

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 Site Development Permit (SDP) based on conformance with the Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP); the Master Maintenance Protocols contained in the Master Program; and the SDP Conditions.

Date: April 4, 2018

Name of Preparer: Mariah Mills

Phone Number: (619) 527-7537

Email: mmills@san diego.gov

ACTIVITY INFORMATION

Master Program Map #(s): 70 & 76

City Equipment #(s): 88000117 (Map 70); 89000121 (Map 76)

Creek Name: Auburn Creek Channel

Watershed(s): Pueblo San Diego

Location: The Auburn Creek channel is located in the Fairmount Park and Ridgeview-Webster Communities in the City of San Diego south of Home Avenue and between Spillman Drive and 46th Street. The channel runs through an urban area and crosses Interstate 805 and Fairmount Avenue.

DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION PACKAGE

Included	NA	Document
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Maintenance Plan (IMP) – Appendix A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Biological Assessment (IBA) – Appendix B
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Historical Assessment (IHA) – Appendix C
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Hydrologic and Hydraulic Assessment (IHHA) – Appendix D
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Water Quality Assessment (IWQA) –Appendix E
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Noise Assessment (INA) – Appendix F
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) – Appendix G
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) – Appendix H

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	<p>Mitigation measures are included in the following SCR Appendices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual Maintenance Plan (IMP) - see Appendix A • Individual Biological Assessment (IBA) - see Appendix B • Individual Historical Assessment (IHA) - see Appendix C • Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) – see Appendix G <p>As the maintenance will not encounter subsurface paleontological resources, mitigation related to paleontological resources is not required. No activity-specific mitigation measures are required for land use.</p>
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	As required by Note 3 under Master Maintenance Program (MMP) Protocol Requirements, (Sheet 5 of the IMP), a pre-maintenance meeting will be scheduled in coordination with MMC prior to initiating project activities. A biological monitor, MMC, City Storm Water Division representative, qualified archaeologist, Native American monitor, and a qualified water quality specialist will be required and included in the pre-maintenance meeting.
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)	Pending	<p>For this project, the following permits and other approvals are pending:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial Conformance Review for City of San Diego Master Site Development Permit No. 1134892 • Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) 401 Water Quality Certification • Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) 404 Nationwide Permit • California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement (1602)

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 (cont.)			
General Mitigation (cont.)			
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)	Pending	As indicated in response to No. 3, an application for authorization under Section 1602 of the Fish and Game Code is pending.
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	The IBA (Appendix B) was prepared by HELIX biologists meeting the qualifications specified in the City of San Diego Guidelines for Conducting Biology Surveys (June 2012 revision), and covers each area proposed to be maintained in accordance with the specifications in the MMP.
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)	TBD	<i>Note: Requires further City review of the IMP and IBA to satisfy this requirement prior to initiation of any proposed annual maintenance activity.</i>
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 response to No. 5.
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)	Y	The mitigation efforts associated with this project will be funded by the T&SWD's annual budget. A Departmental Internal Order (I/O) number/account has been set up to track mitigation costs to allocate appropriate funding to implement associated biological mitigation projects.
9	Has evidence been provided documenting approval of the proposed maintenance by permitting authorities? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.5)	Pending	T&SWD will provide final authorization to comply with permitting authorities prior to final approval.
10	Does the IMP call for a pre-maintenance meeting, if identified in the associated IBA? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.6)	Y	See response to No. 2.

