

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

Purpose: This Substantial Conformance Review (SCR) Checklist is intended to be used by Development Services Department Staff as an aid in reviewing storm water system maintenance projects for consistency with the modified Site Development Permit (SDP) based on conformance with the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP); the Maintenance Protocols contained in the Master Program; and the modified SDP Conditions.

Date: June 27, 2016

Name of Preparer: Catherine Rom

Phone Number: (619) 318-3616

Email: crom@sandiego.gov

ACTIVITY INFORMATION

Master Program

Map #(s): 71

City Equipment #(s): 88000037

Creek Name: Unnamed Tributary to South Chollas Valley (Hydrologic Unit Basin Number 8.22)

Watershed(s): Chollas Creek (Hydrologic Unit Basin Number 8.22)

Location: East of Rolando Blvd., south of University Ave., and north of Vista Grande Dr. in San Diego, CA

DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION PACKAGE

Included	NA	Document
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individual Maintenance Plan (IMP)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Biological Assessment (IBA)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individual Historical Assessment (IHA)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individual Hydrologic and Hydraulic Assessment (IHHA)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individual Water Quality Assessment (IWQA)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Individual Noise Assessment (INA)

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program			
General Mitigation			
1	Have mitigation measures for impacts to biological resources, historical resources, land use, and paleontological resources, as appropriate, been included in entirety on the submitted maintenance documents and contract specifications, under the heading, "Environmental Mitigation Requirements"? (General Mitigation Measure 1)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA and Attachment 7 -Regulatory Permits, which includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Services Department (DSD) Notice of Exemption (NOE); Emergency Project (Section 21080(b)(4); 15269(b) &(c) • Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Attachments D • Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Regional General Permit 63 Emergency; SPL-2015-00924-MG • California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600); Notification of Emergency Work
2	Is a Pre-maintenance Meeting required, including, as appropriate, the Mitigation Monitoring Coordinator (MMC), Storm Water Division (SWD) Project Manager, Biological Monitor, Historical Monitor, Paleontological Monitor, and Maintenance Contractor (MC), and other parties of interest? (General Mitigation Measure 2)	Y	See SCR Memo. Due to the emergency nature of the work, the pre-maintenance meeting was conducted on site on the first day of emergency maintenance (1/12/2016) and included a qualified monitoring biologist and field crews.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
3	Is there documented evidence of compliance with other permitting authorities (e.g., copies of permits issued, letters of resolution issued by the Responsible Agency documenting compliance, or other evidence documenting compliance and deemed acceptable by the Assistant Deputy Director [ADD] Environmental Designee), as applicable? (General Mitigation Measure 3)	Y	<p>For this project, the following permits and other approvals have been issued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modified Master Storm Water System Maintenance Program (MMP) • Master Maintenance Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) <p>See Also: Attachment 7 - Regulatory Permits, which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Services Department (DSD) Notice of Exemption (NOE); Emergency Project (Section 21080(b)(4); 15269(b) &(c)) • Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Attachment D • Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Regional General Permit 63 Emergency; SPL-2015-00924-MG • California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600); Notification of Emergency Work
4	Is there documented evidence of compliance with Section 1602 of the State of California Fish & Game Code (e.g., copies of permits issued, letters of resolution issued by the Responsible Agency documenting compliance, or other evidence documenting compliance and deemed acceptable by the ADD Environmental Designee), as applicable? (General Mitigation Measure 4)	Y	<p>See Attachment 7 - Regulatory Permits, which includes (among other permits):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600); Notification of Emergency Work

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Biological Resources			
5	Has a qualified biologist prepared an IBA for each area proposed to be maintained in accordance with the specifications included in the Master Program? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.1)	Y	Scott Gressard is a qualified biologist, and he prepared Attachment 1 – IBA, which covers each area proposed to be maintained in accordance with the specifications in the Master Maintenance Program.
6	Have the IMPs and IBAs for maintenance activities within a proposed annual maintenance program been approved by the City’s Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental Designee and state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over maintenance activities? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.2)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA and SCR Memo
7	Has an IBA been prepared by a qualified biologist for each proposed maintenance activity, including the required contents? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.3)	Y	See Attachment 1 - IBA
8	Has a mitigation account been established to provide sufficient funds to implement all biological mitigation associated with the proposed maintenance act? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.4)	N/A	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Ongoing mitigation efforts will be funded by Transportation & Storm Water Department. Internal order number XX has been set up to track these costs.
9	Has evidence been provided documenting approval of the proposed maintenance by permitting authorities? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.5)	Y	See Attachment 7 - Regulatory Permits, which includes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Services Department (DSD) Notice of Exemption (NOE); Emergency Project (Section 21080(b)(4); 15269(b) &(c) • Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Attachment D • Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Regional General Permit 63 Emergency; SPL-2015-00924-MG • California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement (1600); Notification of Emergency Work

