small-scale and generates relatively few emissions. When appropriate, dust suppression methods would be included as project components. As such, any near-term and/or future projects would not be inconsistent with the region's air quality plan.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Please see III.a

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

As described above, construction operations could temporarily increase the emissions of dust and other pollutants. However, construction emissions would be temporary and implementation of Best Management Practices would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

below a level of significance. Therefore, any near-term and/or future pipeline alignments would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project is non-attainment in the region under applicable federal or state ambient air quality standards.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Construction operations could temporarily increase the emissions of harmful pollutants, which could affect sensitive receptors adjacent to the project. However, construction emissions would be temporary and it is anticipated that implementation of construction BMPs would reduce potential impacts related to construction activities to minimal levels. Therefore, any near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Operation of construction equipment and vehicles could generate odors associated with fuel combustion. However, these odors would dissipate into the atmosphere upon release and would only remain temporarily in proximity to the construction equipment and vehicles. Therefore, any near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not create substantial amounts of objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- a) Have substantial adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects would be limited to development proposals that do not impact Sensitive Biological Resources. Any near-term and/or future actions that would impact Sensitive Biological Resources would not be consistent with this MND and a new Initial Study and MND would be prepared in accordance with the provisions of CEQA.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

See IV. b)

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

Any near-term and/or future pipeline projects would be located in the developed public right of way where wetlands would not be present, either within or adjacent to the project's boundaries. Therefore, any near-term and/or future pipeline projects do not have the potential to impact these resources. Any near-term and/or future actions that would impact wetland resources would not be consistent with this MND and a new Initial Study and MND would be prepared in accordance with the provisions of CEQA.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

Any near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not result in adverse impacts on wildlife movement in the project's areas. As previously mentioned above, these projects would be located in the developed public right of way which would not contain wildlife corridors.

- e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Any near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Any near-term and/or future pipeline projects may involve associated street improvements such as the replacement of street trees. However, trees that are covered under any kind of a preservation policy or ordinance would not be part of any future actions. Additionally, future project areas would lack any sensitive biological resources and would not require the removal of any unique or

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

sensitive trees. As such, the project would not result in conflict with local policies protecting biological resources.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects may be located in close proximity to, or adjacent to the City's Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), but not within the MHPA. MHPA Land Use Adjacency mitigation has been incorporated into the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), to mitigate indirect impacts to the MHPA. Therefore, the project does not have the potential to impact any habitat conservation plans and would not result in indirect impacts to the MHPA.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

The purpose and intent of the *Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, and Article 2)* is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City of San Diego when historical resources are present on the premises.

CEQA requires that before approving discretionary projects, the Lead Agency must identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects, which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource may have a significant effect on the environment (Sections 15064.5(b) and 21084.1). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (Sections 15064.5(b)(1)). Any historical resource listed in, or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including archaeological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant.

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects may include future actions that would be analyzed for the potential to impact archaeological resources. For those proposals that include ground disturbing activities and are located within mapped areas of the City that indicate a potential for the discovery of archaeological resource, monitoring would be required. As such, when required, archaeological monitoring would reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources to below a level of significance.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Any near-term or future project which is located within a designated historical district would be subject to review by qualified historical staff to determine whether the project would have an adverse effect on the district requiring specific mitigation, as detailed in Section V., of the MND or if the project requires further review in accordance with the Historical Resources Regulations. A project which would adversely affect a designated historical district because it could not comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards or implement the required MMRP would not be consistent with this MND and a new Initial Study and MND would be prepared in accordance with the provisions of CEQA.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects would include work that requiring trenching in areas where there is a potential for archaeological resources to be encountered. As such, the requirement for archaeological monitoring has been included in the MMRP. Projects that would have a direct impact on a recorded or designated archaeological site which requires Phase 2 Testing and mitigation measures (e.g. Archaeology Data Recovery Program) would not be consistent with this MND and a new Initial Study and MND would be prepared in accordance with the provisions of CEQA. Projects which could be found to be adequately covered under this MND and only require monitoring would not result in a significant adverse change in the significance of a resource pursuant to §15064.5 with implementation of the MMRP identified in Section V., of the MND.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects may include work that is underlain by sensitive fossil bearing formations which could be impacted if trenching is anticipated at depths greater than 10 feet. Therefore, based on the sensitivity of the affected formation and the proposed excavation depths, the project could result in significant impacts to paleontological resources.