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 (cont.)			
Biological Resources (cont.)			
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)	Yes	<p>Emergency maintenance in 2016 removed vegetation and sediment within Reach 5 of MMP Map 70, resulting in 0.11 acre of impacts to City jurisdictional habitats including 0.01 acre of riparian scrub (disturbed mule fat scrub), 0.05 acre of riparian scrub (southern willow scrub), 0.04 acre of streambed and 0.01 acre of disturbed wetland (arundo-dominated). Proposed mitigation for 2016 emergency maintenance in Map 70 is in accordance with the Table 4.3.10 and modified SDP 1134892, consists of 0.03 acre of riparian scrub (disturbed mule fat scrub) (3:1 ratio), 0.10 acre of riparian scrub (southern willow scrub) (3:1 ratio) and 0.08 acre of streambed (2:1 ratio). Impacts to disturbed wetland (disturbed habitat, non-native riparian, and non-native vegetation/ornamental) consisting of pure stands of non-native species such as arundo, do not require compensatory mitigation under condition 15 of the SDP which references sections of the CDP, therefore no mitigation is proposed for impacts to arundo-dominated wetland. With the fulfillment of these mitigation obligations for 2016 emergency maintenance at MMP Map 70, subsequent mitigation will not be required for future impacts within the 2016 emergency maintenance footprint. The proposed maintenance within this section entirely overlaps with the previously impacted and mitigated area.</p> <p>Proposed FY19 maintenance at MMP Map 76 would impact 0.06 ac of natural flood channel, 0.01 ac of chaparral, <0.01 acre of disturbed wetland (arundo-dominated), 0.09 acre of ornamental vegetation, 0.04 acre of disturbed land and 0.24 acre of developed land. Proposed mitigation for proposed impacts to MMP Map 76, in accordance with the Table 4.3.10 and modified SDP 1134892, consists of 0.12 acre of natural flood channel mitigation (2:1 ratio) and less than 0.01 acre of chaparral (0.5:1 ratio). As described above, no mitigation is required for impacts to disturbed wetland (arundo-dominated), ornamental vegetation, disturbed land or developed land.</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)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont.)			
Biological Resources (cont.)			
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)	Y	<p>Wetland mitigation plans have been prepared in accordance with the Conceptual Wetland Restoration Plan contained in Appendix H of the Biological Technical Report, included as Appendix D.3 of the PEIR.</p> <p>Wetland mitigation proposed for Map 70 (0.26 acre) will be fulfilled by the 0.10 acre of enhancement identified in the Conceptual Wetland Mitigation Plan for 2015/2016 Emergency Channel Maintenance (Dudek 2018) and 0.16 acre of creation/restoration at the Otay Reed Mitigation Site (Wetland Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan for the Otay Reed Site, HELIX 2017).</p> <p>Wetland mitigation proposed for Map 76 (0.12 acre) will be fulfilled at the Stadium Mitigation Site (Atkins 2015) located along the San Diego River between I-15 and I-805 south of Qualcomm Stadium.</p>
13	Would upland impacts be compensated through payment into the, 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)	NA	Mitigation credits for upland impacts (0.005 acre) will be purchased from the City's Habitat Acquisition Fund.
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)	NA	Coastal California gnatcatchers (CAGNs) were not identified as a listed animal species with a moderate to high potential to be impacted in Appendix B – IBA. Thus, maintenance would not impact this species and mitigation is not 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)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont.)			
Biological Resources (cont.)			
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>Pursuant to the mitigation included in the IBA (Appendix B, page 9), pre-maintenance surveys would be conducted if maintenance activities occur during the breeding season of state or federally listed birds, raptors and other birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. If active nests are found, setbacks identified in the IBA would be respected as long as the nests are active.</p> <p>In addition, the qualified biologist shall point out or identify sensitive biological resources to be avoided during maintenance, flag/delineate sensitive resources to be avoided, review specific measures to be implemented to minimize direct/indirect impacts, and direct crews or other personnel to protect sensitive biological resources as necessary.</p>
16	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)	NA	See response to No. 12.
17	Does the IBA discuss appropriate actions to offset impacts to listed or endemic sensitive plant species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.15)	NA	No endemic sensitive plants species would be impacted by maintenance (See Appendix B – IBA).
18	Would maintenance activities meet setback requirements for sensitive species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.16)	Y	If maintenance is planned during the raptor nesting season, pre-maintenance surveys would be conducted and maintenance setback buffers established around active nests in accordance with the mitigation included in the IBA.
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	Impacts to nesting raptors could occur if maintenance is conducted during the raptor breeding season. Pages 12 and 13 of the IBA includes mitigation measures to avoid direct impacts and noise impacts to nesting raptors. Notes 5 and 7 under Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes a measure to avoid impacts nesting raptors.
20	Has evidence been submitted to document that protocol surveys have been conducted for potentially occurring sensitive bird species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.18)	NA	As described in Appendix B – IBA, biological surveys were conducted for the proposed maintenance. No sensitive bird species were identified, and no further protocol 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 PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont.)			
Biological Resources (cont.)			
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 response to No. 19 for mitigation measures for sensitive bird species.
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)	NA	Eucalyptus trees or other trees used by raptors for nesting would not be removed within 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)	NA	There are no known listed fish species occurring within the project area.
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	Listed/narrow endemic plants are not present in segments proposed for maintenance.
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)	Y	The IBA and IMP require specific measures to protect sensitive wildlife from adverse impacts related to maintenance including setbacks from active nests (see Notes 5 and 7 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP, and page 12 of Appendix B – IBA). If maintenance is conducted during the nesting season, these measures will be followed.
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	A qualified archaeologist has prepared an IHA (Appendix C) to document resource potential in the maintenance area. The IHA determined that the project occurs in an area of moderate cultural sensitivity.
27	Has an Individual Historical Assessment (IHA) been prepared for the proposed maintenance? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	An IHA has been prepared in compliance with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines and MMP (see Appendix C). As stated on page 4 of the IHA, there is a moderate possibility for cultural resources in Reaches 1 (Map 76) and 5 (Map 70).
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	An intensive field survey was completed by qualified archaeological consultants, which included archaeologists from HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. and a Native American Monitor from Red Tail Monitoring and Research. The results of the survey are included in the IHA in Appendix C.