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
10	Does the IMP call for a pre-maintenance meeting, if identified in the associated IBA? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.6)	Y	See SCR Memo as well as the Master List of BMPs, Maintenance Protocols, and Mitigation Measures, in the following sections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PEIR (WQ-4.8.3, page 3) • MMP (BIO-3, page 12) • PEIR (BIO-4.3.6, page 13) • MMP (HIST-2, page 28)
11	Does the IBA for each proposed maintenance activity identify appropriate wetland mitigation measures according to the ratios identified in Table 4.3-10? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.9)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA, Mitigation section. Mitigation locations for impacts from this emergency channel maintenance have not yet been identified.
12	Have wetland mitigation plans and enhancement and/or restoration plans been prepared and submitted to the DSD pursuant to the requirements described in Mitigation Measure 4.3.10? Are they consistent with Appendix H of the Biological Technical Report (BTR) contained in Appendix D.3 of the PEIR? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.10)	N	See response to #11 above and Attachment 1 – IBA; Mitigation section. Mitigation locations for impacts from this emergency channel maintenance have not yet been identified.
13	Would upland impacts be compensated through payment into the City's Habitat Acquisition Fund, or through acquisition and/or preservation of land in accordance with the ratios and requirements identified in Table 4.3-11? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.11)	N	See Attachment 1 – IBA; Maintenance Impacts section. No significant upland impacts occurred as part of this emergency maintenance and no biological mitigation is required or proposed.
14	If the maintenance activity would result in loss of habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher, is mitigation planned (i.e., through the acquisition of suitable habitat or mitigation credits within the MHPA at a ratio of 1:1, to be accomplished within six months of the date of maintenance completion? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.12)	N/A	N/A. See Attachment 1 – IBA. No suitable coastal California gnatcatcher habitat was impacted as part of this emergency channel maintenance.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
15	<p>If sensitive biological resources may be impacted, would the monitoring biologist be able to verify that the following actions have been taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fencing, flagging, signage, or other means to protect sensitive resources been implemented? • Are noise attenuation measures needed to protect sensitive wildlife in place and effective? • Have nesting raptors been identified and necessary maintenance setbacks have been established if maintenance is to occur between February 1 and August 1? <p>(Mitigation Measure 4.3.13)</p>	Y	<p>See Attachment 1– IBA.</p> <p>The monitoring biologist documented all impacts to sensitive resources during this emergency maintenance and verified that no unplanned impacts to these resources occurred.</p> <p>After January 15th, nesting surveys for raptors were conducted prior to maintenance. No nests were found within 500 feet of the maintenance area nor were any encountered during the maintenance period.</p>
16	<p>Have off-site mitigation areas been reviewed to determine if the mitigation would have a significant impact on biological resources located within the disturbance area of the mitigation? If so, have appropriate mitigation measures been proposed to reduce these impacts to below a level of significance? (Mitigation Measures 4.3.14)</p>	Y	<p>See response to #11 above and Attachment 1 – IBA, Mitigation section. Mitigation locations and plans for impacts from this emergency channel maintenance have not yet been identified or completed.</p>
17	<p>Does the IBA discuss appropriate actions to offset impacts to listed or endemic sensitive plant species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.15)</p>	Y	<p>See Attachment 1 – IBA. The emergency channel consisted primarily of non-native vegetation (i.e. palms) with only small patches of native vegetation suitable for special status species, resulting in low potential for sensitive plant species to occur. In addition, the maintenance area is surrounded by urban development and is isolated from other native communities further reducing the probability that endemic sensitive plant species would occur in the maintenance area.</p>