To reduce this impact to below a level of significance, excavation within previously undisturbed formations at a depth of 10 or more feet would be monitored by a qualified paleontologist or paleontological monitor. Any significant paleontological resources encountered would be recovered and curated. Paleontological monitoring would be required and would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

- d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

A potential to encounter human remains during construction activity within the City's public right-of-way exists for any near-term or future pipeline alignment project; especially in areas where work would occur within high sensitivity areas for archaeological resources which can include Native American remains. Mitigation measures addressing the unanticipated discovery

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

of Native American human remains are included in Section V of the MMRP. Implementation of these measures would reduce potential unanticipated impacts to below a level of significance.

For projects that are not covered under this environmental document (e.g., meet the criteria for a Statutory or Categorical Exemption under CEQA), then standard language regarding the unanticipated discovery of human remains of unknown origin found in the *City of San Diego Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction ("WHITEBOOK")* would take precedence. Upon notification by the Contractor of the discovery of human remains of unknown origin, these requirements require that the Engineer shall immediately notify the San Diego County Coroner to start the investigation process, in accordance with the California Health and Safety Code §§7050.5 and 7051 and the California Public Resources Code.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects would utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices in order to ensure that potential impacts in this category based on regional geologic hazards would remain less than significant. Therefore, risks from rupture of a known earthquake fault would be below a level of significance.

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not expose people or structures to strong seismic ground shaking. The design of the proposed project and any subsequent projects would utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices to ensure that the potential for impacts from ground shaking would be below a level of significance.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

liquefaction?

The design of any near-term and/or future pipeline projects would utilize proper engineering design standard construction practices to ensure that the potential for impacts from seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction would be below a level of significance.

- | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| iv) Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not include actions that would expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides. Pipeline design for projects covered under this MND would utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices to ensure that the potential for impacts would be below a level of significance.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Construction of the near-term and/or future pipeline projects covered under this MND would take place within the developed public right of way. Any disturbances to streets and alleys would be replaced in kind. Additionally, appropriate BMPs aimed at preventing soil erosion would be incorporated during construction and design of the project. As such, project implementation would not result in a substantial amount of soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Near-term and/or future pipeline projects are located entirely within the City's PROW (See project descriptions). It is possible, that any near-term and/or future projects may be located throughout the City within the Public Right-of-Way and may be located within various Geologic Hazard Categories. However, proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices would ensure that the potential for impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

The design of any near-term and/or future pipeline projects would utilize proper engineering design and utilization of standard construction practices would ensure that the potential for impacts would be less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The design of any near-term and/or future pipeline projects covered under this MND would utilize proper engineering design and standard construction practices to ensure that the potential for impacts would be below a level of significance.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS - Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The City of San Diego is utilizing the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) report "CEQA and Climate Change" (CAPCOA 2009) to determine whether a GHG analysis would be required for submitted projects. The CAPCOA report references a 900 metric ton guideline as a conservative threshold for requiring further analysis and possible mitigation. This emission level is based on the amount of vehicle trips, the typical energy and water use associated with projects, and other factors.

CAPCOA identifies project types that are estimated to emit approximately 900 metric tons of GHG's annually. This 900 metric ton threshold is roughly equivalent to 35,000 square feet of office space, 11,000 square feet of retail, 50 single-family residential units, 70 multi-family residential units and 6,300 square feet of supermarkets.

Since any future pipeline projects covered in this CEQA document do not fit in the categories listed above, a GHG modeling analysis would be conducted for each project.

A GHG modeling analysis was conducted for each near-term project also covered in the MND. This modeling was conducted to determine the level of GHG emissions. The Roadway Construction Emissions Model is a spreadsheet program created by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District to analyze construction related GHGs and was utilized to quantify the project's GHG emissions. The model utilizes project information (e.g. total construction months, project type, construction equipment, grading quantities and the total disturbance area, etc.) to quantify GHG emissions from heavy-duty construction equipment, haul trucks, and worker commute trips associated with linear construction projects.

Harbor Drive project: Results of the Roadway Construction Emissions Model output demonstrated that during the 6 months of construction the project would generate approximately 250 metric tons of emissions per year. On an annualized basis, the output would be approximately 500 metric tons per year. The output for the project falls well below the 900 metric ton per year figure. Therefore, based

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

upon the analysis showed above the project would result in a less than significant CEQA Greenhouse gas impact and mitigation would not be required.