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 (cont.)			
Historical Resources (cont.)			
29	Has a record search been requested from the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC)? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	A full records search was conducted from the SCIC in September 2015 for the Nestor Creek channels. See Appendix C – IHA.
30	Has an archaeological testing program been performed based on the City's Historical Resources Guidelines? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	NA	As stated on page 4 of the IHA, no cultural resources were identified within the maintenance area. MM 4.4.1 states “the archaeologist shall conduct an archaeological testing program for any identified historical resources,” and since no historic resources have been identified, testing is not required.
31	Have significant historical resources been identified within the proposed maintenance activity APE? If yes, address criteria numbers 32 through 38. If no, proceed to criteria number 39 (Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 and 4.4.2)	Y	There are no known significant resources within the APE. However, as stated on page 5 of the IHA, although no known significant resources occur within the APE, Reach 5 (Map 70) is located near two large lithic and ground stone artifact scatters. As such, within Reach 5, there is a moderate possibility that intact archaeological deposits could be impacted within areas adjacent to the channel or beneath the channel bottom. Additionally, the staging and maintenance areas for Reach 1 (Map 76) are located within close proximity to a known archaeological site. As such, within Reach 1, there is a moderate possibility that intact archaeological deposits could be impacted within the staging area and other areas adjacent to the channel or beneath the channel bottom. Therefore, Mitigation Measure 4.4.2 would be implemented and No. 32 through 38 are addressed below.
32	Has a Principal Investigator (PI) been selected and approved by the SWD and ADD Environmental Designee? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.1)	TBD	A PI will be selected and approved to satisfy this requirement prior to initiation of any proposed annual maintenance activity, pending required verification of the PI from the City's MMC.
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)	TBD	Mitigation recommendations from the IHA would be incorporated into the IMP to the satisfaction of the PI to satisfy this requirement prior to initiation of any proposed annual maintenance activity, pending required verification of the PI from the City's MMC.
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)	TBD	Pending required verification of the PI from the City's MMC to satisfy the requirements under No. 32, 33, and 35, and pending impacts to significant historical resources that cannot be avoided, the PI would prepare and implement an ARDDRP for the affected resources, with input from a Native American consultant.

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 (cont.)			
Historical Resources (cont.)			
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)	TBD	A pre-maintenance meeting will be planned and conducted on site to satisfy this requirement prior to initiation of any proposed annual maintenance activity, pending required verification of the PI from the City's MMC.
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)	TBD	Pending required verification of the PI from City's MMC to satisfy the requirements under No. 32, 33, and 35, and pending discovery of human remains in the course of conducting the ARDDRP, the procedures set forth in the Public Resources Code and Safety Code would be implemented.
37	Will the PI and Archaeologist assume required responsibilities? (Mitigation Measures 4.4.2.6, 4.4.2.7, and 4.4.2.8)	TBD	Pending verification of the PI from City's MMC to satisfy the requirements under No. 32 through 36, the PI and Archaeologist will assume the required responsibilities from Mitigation Measures 4.4.2.6 through 4.4.2.8.
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)	Y	The IHA identified a moderate potential for historical resources in Reaches 1 (Map 76) and 5 (Map 70). If cultural resources are inadvertently encountered during maintenance work, the maintenance crew will be required to halt work in the immediate area of the resource. The archaeological consultant and Native American monitor will examine the discovery and make a determination, in consultation with City staff, as to the significance of the discovery and whether mitigation measures are required, in accordance with Mitigation Measure 4.4.3.
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	The MHPA is located approximately 95 feet southeast of Map 70 (Figure 5 of Appendix B -IBA). For Map 76, the MHPA is approximately 700 feet to the east; due to this distance from the maintenance area, maintenance work would not extend into the MHPA and it is not included on the IMP sheets.

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 (cont.)			
Land Use (cont.)			
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)	NA	As indicated in the IBA and Response No. 39, the MHPA is located approximately 95 feet southeast of the maintenance area for Map 70. Maintenance would not be adjacent or within the MHPA, and there would be no direct or indirect impacts to MHPA. Therefore, areas within the MHPA were not surveyed. Areas outside of the MHPA that were within the maintenance area were surveyed for habitat of listed species; no habitat was found and there would not be a moderate or high potential for the maintenance to impact listed animal 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)	NA	According to Mitigation Measure 4.1.3, a noise analysis is required if a listed species is located within 750 feet of a proposed maintenance activity. As identified in Appendix B - IBA, listed species were not identified during the protocol survey. An Individual Noise Assessment (INA) is included as Appendix F.
42	Would the proposed maintenance have the potential to impact breeding activities of listed species? If yes, would maintenance activities be restricted to outside the breeding season? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.4)	Y	The IBA concludes that maintenance activities could impact nesting raptors and other MBTA protected birds. As indicated in response to No. 19, mitigation measures would be implemented during the breeding season to protect birds from significant impacts.
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	As indicated in response to No. 20, no listed birds are expected to occur in the maintenance area. Therefore, no mitigation measures are required.
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	A pre-maintenance meeting will be scheduled in coordination with MMC prior to initiating project activities. A biological monitor will be required and included in the pre-maintenance meeting. See response to No. 2 for more information.