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST

MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
18	Would maintenance activities meet setback requirements for sensitive species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.16)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Yes, the maintenance activities would meet the setback requirements for sensitive species as nesting surveys were conducted daily after January 15th prior to work and no sensitive or avian species defined in Mitigation Measure 4.3.16 were detected onsite.
19	Would clearing, grubbing, or grading (inside and outside the MHPA) be restricted during the breeding season of the listed species? Have protocol surveys been conducted for other potentially occurring sensitive species? If observed, have adequate mitigation measures been identified in the IBA? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.17)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Nesting surveys were conducted for raptors prior to all work and no nests were observed; therefore no mitigation measures for these impacts were included in the IBA.
20	Has evidence been submitted to document that protocol surveys have been conducted for potentially occurring sensitive bird species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.18)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Nesting surveys were conducted for raptors prior to all work and no nests were observed; therefore no mitigation measures for these impacts were included in the IBA.
21	Has the IBA included appropriate mitigation measures when the potential exists for a sensitive bird species to occur near a proposed maintenance area and no protocol surveys have been conducted? (Mitigation Measures 4.3.19, 20 and 21)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA. With respect to Mitigation Measure 4.3.19, 20, and 21, the IBA included the requirement for daily nesting surveys for sensitive bird species (i.e. raptors) prior to the start of work after January 15 th . The results of these surveys were negative and no nests were found within 500 feet of the maintenance area nor were any encountered during the maintenance period. In addition, see response to #15 above in reference to noise attenuation measures for sensitive wildlife.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
22	Would removal of any eucalyptus trees or other trees used by raptors for nesting be proposed within the maintenance area? If yes, would maintenance include appropriate setbacks and limitations? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.22)	N	See Attachment 1 – IBA. No trees that would be used by raptors were removed within the maintenance area. Raptor nesting surveys were conducted daily prior to the start of work. No nests were found within 500 feet of the maintenance area.
23	Would maintenance activities occur at known localities for listed fish species? If yes, would maintenance include appropriate mitigation? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.23)	N	See Attachment 1 – IBA. There are no known listed fish species occurring within the emergency channel maintenance area.
Biological Resources (cont.)			
24	Would maintenance activities occur within areas supporting listed and/or narrow endemic plants? If yes, would maintenance proceed as described in Mitigation Measure 4.3.24?	N	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Listed/narrow endemic plants were not found and are not expected to be found within the emergency maintenance footprint.
25	If maintenance is proposed during the nesting season of avian species, including those species not covered by the MSCP, does the IBA require maintenance within or adjacent to avian nesting habitat occur outside of the avian breeding season (January 15 to August 31) unless postponing maintenance would result in a threat to human life or property? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.25)	N/A	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Due to the emergency nature of this work, postponing maintenance would result in a threat to human life and/or property surrounding the channel. In order to avoid impacts to any avian species, nesting surveys were conducted daily prior to the start of maintenance. No nests were found within 500 feet of the maintenance area nor were any encountered during the maintenance period.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Historical Resources			
26	Has a qualified archaeologist determined the potential for significant historical resources to occur in the maintenance area and prepared an IHA? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. A historical records search, in combination with the fact that work is limited to a stream channel that is subject to frequent scour, led to a determination that the potential for impacts to significant historical resources within the channel was low. The area around the channel was also determined to have a low potential for impacts to significant cultural resources, due to previous disturbances. An IHA was not prepared due to the emergency nature of the maintenance activities. A pedestrian survey was performed by Dudek archaeologist Brad Comeau, M.Sc., RPA and a Native American monitor prior to maintenance, which confirmed the low potential for significant resources.
27	Has an Individual Historical Assessment (IHA) been prepared for the proposed maintenance? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	N	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. Due to the emergency nature of the project, a formal IHA was not prepared. An updated records search and survey were implemented by Dudek.
28	If required, has a field survey of the maintenance activity APE been performed by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. A field survey was performed on January 8, 2016 by Dudek, with a Native American monitor from Red Tail Monitoring and Research, Inc. No resources were identified in the APE.
29	Has a record search been requested from the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC)? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. A historical records search was requested; no previously resources were identified in the APE.
30	Has an archaeological testing program been performed based on the City's Historical Resources Guidelines? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	N	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. No resources were identified during the survey or in the records search, therefore no testing was required.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
31	Have significant historical resources been identified within the proposed maintenance activity APE? If yes, address criteria numbers 36 through 42. If no, proceed to criteria number 43. (Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 and 4.4.2)	N	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. No significant historical resources were identified within the emergency channel maintenance APE.
32	Has a Principal Investigator (PI) been selected and approved by the SWD and ADD Environmental Designee? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.1)	Y	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. Brad Comeau is the selected and approved Principal Investigator (PI) for the project.
33	Have mitigation recommendations from the IHA been incorporated into the IMP to the satisfaction of the PI and the ADD Environmental Designee? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.2)	N	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. Since the potential for significant historical resources within this channel was low, but no previous archaeological studies have directly examined the area, a survey was performed prior to maintenance activities. Based on the negative survey results, no mitigation was required for this channel.
34	If impacts to significant historical resources cannot be avoided, has the PI prepared and implemented an Archaeological Research Design and Data Recovery Program (ARDDRP) for the affected resources, with input from a Native American consultant (approved by the ADD Environmental Designee? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.3)	N/A	N/A. See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. Impacts to historical resources were not expected and did not occur during maintenance.
35	Has a pre-maintenance meeting been planned and/or conducted on site, including representatives from the PI, Native American consultant, SWD, MMC, Resident Engineer (RE), and MC? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.4)	Y	Due to the low potential of significant cultural resources, and the determination that monitoring was not required, the PI and Native American consultant did not attend any pre-maintenance meetings.
36	If human remains have been discovered in the course of conducting the ARDDRP, would the procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) be implemented? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.5)	Y	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. The potential for historical resources were low and had human remains been found, the procedures described would have been implemented. However, no human remains were discovered during maintenance.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
37	Will the PI and Archaeologist assume required responsibilities? (Mitigation Measures 4.4.2.6, 4.4.2.7, and 4.4.2.8)	Y	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. The PI, Brad Comeau has assumed all required responsibilities.
38	If the IHA identifies a moderate to high potential for the occurrence of significant historical resources within the APE, would mitigation measures be implemented? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.3)	N/A	N/A. See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. As the channel was determined to have a low potential for significant historical resources, and the pedestrian survey did not find any resources, no mitigation measures were necessary.
Land Use			
39	Has the ADD Environmental Designee verified that all MHPA boundaries and limits of work have been delineated on all maintenance documents? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.1)	Y	See Attachment 7 – Regulatory Permits. There are no MHPA boundaries within or adjacent to the emergency channel maintenance area.
40	Has a qualified biologist (possessing a valid Endangered Species Act Section 10(a)(1)(a) recovery permit) surveyed habitat areas inside and outside the MHPA suspected to serve as habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo and/or other listed species? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.2)	Y	See Attachment 1 - IBA. There are no MHPA boundaries within or adjacent to the emergency channel maintenance area. Nesting surveys for raptors were conducted by the qualified monitoring biologist daily prior to maintenance and no nests were observed. There was no suitable habitat for California gnatcatcher within or adjacent to the emergency maintenance area, therefore no surveys were conducted for the species.
41	Has a qualified acoustician (possessing current noise engineer license or registration with monitoring noise level experience with listed animal species) performed a noise analysis for the proposed maintenance activity? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.3)	N	See SCR Memo, Noise Assessment section. Nesting surveys were conducted for raptors prior to all work and no nests were observed. Therefore, no technical noise analysis was conducted.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
42	Would the proposed maintenance have the potential to impact breeding activities of listed species? If yes, would maintenance activities be restricted to the breeding season? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.4)	N	See #40&41 above. See also Attachment 1 - IBA. Nesting surveys for raptors were conducted by the qualified monitoring biologist daily prior to maintenance and no nests were observed. All native vegetation suitable for nesting for special status species (i.e. Least Bell's vireo) was removed prior to the start of the species' nesting season. Therefore there was no potential for maintenance activities to impact breeding activities of listed species.
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program			
43	If maintenance cannot be avoided during an identified breeding season for a listed bird which is determined to be potentially significantly affected by maintenance, would the appropriate measures be taken? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.5)	Y	See #40, 41, & 42 above. See also Attachment 1 - IBA. Nesting surveys for raptors were conducted by the qualified monitoring biologist daily prior to maintenance and no nests were observed.
44	Has a pre-maintenance meeting been planned and/or conducted, including the MC, Project Biologist, and City representative? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.6)	Y	See Attachment A – IBA. The pre-maintenance meeting, attended by participants required in Mitigation Measure 4.1.6, was planned and conducted on site on the first day of maintenance (1/12/2016) due to the emergency nature of the work.
45	Does the IMP include appropriate maintenance designs? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.7)	N/A	See Attachment 1 – IBA and SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section. Due to the emergency nature of the project, a formal IMP was not prepared.
46	Has the ADD Environmental Designee verified that the MHPA boundaries and the requirements regarding coastal California gnatcatcher been included in the IMP and/or IBA? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.8)	N/A	See Attachment 1 – IBA and Attachment 7 – Regulatory Permits. There are no MHPA boundaries within or adjacent to the emergency channel maintenance area. No suitable coastal California gnatcatcher present within or adjacent to the channel, therefore no focused surveys were conducted.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program Protocols			
Water Quality			
47	Does the IMP include measures to stabilize designated access roads (or other graded areas) with permeable protective surfacing (e.g., grasscrete), storm water diversion structures (e.g., brow ditches or berms), or crossing structures (e.g., culverts) to control erosion and prevent off-site sediment transport? (WQ-1)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA and SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section. Since this work was conducted as emergency channel maintenance, no Water Pollution Control Plan was drafted. Where applicable, measures to stabilize designated access roads/staging areas were applied.
48	Does the IMP include measures to prevent off-site sediment transport during maintenance through the use erosion and sediment controls within storm water facilities, along access routes and around stockpile/staging areas? Will temporary erosion or sediment control measures be removed upon completion of maintenance unless their removal would result in greater environmental impact than leaving them in place? (WQ-2)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA and SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section. Fiber rolls were installed around stockpiled material outside of channel width and along all unvegetated slopes following maintenance. A sand bag berm was placed at the downstream end of the maintenance area to prevent any incidental flows from transporting sediment/pollutants downstream from work areas. Fiber rolls were also installed on the exposed earthen slopes following maintenance in order to prevent erosion.
49	Does the IMP require storage of BMP materials on-site in a way that provides complete protection of exposed areas and prevent off-site sediment transport? (WQ-3)	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section.
50	Does the IMP require training for personnel responsible for the proper installation, inspection, and maintenance of on-site BMPs. (WQ-4)	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section.
51	Does the IMP require revegetation of spoil and staging areas within 30 days of completion of maintenance activities? Does it require monitoring and maintenance of revegetated areas for a period of not less than 25 months following planting? (WQ-5)	N	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Select areas of staging and access will be revegetated or stabilized using Erosion Control Blanket or soil tackifier. These areas will be monitoring for a period of no less than 25 months following installation No invasive species have been used or will be used in any future revegetation that is implemented.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
52	Does the IMP require sampling and analysis; monitoring and reporting; and post-maintenance management programs per National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and/or City requirements? (WQ-6)	N	Since BMPs were installed (i.e. sandbag berms, pump diversion systems, etc...) to prevent storm water from being discharged from the maintenance area. Ground water that entered the work area was not allowed to pass downstream or was pumped to a section of the channel where there was positive flow to the west prior to the start of work. Any residual standing water within the work area was allowed to dissipate or evaporate prior to start of work, when practicable, therefore no such sampling/analysis was required.
53	Does the IMP prohibit storing hazardous materials used during maintenance within 50 feet from storm water facilities? Does it require hazardous materials to be managed and stored in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations? (WQ-7)	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section.
54	Does the IMP prohibit storage of maintenance-related trash in areas within 50 feet from storm water facilities, and require removal of trash in receptacles at least weekly? (WQ-8)	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section.
55	Does the IMP require installation of any check dam or other comparable mechanism identified in the corresponding IHHA? Are these structures required to be removed when vegetation growth has reached a point where the structure is no longer required unless removal would result in greater environmental harm than leaving them in place? (WQ-9)	N	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
56	Does the IMP require inspection of earthen-bottom storm water facilities within 30 days of the first 2-year storm following maintenance? Are erosion control measures recommended by the field engineer incorporated into the IMP? (WQ-10)	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section. Inspection is required and will be conducted at the appropriate time. The channel is currently being evaluated by Rick Engineering to determine overall channel bed and bank stability and potential improvements to reduce potential erosion.
57	Does the IMP incorporate mitigation measures identified in the IWQA and/or Table 4.8-8 of the PEIR?	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan & Water Quality Assessment sections
Master Program Protocols (cont.)			
Biological Resource Protection			
58	Does the IMP restrict vehicles to access designated in the Master Program? (BIO-1)	Y	See Attachment 7 - Regulatory Permits and SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section. All vehicles were restricted to access areas defined in the approved agency emergency permit applications.
59	Does the IMP require delineation and flagging of all sensitive biological resources to remain within or adjacent to the maintenance area? (BIO-2)	N/A	See Attachment 1 – IBA and SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section. No sensitive biological resources were identified within or adjacent to the maintenance area that were to remain and required flagging.
60	Does the IMP require a pre-maintenance meeting when maintenance will occur within or adjacent to sensitive biological resources? (BIO-3)	Y	Refer to #59 above.
61	Are erosion control measures designed to avoid introduction of invasive plant species? (BIO-4)	Y	See Attachment 1 - IBA and SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section.
62	Does the IMP require conducting pre-maintenance protocol surveys if maintenance is proposed during the breeding season of a sensitive animal species? (BIO-5)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Nesting surveys for raptors were conducted by the qualified monitoring biologist daily prior to maintenance and no nests were observed.
63	If arundo will be removed during maintenance, does the IMP include appropriate removal methods to minimize downstream dispersal? (BIO-6)	N	See Attachment 1 – IBA. No Arundo was removed as part of this maintenance.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
64	Does the IMP prohibit the use of mechanized maintenance within 300 feet of a Cooper's hawk nest, 900 feet of a northern harrier's nest, or 500 feet of any other raptor's nest until any fledglings have left the nest? (BIO-7)	Y	See Attachment 1 – IBA. Nesting surveys for raptors were conducted by the qualified monitoring biologist daily prior to maintenance and no nests were observed.
65	Does the IMP include measures to minimize the potential for entrapping wildlife when implementing erosion control measures? (BIO-8).	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section. All BMPs were installed within the staging area and banks of the channel only and the potential for entrapping wildlife was low.
Historical Resource Protection			
66	Does the IMP call for flagging, capping, or fencing of all historical resource areas in the field prior to initiation of maintenance activities in the presence of a qualified historical resource specialist, as necessary)? (HIST-1)	N	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. The field survey and historical records search indicated that potential for historical resource areas in and around the channel maintenance was low, therefore no flagging, capping, or fencing occurred or was required.
67	Does the IMP require a pre-maintenance meeting on-site when maintenance activities are determined in the IHA to potentially impact historic resources? (HIST-2)	Y	See SCR Memo, Historical Assessment section. Due to the low likelihood of historical resources being present onsite, the historical assessment summary did not require a pre-maintenance meeting for this work.
Waste Management			
68	Does the IMP call for disposal of compostable green waste material at an approved composting facility, if available? (WM-1)	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section.
69	Does the IMP call for screening of soil, sand, and silt to remove waste debris and, wherever possible, to be re-used as fill material, aggregate, or other raw material? (WM-2)	N	This work was conducted as an Emergency Channel Maintenance project and there was limited opportunity for the re-use of material during construction. Rip rap removed from the southwest bank of the channel was re-used to repair the bank structure. See Attachment 7 - Regulatory Permits and SCR Memo.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST**MASTER STORM WATER SYSTEM MAINTENANCE PROGRAM**

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
70	Does the IMP call for separation and transport of waste tires to an appropriate disposal facility, including the completion of a Comprehensive Trip Log (CTL) if more than nine tires are in a vehicle or waste bin at any one time? (WM-3)	Y	No tires were encountered during maintenance. See Attachment B - Regulatory Permits and Attachment C - Dudek SCR Memo; Individual Maintenance Plan.
71	Does the IMP require hazardous materials encountered during maintenance to be logged under a hazardous materials manifest and transported to an approved hazardous waste storage, recycling, treatment or disposal facility? (WM-4)	Y	See SCR Memo, Individual Maintenance Plan section. Spill containment materials were available during emergency maintenance; however no spills occurred and no hazardous materials were encountered during maintenance.