Sewer/Water Job 732: Results of the Roadway Construction Emissions Model output demonstrated that the project duration of 6 months, and assuming a May start date, this project would produce 162.5 metric tons of CO2 in the first year and 0 metric tons of CO2 the second year. The output for the project falls well below the 900 metric ton figure. Therefore, based upon the analysis showed above the project would result in a less than significant CEQA Greenhouse gas impact and mitigation would not be required.

~~**Sewer Group 787:** Results of the Roadway Construction Emissions Model output demonstrated that this project would produce a total of 555.9 metric tons of CO2 during the 19 month construction period. Assuming a September start, 117.0 metric tons would be generated in the second year, and 87.8 metric tons of CO2 would be generated in the third year. The project's estimated GHG emissions results are well below the 900 metric tons of CO2 and; therefore, impacts are less than CEQA significant and mitigation would not be required.~~

Water Group 914: Results of the Roadway Construction Emissions Model output demonstrated that this project's duration is 14 months and assuming a September start date the project would produce 141.5 metric tons of CO2 in the first year, and 353.7 metric tons of CO2 in the second year. The project's estimated GHG emissions results are well below the 900 metric tons of CO2 and; therefore, impacts are less than CEQA significant and mitigation would not be required.

Water Group 949: Results of the Roadway Construction Emissions Model output demonstrated that the project duration of 6 months, and assuming a May start date, the project would produce 162.5 metric tons of CO2 in the first year and 0 metric tons of CO2 the second year. The output for the project falls well below the 900 metric ton figure. Therefore, based upon the analysis showed above the project would result in a less than significant CEQA Greenhouse gas impact and mitigation would not be required.

For a determination of whether future projects would be consistent with this MND, the Roadway Construction Emissions Model can be utilized. If the output is less than 900 metric tons of GHG annually, then no further analysis is needed and the project would be consistent with the GHG analysis in this document. If, however, the output from the Roadway Construction Emission Model is greater than 900 metric tons annually, then a formal GHG Analysis would be conducted incorporating appropriate mitigation measures. If the analysis indicates project implementation would result in 900 metric tons or more annually, then the project would not be consistent with the GHG analysis in this MND as the project would be required to incorporate mitigation to reduce its GHG output by 30% compared to the California Air Resources Board (CARB) 2020 business-as-usual forecast and a new Initial Study and MND would be prepared pursuant to CEQA.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

Please see VII.a. It is anticipated that the any near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not conflict with any applicable plans, policies, or regulations related to greenhouse gases.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Construction of any near-term and/or future pipeline projects covered under this MND may require the use of hazardous materials (e.g., fuels, lubricants, solvents, etc.) which would require proper storage, handling, use and disposal; however, these conditions would not occur during routine construction within the PROW. Construction specifications would include requirements for the contractor regarding where routine handling or disposal of hazardous materials could occur and what measures to implement in the event of a spill from equipment. Compliance with contract specifications would ensure that potential hazards are minimized to below a level of significance.

- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Any near-term and/or future project alignments covered under this MND have the potential to traverse properties which could contain Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) cleanup sites, permitted UST's, or contaminated sites located within a 1,000 feet from the project alignments; however, in the event that construction activities encounter underground contamination, the contractor would be required to implement § 803 of the City's "WHITEBOOK" for "Encountering or Releasing Hazardous Substances or Petroleum Products" of the City of San Diego Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction which is included in all construction documents and would ensure the proper handling and disposal of any contaminated soils in accordance with all applicable local, state and federal regulations. Compliance with these requirements would minimize the risk to the public and the environmental; therefore, impacts would remain less than significant.

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

Several of the near-term projects are located within a ¼ mile radius of an existing or proposed school

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

and would involve trenching activities that could result in the release of hazardous emissions if unanticipated contamination is encountered within the PROW. The same would be true for any future projects that may be proposed within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school and would involve trenching activities that could result in the release of hazardous emissions if unanticipated contamination is encountered. In both cases, §803 of the City of San Diego's "WHITEBOOK" is included in all construction documents to ensure that appropriate protocols are followed pursuant to County DEH requirements should any hazardous conditions be encountered. As such, impacts regarding the handling or discovery of hazardous materials, substances or waste within close proximity of a school would be below a level of significance with implementation of the measures required pursuant to the contract specifications and County DEH oversight.

- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Although none of the near-term project alignments covered in the document are identified on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, future projects could be located within close proximity to hazardous materials sites or within 1,000 feet from leaking USTs. However, as previously outlined in VIII a-c above, specific measures have been or will be incorporated into the contract specifications to address any contaminated soils encountered during construction related activities in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. Therefore, with implementation of measures contained in the contract specifications, potential hazards would be reduced to below a level of significance.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two mile of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Several near-term projects covered in this MND (Harbor Drive Pipeline, Water Group 914, and Sewer/Water Group 732) are located within or in close proximity to the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of the San Diego International Airport's Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). This geographically demarcated area that surrounds Lindbergh Field ensures that factors such as noise, land use, safety and airspace protection are considered anytime a land use decision is made. Since these near-term projects and any future projects are linear underground projects, construction of these types of projects would not introduce any new features that would result in a safety hazard for people residing in or working in the area or create a flight hazard.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

None of the near-term or future project alignments would be located within the vicinity of a private airstrip; no provide airstrips are located with the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of San Diego; therefore, no impact would result under this category.

- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Construction of any near-term or future projects would temporarily affect traffic circulation within the project Area of Potential Effect (APE) and its adjoining roads. However, an approved Traffic Control Plan would be implemented during construction which would allow emergency plans to be employed. Therefore, the project would not physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Construction of any near-term or future projects would be located within the City's Public Right-of-Way and would not be located within or adjacent wildlands that could pose a threat of wildland fires. Additionally, sewer and water infrastructure projects would not introduce any new features that would increase the risk of fire.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Potential impacts to existing water quality standards associated with the any near-term and/or future projects would include minimal short-term construction-related erosion/sedimentation, but would not include any long term operational storm water impacts. Any near-term and/or future projects would be required to comply with the City's Storm Water Standards Manual. Depending on the area of disturbance, projects would have to comply with either a Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) or Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). These plans would prevent or effectively minimize short-term water quality impacts during construction activities. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any existing water quality standards or discharge requirements.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

Any near-term and/or future projects do not propose the use of groundwater. Furthermore, these projects would not introduce a substantially large amount of new impervious surfaces over ground that could interfere with groundwater recharge. Therefore, construction of these projects would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner, which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Any near-term and/or future projects would be located below the surface of the developed public right of way within paved streets. Upon completion of the installation of the utility lines the streets would be returned to their preexisting conditions. Therefore these projects would not substantially alter any existing drainage patterns.

- d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Please see IX.c.

- e) Create or contribute runoff water, which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Conformance to BMPs outlined in an approved WPCP and compliance with the City Stormwater Standards would prevent or effectively minimize short-term construction runoff impacts from any near-term and/or future pipeline projects covered under the MND. Additionally, these projects would not result in a substantial increase in impervious surface, and therefore, would not contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing storm water systems.

- f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Conformance to BMPs outlined in an approved WPCP and compliance with the City Stormwater Standards would prevent or effectively minimize short-term construction runoff impacts from any near-term and/or future pipeline projects covered under the MND. See IX-a.

- g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

The near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not include the construction of any housing.

- h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?

The near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not impede the direction of flows or substantially impact a 100-year flood hazard area.

- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

The near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not include any new features that would increase the risk associated with flooding beyond those of any existing conditions.

- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

The near-term and/or future pipeline projects would not include any new features that would increase the risk associated with seiche, tsunami, or mudflow beyond those of any existing conditions.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:

- a) Physically divide an established community?

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Implementation of the near-term and/or future pipeline projects would involve replacing and installing utility infrastructure and would not introduce new features that could divide an established community.

- b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Implementation of the near-term and/or future pipeline projects would involve replacing and installing utility infrastructure and would be consistent with all applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project and would not conflict with any land use plans.

- c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Implementation of the near-term and/or future pipeline projects would involve replacing and installing utility infrastructure located entirely within the developed public right of way. Although some projects could be located within proximity to the City's MHPA which is covered by the MSCP Subarea Plan, no conflicts are anticipated because implementation of the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines would be required for any project located within 100 feet from the MHPA. Measures to reduce potential indirect impacts to the City's MHPA have been included in the MMRP contained within Section V. of the MND.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project?