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 (cont.)			
Land Use (cont.)			
45		Y	Notes under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP include the design measures specified by Mitigation Measure 4.1.7. Notes 10 through 19 under MMP Protocol Requirements will control trash and maintenance equipment servicing byproducts. In addition, Note 4 of the MMP Protocol Requirements section of the IMP on Sheet 5 contains provisions to preclude introduction of invasive plants. The IMP also limits maintenance access and staging to disturbed areas.
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)	NA	As indicated in Response No. 14, no suitable habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher will be impacted by the proposed maintenance. In addition, as indicated in Response No. 39, the maintenance areas will not be adjacent to or within an MHPA boundary.
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	Notes 14-19 of the MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP requires implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control erosion and sediment during maintenance. Additionally, Sheet 4 of the IMP provides a list of required Maintenance BMPs.
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	Note 14 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes this requirement.
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	Note 15 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes this requirement.
50	Does the IMP require training for personnel responsible for the proper installation, inspection, and maintenance of on-site BMPs. (WQ-4)	Y	Note 16 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes this requirement.
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)	Y	Note 17 under Maintenance BMPs on Sheet 4 of the IMP includes this requirement.

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 (cont.)			
Water Quality (cont.)			
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)	NA	The project is not subject to NPDES requirements because the NPDES General Construction Permit excludes projects that consist of “routine maintenance to maintain original line and grade, hydraulic capacity, or original purpose of the facility” activities (for more information, see Appendix G – WPCP, page 2). However, Note 13 under Maintenance BMPs on Sheet 4 of the IMP includes this requirement pursuant to City requirements.
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	Note 17 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes this requirement.
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	Note 18 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes this requirement.
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)	NA	The IHHA (Appendix D) determined that for the areas proposed for maintenance, Reach 1 (Map 76) and Reach 5 (Map 70), check dams were not necessary to reduce velocities based on the non-erosive velocities of the reaches.
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	Note 19 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP requires inspection of earthen-bottom storm water facilities within 30 days of the first 2-year storm following maintenance and implementation of appropriate remedial erosion control measures.
57	Does the IMP incorporate mitigation measures identified in the IWQA and/or Table 4.8-8 of the PEIR?	Y	Maintenance BMPs are identified on Sheet 4 of the IMP. In addition, the City will continue to implement general water quality improvement activities, as required. The City will utilize a suite of pollution prevention, source control, and treatment BMPs to address sediment and other pollutant inputs.

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 (cont.)			
Biological Resource Protection			
58	Does the IMP restrict vehicles to access designated in the Master Program? (BIO-1)	Y	Note 1 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP requires all vehicles to remain in the access areas designated in the MMP.
59	Does the IMP require delineation and flagging of all sensitive biological resources to remain within or adjacent to the maintenance area? (BIO-2)	Y	Note 2 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP requires flagging of all sensitive biological resources to remain within or adjacent to the maintenance area.
60	Does the IMP require a pre-maintenance meeting when maintenance will occur within or adjacent to sensitive biological resources? (BIO-3)	Y	Note 3 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP requires a pre-maintenance meeting.
61	Are erosion control measures designed to avoid introduction of invasive plant species? (BIO-4)	Y	Note 4 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP identifies erosion control measures to be implemented during maintenance.
62	Does the IMP require conducting pre-Master Maintenance Protocol surveys if maintenance is proposed during the breeding season of a sensitive animal species? (BIO-5)	Y	See Note 5 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP.
63	If arundo will be removed during maintenance, does the IMP include appropriate removal methods to minimize downstream dispersal? (BIO-6)	Y	Note 6 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes protocols for removal of arundo.
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	Note 7 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes this requirement.
65	Does the IMP include measures to minimize the potential for entrapping wildlife when implementing erosion control measures? (BIO-8).	NA	No erosion control measures are associated with the maintenance that would pose a substantial risk of entrapping wildlife.
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)	Y	Note 8 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP includes this requirement.
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	Note 9 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 4 of the IMP includes this requirement.

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 (cont.)			
Waste Management			
68	Does the IMP call for disposal of compostable green waste material at an approved composting facility, if available? (WM-1)	Y	Note 10 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP meets this requirement.
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)	Y	Note 11 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP meets this requirement.
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	Note 12 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP meets this requirement.
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	Note 13 under MMP Protocol Requirements on Sheet 5 of the IMP meets this requirement.