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

Areas surrounding the near-term project alignments are not being used for the recovery of mineral resources. Similarly, these areas are also not designated for the recovery of mineral resources on the City of San Diego General Plan Land Use Map. Additionally, any future projects submitted for review in accordance with this MND would be evaluated based on their proximity to areas where mineral resources could be affected. At this time however, it is not anticipated that any future pipeline project, which would be located entirely within the PROW would result in the loss of

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

availability of a known mineral resource of value to the region and the state.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Areas surrounding the near-term project alignments have not been delineated as being used for the recovery of mineral resources or designated for the recovery of mineral resources on the City of San Diego General Plan Land Use Map. Additionally, any future projects submitted for review in accordance with this MND would be evaluated based on their proximity to areas where mineral resources could be affected. At this time however, it is not anticipated that any future pipeline project, which would be located entirely within the PROW would result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Any near-term or future pipeline projects covered under this MND would not in and of itself result in the generation of operational noise levels in excess of existing standards. However, some construction related noise would result, but would be temporary and transitory in nature and strictly regulated under San Diego Municipal Code Section 59.5.0404, "Noise Abatement and Control" which places limits on the hours of construction operations and standard decibels which cannot be exceeded. Therefore, people would not be exposed to noise levels in excess of those covered by existing noise regulations.

- b) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Any near-term or future pipeline projects covered under this MND would result in negligible ground disturbing vibrations during construction based on the type of equipment being used and the construction methodology being employed for each project type. Noise occurring during construction activities would be temporary and transitory in nature and would be strictly regulated under San Diego Municipal Code Section 59.5.0404, "Noise Abatement and Control" which places limits on the hours of construction operations and standard decibels which cannot be exceeded. Therefore, people would not be exposed to excessive ground disturbing vibration levels after completion of each project.

- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Any near-term or future pipeline projects covered under this MND all occur within the developed PROW would not permanently increase the ambient noise levels beyond those which exist without the project. Please see XII.a & b.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing without the project?

A portion of one near-term project would be located along Harbor Drive where the existing noise environment is already high due to its proximity to Lindbergh Field and from high traffic patterns surrounding the airport and nearby businesses. Other near-term and/or future projects covered under this MND may occur City-wide and result in temporary construction related noise impacts; however, the increase in noise due to construction activities would be temporary in nature and strictly regulated in accordance with the Municipal Code. These temporary and periodic construction related noise increased would not be considered substantial and therefore, the increase in ambient noise levels would be less than significant. Please see XII.a.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?

Several near-term projects covered in this MND (Harbor Drive Pipeline, Water Group 914, and Sewer/Water Group 732) are located within 2 miles of a public airport; specifically to the Airport Influence Area (AIA) of the San Diego International Airport's Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). This geographically demarcated area that surrounds Lindbergh Field ensures that factors such as noise, land use, safety and airspace protection are considered anytime a land use decision is made. Although these near-term projects and any future projects are linear underground projects, construction would not in and of itself expose people residing in the area or construction workers to excessive noise levels beyond those that may currently exist. For projects within proximity to Lindbergh Field and heavily traveled roadways, the ambient noise level is already loud. Strict compliance with OSHA standards for worker safety would ensure that exposure to excessive noise levels would not occur for all other near-term and/or future pipeline projects.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

None of the near-term projects are located within proximity to a private airstrip and it's not anticipated that any future projects would be either; mainly because no private airstrips are located in the urbanized areas within the City's jurisdictional boundaries. Therefore no impacts in this category would occur.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

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

The near-term and/or future pipeline projects would replace, rehabilitate and install new utility infrastructure. These upgrades are intended to improve currently outdated sewer and water systems in order to keep up with current demand. These projects would not extend any existing roadways into undeveloped areas or introduce any new roadways that could induce population growth and therefore, no impact would occur.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

The near-term and/or future pipeline projects would replace, rehabilitate and install new utility infrastructure. These upgrades are intended to improve currently outdated sewer and water systems in order to keep up with current demand. These projects would not displace any housing.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See XIII b).

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service rations, response times or other

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i) Fire Protection

Any near-term or future pipeline project would not physically alter any fire protection facilities. Replacement and installation of utility infrastructure would not require any new or altered fire protection services. Future projects may require a Traffic Control Plan to ensure major disruptions to traffic flow do not occur. Disruptions to response times are not anticipated.

- ii) Police Protection

Any near-term or future pipeline project would not physically alter any fire protection facilities. Replacement and installation of utility infrastructure would not require any new or altered police protection services. Future projects may require a Traffic Control Plan to ensure major disruptions to traffic flow do not occur. Disruptions to response times are not anticipated.

- iii) Schools

Any near-term or future pipeline project would not physically alter any schools. Additionally, these projects would not include construction of future housing or induce growth that could increase demand for schools in the area.

- v) Parks

Any near-term or future pipeline project would not physically alter any parks. Therefore, these projects would not create demand for new parks or other recreational facilities.

- vi) Other public facilities

Any near-term or future pipeline project would not result in the increased demand for electricity, gas, or other public facilities. These projects would improve the sewer and water utility system to keep up with current and projected demand.

XV. RECREATION –

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

Implementation of the near-term and/or future pipeline projects would replace and improve utility infrastructure. The improved infrastructure would not allow for increased access to existing recreation areas. These projects would not directly generate additional trips to existing recreation areas or induce future growth that would result in additional trips to these facilities. Therefore, these

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

projects would not increase the use of existing recreational areas such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Implementation of the near-term and/or future pipeline projects would replace and improve utility infrastructure and would not include the construction of recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project?

- a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Construction of the near-term and/or future pipeline projects would temporarily affect traffic circulation within the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE). However, an approved Traffic Control Plan would be implemented during construction so that traffic circulation would not be substantially impacted. Therefore, these projects would not result in an increase of traffic which is substantial in relation to existing traffic capacities.

- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Construction of the near-term and/or future pipeline projects would temporarily affect traffic circulation within the project's APE and its adjoining roads. However, an approved Traffic Control Plan would be implemented during construction so that traffic would not exceed cumulative or

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

individual levels of service.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

The near-term and any future projects covered under this MND would not include any tall structures or new features that could affect air traffic patterns or introduce new safety hazards related to air traffic.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

The near-term and any future projects covered under this MND would not include any tall structures or design features that would increase hazards in the area. All projects would be designed to meet City standards and therefore would meet existing levels of service.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Construction of the near-term or any future project would temporarily affect traffic circulation within the project's APE. However, an approved Traffic Control Plan would be implemented during construction so that there would be adequate emergency access.

- f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Construction of the near-term or any future project would temporarily impact circulation during construction activities as it relates to traffic, pedestrians, public transit and bicycles. However, the preparation of a Traffic Control Plan would ensure that any disruption to these services would not be significant.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>Construction of the near-term or any future projects covered under this MND would facilitate the treatment of wastewater and would not exceed the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.</p>				
<p>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Construction of the near-term or any future projects covered under this MND would result in improvements to water and sewer pipeline infrastructure. Use of this MND is limited to projects that would not result in a significant unmitigated impact to the environment.</p>				
<p>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Construction of the near-term or any future projects covered under this MND would not result in an increase in impervious surfaces as the scope is completely within the City Right-of-Way. Therefore, these projects would not require the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities.</p>				
<p>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>Construction of the near-term or any future projects covered under this MND would not increase the demand for water. These projects would improve the existing water pipelines system throughout the City.</p>				
<p>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provided which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>See XVII c)</p>				
<p>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Construction of the near-term or any future projects covered under this MND would not result in the demolition of structures. Construction of these projects would likely generate minimal waste. This waste would be disposed of in accordance with all applicable local and state regulations pertaining to solid waste including permitting capacity of the landfill serving the project area. Demolition or construction materials which can be recycled shall comply with the City's Construction and Demolition Debris Ordinance. Operation of the project would not generate waste and, therefore, would not affect the permitted capacity of the landfill serving the project area.

- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste?

See XVII f). Any solid waste generated during construction related activities would be recycled or disposed of in accordance with all applicable local state and feral regulations.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE –

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

Any near-term and/or future pipeline projects covered under this MND would be located within the developed public right of way and would not impact any *Sensitive Biological Resources*. Projects that would be located adjacent to the MHPA would be required to incorporate MHPA Land Use Adjacency measures to reduce any potential indirect impacts. As such, indirect impacts would be mitigated to below a level of significance. With respect to historical resources, mitigation for archaeology, paleontology and the built environment have been incorporated into the MND. Each project would be analyzed and a determination made regarding which mitigation measures would be applied in the subsequent environmental document and would be required to comply with the mitigation measures further detailed in Section V of this MND. As a result, project implementation would not result in a significant impact to these resources.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
-------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable futures projects)?

When viewed in connection with the effects of the near-term projects and any future pipeline projects on a Citywide basis, construction trenching has the potential to impact archaeological and paleontological resources which could incrementally contribute to a cumulative loss of non-renewable resources. However, with implementation of the mitigation measures found in Section V of the MND, this incremental impact would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Although any near-term and/or future projects could be located within a designated historical district, no direct or cumulative impact is anticipated because each project would be subject to review in accordance with the City’s Historical Resources Guidelines, and for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior Standards and this environmental document. Measures to reduce potential indirect impacts for projects located within a historic district would be incorporated into each subsequent environmental document when applicable to the conditions and environmental setting of the alignment. Therefore, no cumulative impact would result under these project types.

Because the near-term and/or future projects would not be located in areas where biological resources could be encountered and would not result in a cumulative loss of resources. Measures to reduce potential indirect impacts for projects located adjacent to the City’s MHPA would be incorporated into each subsequent environmental document when applicable to the conditions and environmental setting of the alignment. Implementation of the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines is consistent with the MSCP Subarea Plan & FEIR which addressed the cumulative loss of sensitive biological resources and edge effects on the MHPA from future development. Therefore, no cumulative impact would result under these project types.

c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

As stated previously, potentially significant impacts have been identified for Paleontological Resources, Archaeological Resources, Historical Resources (Historic Districts) and MHPA Land Use Adjacency. However, mitigation has been included in Section V of this MND to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. As such, project implementation would not result in substantial adverse impact to human beings.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

I. AESTHETICS / NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- Local Coastal Plan.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES & FOREST RESOURCES

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey - San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973.
- California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997)
- Site Specific Report:

III. AIR QUALITY

- California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990.
- Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) - APCD.
- Site Specific Report:

IV. BIOLOGY

- City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997
- City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996.
- City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multiple Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997.
- Community Plan - Resource Element.
- California Department of Fish and Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001.
- California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California," January 2001.
- City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines.
- Site Specific Report:

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES (INCLUDES HISTORICAL RESOURCES)

City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines.

City of San Diego Archaeology Library.

Historical Resources Board List.

Community Historical Survey:

Site Specific Report:

VI. GEOLOGY/SOILS

City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study.

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

Site Specific Report:

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Site Specific Report: 'Roadway Construction Emissions Models' conducted for each near-term project (2010 & 2011).

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing

San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division

FAA Determination

State Assessment and Mitigation, Unauthorized Release Listing, Public Use Authorized.

Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

Site Specific Report:

IX. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY

Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program - Flood Boundary and Floodway Map.

Clean Water Act Section 303(b) list, http://www.swrcb.ca.gov/tmdl/303d_lists.html.

Site Specific Report:

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan: Lindberg Field
- City of San Diego Zoning Maps
- FAA Determination

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES

- California Department of Conservation - Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification.
- Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 - Significant Resources Maps.
- California Geological Survey - SMARA Mineral Land Classification Maps.
- Site Specific Report:

XII. NOISE

- Community Plan
- San Diego International Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps.
- MCAS Miramar ACLUP
- Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps.
- Montgomery Field CNEL Maps.
- San Diego Association of Governments - San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes.
- San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.
- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Site Specific Report:

XIII. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines.
- Deméré, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996.
- Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2

Minute Quadrangles," California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 200, Sacramento, 1975.

- Kennedy, Michael P., and Siang S. Tan, "Geology of National City, Imperial Beach and Otay Mesa Quadrangles, Southern San Diego Metropolitan Area, California," Map Sheet 29, 1977.
- Site Specific Report:

XIV. POPULATION / HOUSING

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- Series 11 Population Forecasts, SANDAG.
- Other:

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plan.

XVI. RECREATIONAL RESOURCES

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- Department of Park and Recreation
- City of San Diego - San Diego Regional Bicycling Map
- Additional Resources:

XVII. TRANSPORTATION / CIRCULATION

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plan.
- San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG.
- San Diego Region Weekday Traffic Volumes, SANDAG.
- Site Specific Report:

XVIII. UTILITIES

- City of San Diego General Plan.
- Community Plan.

___ Site Specific Report:

XIX. WATER CONSERVATION

___ City of San Diego General Plan.

___ Community Plan.

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

___ Site Specific Report: