EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This summary provides a brief synopsis of the Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) Update project description, the results of the environmental analysis, and project alternatives considered in this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis contained in the Program EIR. Therefore, the reader should review the entire Program EIR to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

This document has been prepared as a Program EIR pursuant to Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines, and it represents the independent judgment of the City as Lead Agency (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15050).

ES-1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project area for the BMP Update includes the jurisdictional boundaries of the City of San Diego (City), which encompasses approximately 342.5 square miles.

The proposed project is the update of the City's 2002 BMP. The 2002 BMP is a policy document that addressed issues such as bikeway planning, community involvement, facility design, bikeway classifications, utilization of existing resources, multi-modal integration, safety and education, support facilities, implementation, maintenance and funding strategies.

The City is updating the 2002 BMP to provide a renewed bicycle plan for the City and a framework for making cycling a more practical and convenient transportation option for a wide variety of San Diegans with different riding purposes and skill-levels. The primary goals and objectives of the proposed project include:

- Provide a framework to guide the implementation of an expanded bicycle network within the City to promote bicycling as a transportation mode;
- Provide improved local and regional bicycle connectivity to transit centers, employment centers, shopping districts, parks, and other local amenities;
- Provide a safe and comprehensive local and regional bikeway network; and
- Supplement the City's General Plan Mobility Element with policies focused on enhancing bicycling as a viable transportation mode in the City.

The project proposes the following project features:

- Bikeways;
- Bike Parking and End-of-Trip Facilities;
- Bicycle Signal Detection;
- Signage and Striping;
- Multi-Modal Connections; and
- Other Bikeway-related Improvements.

There are approximately 511 miles of existing facilities, the majority of which are Class II Bike Lanes. The City's existing bicycle network is comprised of Bike Paths, Bike Lanes, Bike Routes,

and freeway shoulder where Caltrans permits bicycle use. Class I Bike Paths consist of off-street paved right-of-way for exclusive use by bicyclists, pedestrians, and those using non-motorized modes of travel; Class II Bike Lanes are one-way facilities on either side of a roadway designated for exclusive or preferential bicycle travel with striping and signage; and Class III Bike Routes use signage to provide shared use with motor vehicle traffic within the same travel lane.

The proposed bicycle network includes an additional 595 miles of bicycle facilities, for a future network totaling approximately 1,090 miles. For purposes of analysis in this Program EIR, proposed bikeways[1] are grouped into three categories:

- Off-street Bikeways;
- On-street Bikeways With Widening; and
- On-street Bikeways Without Widening.

Off-street Bikeways are not associated with a roadway carrying motorized vehicle traffic. They would be constructed within their own right-of-way outside of a roadway "footprint." On-street Bikeways would provide bicycle facilities in association with a roadway carrying motorized vehicle traffic. This may only involve the addition of bikeway signage, striping, and related improvements without the need for roadway modifications outside of the existing roadway "footprint." Such bikeways are grouped together for analysis as On-street Bikeways Without Widening. On-street Bikeways requiring roadway modifications beyond the existing roadway "footprint" are referred to as On-street Bikeways With Widening.

The proposed network is summarized in Table ES-1, *Proposed San Diego Bicycle Network.*

Table ES-1
PROPOSED SAN DIEGO BICYCLE NETWORK

Facility Type	Miles of Existing Facility	Miles of Proposed Unbuilt Facility	Total Miles of Facility
Class I - Bike Path	72.3	94.1	166.4
Class II - Bike Lane	309.4	140.6	450.0
Class III - Bike Route	112.9	171.2	284.1
Class II or III[1]	NA	143.4	143.4
Freeway Shoulder[2]	16.1	0	16.12
Bicycle Boulevard	0	39.4	39.4
Cycle Track	0	6.6	6.6
TOTAL	**510.7**	595.3	1,089.9

[1] It is undetermined at this point whether 143.4 miles of proposed bikeways would be Class II or Class III bikeways.
[2]Facility not included in the total summary
NA = not applicable
Source: BMP Update 2011

[1] "Bikeway," as used in this document, refers to Bike Paths, Bike Lanes, and Bike Routes (as s defined in the Caltrans Highway Design Manual [2012b]), as well as Bicycle Boulevards and Cycle Tracks (that are not currently classified in the Highway Design Manual).

The BMP Update recommends provision of additional bicycle parking facilities in new and existing commercial, retail, and employment areas. Bicycle parking recommendations include the City's standard inverted-U bike racks, lockers, high-capacity bike parking such as corrals, and a bike station. In addition to parking accommodations, end-of-trip facilities such as restrooms, changing rooms, showers, and storage for bicycling clothes (helmet and other gear) are especially important for cyclists who commute to work or school.

Signal detection would be provided at signalized intersections for new bikeways, where possible. Pavement stenciling to educate bicyclists and motorists would be provided along new on-street bikeways and existing roadways with loop detectors.

Signage would be provided for bikeways implemented under the BMP Update where no signs exist. Proposed signage includes:

- "Share the Road" signs for Class III bike routes;
- Designated bikeway signs;
- Bicycle boulevard identification ;
- Wayfinding signs; and
- Warning signage.

The project proposes to improve connections to transit facilities by: (1) providing bicycle access to transit stops; and (2) providing bicycle parking facilities at transit stops. Such measures are intended to provide a convenient connection for bicyclists to continue their trips on public transit vehicles. The BMP Update's proposed bikeway network would connect to existing transit stops and bicycle parking at major train, trolley, and bus transit stops.

Other bikeway-related improvements could include landscaping, lighting, fencing, drainage facilities, and utility work.

ES-2 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The Program EIR contains an environmental analysis of the potential impacts associated with implementation of the proposed BMP Update. The issues that are addressed in detail in the Program EIR are Biological Resources, Historical Resources, Transportation/Circulation, Visual Quality/Neighborhood Character, Paleontological Resources, and Geologic Conditions. The analysis concluded that significant, direct and/or cumulative impacts could occur with respect to each of these six issues. All potentially significant impacts are expected to be reduced to below a level of significance by proposed mitigation measures with the exception of Transportation/Circulation.

Based on initial environmental review of the BMP Update, the City has determined that the proposed project would not have the potential to cause significant adverse effects in the following areas: Agricultural and Forest Resources, Air Quality, Energy, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Human Health and Public Safety, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services and Facilities, Public Utilities, and Recreation.

Table ES-2, *Project Impacts and Proposed Mitigation*, at the end of this section summarizes the BMP Update's potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures by issue, as analyzed in Sections 5.0, *Environmental Impact Analysis*, and 6.0, *Cumulative Effects*, of this Program EIR. The last column of this table indicates whether the impact is expected to be reduced to below a level of significance after implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

ES-3 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Alternatives to the proposed BMP Update are evaluated in Section 10.0, *Alternatives*, of this Program EIR in terms of their ability to meet most of the objectives of the proposed project, and eliminate or further reduce significant environmental effects of the project. In addition, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires the inclusion of a No Project Alternative. The alternatives considered in this Program EIR include the following alternatives:

- No Project/No New Bikeways – This alternative assumes that no new bicycle facilities are constructed beyond those in existence.
- No Project/Implementation of Current Bicycle Master Plan – This alternative assumes that the City's bicycle network is implemented pursuant to the currently adopted 2002 BMP.
- Reduced Traffic Impact – This alternative assumes that all facilities of the BMP Update would be implemented except for bikeways where lane removals and/or median modifications (or other proposed features) would significantly impact intersections or roadways.
- Reduced Biology Impact – This alternative assumes that all facilities of the BMP Update would be implemented except for bikeways that would impact sensitive habitat (Multiple Species Conservation Plan [MSCP] Tier I, II, and III habitats).

These alternatives are briefly summarized below.

No Project/No New Bikeways Alternative

With the No Project/No New Bikeways Alternative, the existing bikeway network would remain as is. The City would maintain the approximately 510 total miles of existing bikeways. The proposed additional bikeways would not be constructed. Additional other facilities proposed in the BMP Update (e.g., way-finding signage, bicycle detector loops, etc.) would not be developed. In addition, no new policies emphasizing enhancement of bicycle planning would be provided to supplement the City's General Plan Mobility Element policies regarding bicycling.

The No Project/No New Bikeways Alternative would avoid all potential impacts of the BMP Update, but the alternative would not provide the beneficial impacts of enhancing bicycle and pedestrian circulation and safety, which would result in a reduction of vehicular traffic throughout the City. The No Project/No New Bikeways Alternative also would not provide other beneficial impacts on air quality and energy, and would not provide a framework for an expanded bicycle network, improve local and regional bicycle connectivity, provide a comprehensive bikeway network, or supplement the City's General Plan Mobility Element. This alternative therefore would not meet any of the BMP Update objectives.

No Project/Implementation of Current Bicycle Master Plan Alternative

With the No Project/Implementation of Current Bicycle Master Plan Alternative, the existing bikeway network would be improved to include the bikeways and other facilities proposed in the current San Diego Bicycle Master Plan (Alta Transportation Consulting 2002). The 2002 BMP recommends four categories of bikeway projects: Programmed, Top Priority, Second Priority, and Third Priority. In addition to identifying specific bikeway projects, the 2002 BMP was developed to serve as a policy document that addresses important issues related to San Diego's bikeways such as planning, community involvement, utilization of existing resources, facility design, multi-modal integration, safety and education, and support facilities, as well as specific programs, implementation, maintenance, and funding.

Overall, the 2002 BMP would have more miles of bikeways likely to cause impacts compared to the BMP Update (67 miles versus 60 miles of Class I or mix of Class II and III). Based on this comparison, the 2002 BMP would have greater impacts than the BMP Update. This comparison does not take into account the lower priority projects proposed for either program, however. The No Project/Implementation of Current Bicycle Master Plan Alternative would provide a framework for an expanded bicycle network, improve local and regional bicycle connectivity, and provide a comprehensive bikeway network. This alternative therefore would meet most of the BMP Update objectives.

Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative

With the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative, all facilities and policies of the BMP Update would be implemented with the following exception: bikeways where lane removals and/or median modifications (or other proposed features) are demonstrated through project specific traffic analysis to significantly impact intersections or roadways would not be implemented. These bikeways could include a Class I (Bike Path), Class II (Bike Lane), or Class III (Bike Route) facility, depending on the type of traffic impact determined to occur from each proposed facility on a project by project basis.

This alternative would avoid some of the temporary and permanent direct and indirect potential impacts associated with constructing the bikeways proposed by the BMP Update because fewer bikeways would be implemented. In particular, the Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative would avoid potentially significant Traffic/Circulation impacts (including those impacts identified as potentially unmitigable to below a level of significance), and possibly avoid other impacts that could be caused by those bikeways that would otherwise have been implemented by the BMP Update.

The Reduced Traffic Impact Alternative would meet most of the BMP Update objectives, but would not provide beneficial impacts to the same degree as the complete BMP Update, including enhancing bicycle and pedestrian circulation and safety, reducing vehicular traffic, reducing vehicular emissions of pollutants and GHG emissions in the long term, and reducing overall energy consumption related to transportation.

Reduced Biology Impact Alternative

With the Reduced Biology Impact Alternative, all facilities and policies of the BMP Update would be implemented with the following exception: bikeways where any proposed features are demonstrated through project specific biological resources analysis to significantly impact sensitive habitat (MSCP Tier I, II, and III habitats) would not be implemented. These bikeways would most likely be a Class I (Bike Path) facility, depending on the type of biological resources impact determined to occur from each proposed facility on a project by project basis.

The Reduced Biology Impact Alternative would avoid potentially significant impacts to biological resources, and possibly avoid other impacts that could be caused by those bikeways that would otherwise have been implemented by the BMP Update.

Although the Reduced Biology Impact Alternative would avoid certain potential impacts of the BMP Update and meet most of the BMP Update objectives, the alternative would not provide beneficial impacts to the same degree as the complete BMP Update, including enhancing bicycle and pedestrian circulation and safety, reducing vehicular traffic, reducing vehicular emissions of pollutants and GHG emissions in the long term, and reducing overall energy consumption related to transportation. It also may not fully implement General Plan policies to provide access to, and connect open space areas (Recreation Element Policies RE-D.6 and RE-D.7).

ES-4 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY/ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

The City prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated June 25, 2012, and distributed it to the public including all responsible and trustee agencies, members of the general public and governmental agencies, including the State Clearinghouse. Comment letters received on the NOP are in Appendix A of this Program EIR along with copies of the NOP, City of San Diego scoping letter, and NOP distribution list. In addition, a scoping meeting was held on July 9, 2012 to inform the public about the project and collect written comments. Input and comments received on the content of this Program EIR during the scoping meeting include concerns regarding traffic, consistency with the SANDAG Regional Bike Plan; metrics used to evaluate the bicycle program; providing signalized intersections that are equipped for bicycle circulation; subsequent CEQA documentation; and evaluating existing non-standard design features for bicycle safety. Oral and written comments received by the City during the scoping process have been taken into consideration during preparation of this Program EIR.

Table ES-2
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
The project could potentially result in direct and indirect impacts to candidate, sensitive, or special status species.	***Bio-1***: A biological resources report shall be prepared for bikeways proposed in naturally vegetated areas or adjacent to the Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). The biological resources report shall identify sensitive biological resources within and adjacent to the proposed bikeway alignment and make recommendations for avoidance and minimization of impacts to those resources identified. If the project-level biological resources report determines that sensitive biological resources are within or adjacent to the proposed bikeway alignment, one or more of the following mitigation measures shall be implemented, as applicable. As each future bikeway project implemented under the BMP Update is reviewed under CEQA, additional specificity may be required with respect to mitigation measures identified below. If a biological resources report is required at the time of a specific bikeway project submittal, the report shall be prepared utilizing current biological mitigation and monitoring in accordance with City requirements. The biological resources report will include a specific detailed analysis of consistency with MSCP policies and guidelines, including MSCP Subarea Plan policies for the particular project location.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
	Bio-2: Proposed bikeways shall be designed to minimize impacts to biological resources. Projects within or adjacent to sensitive biological resource areas shall incorporate the following design features: ▪ Existing trails shall be used whenever feasible. ▪ Reduction in path width shall be considered in sensitive biological resource areas. ▪ Bikeways shall be designed to avoid damage to trees, where possible. When avoidance is not feasible, trees shall be protected during construction, transplanted or replaced. ▪ Use of decomposed granite, unpaved trail, or equivalent pervious trail surface shall be considered.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
	Bio-3: Proposed bikeways adjacent to the MHPA shall conform to all applicable MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (Section 1.4.3) of the MSCP Subarea Plan. In particular, lighting, drainage, landscaping, grading, access, and noise must not result in a substantial, adverse effect on the MHPA. Prior to issuance of grading permits, the following shall occur:	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	▪ Lighting shall be directed away from the MHPA, and shielded if necessary. ▪ Drainage shall be directed away from the MHPA, or if not possible, must not drain directly into the MHPA. Instead, runoff should flow into sedimentation basins, grassy swales, or mechanical trapping devices prior to draining into the MHPA. Drainage shall be shown on the site plan and reviewed satisfactory to the City Engineer. ▪ Landscape plans for bikeways shall be reviewed and approved by the Development Services Department Environmental Review Manager (ERM) to ensure that no invasive non-native plant species shall be planted in or adjacent to the MHPA. ▪ Manufactured slopes shall be included within the development footprint of proposed bikeways and outside the MHPA. ▪ Construction activities associated with proposed bikeways located within or adjacent to the MHPA shall occur outside of the avian breeding season, if feasible. If avoidance of the breeding season is not feasible, additional measures identified in the project-specific biological resources report shall be implemented, such as temporary noise barriers. Litter and trash will be removed on a regular basis. Signage will be installed to prevent littering and encourage reporting of littering in trail and road access areas. Trash cans and bins will be provided at trail access points. Signage will be installed notifying users that penalties will be imposed for littering and dumping.	
	Bio-4: Biological mitigation for direct impacts to upland habitat shall be in accordance with the City's Biology Guidelines. Prior to the commencement of construction related activity (including earthwork and fencing), mitigation for direct impacts to Tier I, Tier II, Tier IIIA, and Tier IIIB upland habitat shall be assured to the satisfaction of the ERM through preservation of upland habitats in conformance with the City's Biology Guidelines, MSCP, and ESL Regulations.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	Mitigation for upland habitats may include on-site preservation, on-site enhancement/restoration; payment into the Habitat Acquisition Fund; acquisition/dedication of habitat inside or outside the MHPA; or other mitigation as approved by the ERM, MSCP staff, and the Park and Recreation (if applicable), as described below. Any restoration plans are subject to review by the City's Environmental Analysis Section (EAS), Parks and Recreation, and MSCP staff prior to issuance of any grading permits. These entities also must sign off on final acceptance of the mitigation project as successful.	
	Bio-5: Impacts to wetlands shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable and fully mitigated per the Biology Guidelines. For projects with the potential to affect wetlands, the project-specific biological resources report shall include an analysis of wetlands (including City, state and federal jurisdiction analysis) within and adjacent to the footprint of the proposed bikeway and measures to avoid or minimize impacts to wetlands. If impacts to wetlands cannot be avoided, a conceptual mitigation program (which includes identification of the mitigation site) must be prepared by the City and approved by the resource agency or agencies with jurisdiction over the affected wetlands, and implemented by the City. In addition, prior to the commencement of any construction related activities on-site for Off-Street Bikeway projects impacting wetland habitat (including earthwork and fencing), the applicant shall provide evidence[2] of the following to the Environmental Review Manager (ERM) prior to any construction activity: ▪ Compliance with ACOE Section 404 nationwide permit; ▪ Compliance with the Regional Water Quality Control Board Section 401 Water Quality Certification; and ▪ Compliance with the CDFW Section 1601/1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

[2] Evidence shall include either copies of permits issued, letter of resolutions issued by the responsible agency documenting compliance, or other evidence documenting compliance and deemed acceptable by the Assistance Deputy Director (ADD) of City Land Development Review (LDR) Department.

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	Bio-6: Proposed bikeways shall provide for continued wildlife movement through wildlife corridors as identified in the MSCP Subarea Plan or as identified through project-level analysis. Mitigation may include, but is not limited to, provision of appropriately-sized bridges, culverts, or other openings to allow wildlife movement. The following mitigation measures shall be implemented for proposed bikeways that could potentially impact the following specific candidate, sensitive, or special status species through grading or clearing activities in areas where there is potential for these sensitive species to occur: ▪ Coastal California gnatcatcher (Federally Threatened); ▪ Least Bell's vireo (State Endangered/Federally Endangered); and ▪ Southwestern willow flycatcher *(*Federally Endangered).	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
	Bio-7: Prior to the issuance of any authorization to proceed, the City's ERM (or appointed designee) shall verify that the MHPA boundaries and the following project requirements regarding the coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and southwestern willow flycatcher are shown on the grading and building permit plans: **No clearing, grubbing, grading or other construction activities shall occur between March 1 and August 15, the breeding season of the coastal California gnatcatcher; between March 15 and September 15, the breeding season of the least Bell's vireo; and 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 Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) of Land Development Review Division (LDR).** A qualified biologist (possessing a valid Endangered Species Act Section 10(a)(1)(A) Recovery Permit) shall survey habitat areas (only within the MHPA for gnatcatchers) that would be subject to the construction noise levels exceeding 60 decibels [dB(A)] hourly average for the presence of the coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and the southwestern willow flycatcher.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)	
	Surveys for this species shall be conducted pursuant to the protocol survey guidelines established by the USFWS within the breeding season prior to the commencement of construction. **If the coastal California gnatcatchers, least Bell's vireo, and/or the southwestern willow flycatcher are present, then the following conditions must be met:** o Between March 1 and August 15 for occupied gnatcatcher habitat, between March 15 and August 15 for occupied least Bell's vireo habitat, and between May 1 and September 1 for occupied southwestern willow flycatcher habitat, no clearing, grubbing, or grading of occupied habitat shall be permitted. Areas restricted from such activities shall be staked or fenced under the supervision of a qualified biologist; **AND** o Between March 1 and August 15 for occupied gnatcatcher habitat, between March 15 and August 15 for occupied least Bell's vireo habitat, and between May 1 and September 1 for occupied southwestern willow flycatcher habitat, 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 the occupied 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 a current noise engineer license or registration with monitoring noise level experience with listed animal species) and approved by the ERM at least two weeks prior to the commencement of construction activities; OR o At least two weeks prior to the commencement of clearing, grubbing, grading and/or any 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 aforementioned avian species. Concurrent with the commencement of construction activities and the construction of necessary noise attenuation facilities, noise monitoring shall be	

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)	
	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 appropriate breeding season. o ** 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 ERM, 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.* o If the aforementioned avian species are not detected during the protocol survey, the qualified biologist shall submit substantial evidence to the ERM and applicable resource agencies which demonstrate whether or not mitigation measures such as noise walls are necessary during the applicable breeding seasons of March 1 and August 15, March 15 and September 15, and May 1 and September 1, as follows: o If this evidence indicates the potential is high for the aforementioned avian species to be present based on historical records or site conditions, then Condition 1-b or 1-c shall be adhered to as specified above. o If this evidence concludes that no impacts to the species are anticipated, no new mitigation measures are necessary. o If the City begins construction prior to the completion of the protocol avian surveys, then the Development Services Department shall assume that the appropriate avian species are present and all necessary protection and mitigation measures shall be required as described in 1 a, b, and c.	

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	Bio-8: If project grading is proposed during the raptor breeding season (Feb. 1-Sept. 15), the project biologist shall conduct a pre-grading survey for active raptor nests within 300 feet of the development area and submit a letter report to MMC prior to the preconstruction meeting. If active raptor nests are detected, the report shall include mitigation in conformance with the City's Biology Guidelines (i.e. appropriate buffers, monitoring schedules, etc.) to the satisfaction of the City's ERM. Mitigation requirements determined by the project biologist and the ERM shall be incorporated into the project's Biological Construction Monitoring Exhibit (BCME) and monitoring results incorporated in to the final biological construction monitoring report. If no nesting raptors are detected during the pre-grading survey, no mitigation is required.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
	Bio-9: If project grading/brush management is proposed in or adjacent to native habitat during the typical bird breeding season (i.e., Feb. 1-Sept. 15), or an active nest is noted, the project biologist shall conduct a pregrading survey for active nests in the development area and within ***300*** feet of the nest.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
	Bio-10: A qualified Biological Monitor shall be on site at a minimum when initial grading of Off-Street Bikeways is occurring adjacent to wetland habitats and/or potential occupied avian or sensitive species habitat, to ensure that no take of sensitive species or active bird nests occurs, grading limits are observed, and that orange fencing and silt fencing are installed to protect sensitive areas outside earthwork limits.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
The project could potentially result in direct and indirect impacts to sensitive habitats, including wetlands.	Refer to ***Bio-1*** through ***Bio 10***.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
The project could potentially result in direct and indirect impacts to wildlife movements.	Refer to ***Bio-6***.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
The project could potentially result in adverse edge effects to the MHPA.	Refer to ***Bio-3***.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
The project could potentially result in significant direct and indirect impacts related to invasive species.	Refer to ***Bio-3***.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
HISTORICAL RESOURCES		
The project could potentially result in direct impacts to prehistoric or historic buildings, structures, objects or sites or existing religious or sacred uses.	***Hist-1*:** Prior to issuance of any permit that could directly affect an archaeological resource or resources associated with prehistoric Native American activities, the City shall require the following steps be taken to determine: (1) the presence of archaeological resources and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources that may be impacted by a development activity. **Initial Determination**: The environmental analyst shall determine the likelihood for the project site to contain historical resources by reviewing site photographs and existing historic information (e.g., Archaeological Sensitivity Maps, the Archaeological Map Book, and the California Historical Resources Inventory System) and conducting a site visit. If there is any evidence that the site contains archaeological resources, then an evaluation consistent with the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Guidelines shall be required. All individuals conducting any phase of the archaeological evaluation program must meet professional qualifications in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines. **Step 1**: Based on the results of the Initial Determination, if there is evidence that the site contains archeological resources, preparation of an evaluation report is required. The evaluation report could generally include background research, field survey, archeological testing, and analysis. Before actual field reconnaissance would occur, background research is required that includes a record search at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) at San Diego State University and the San Diego Museum of Man. A review of the Sacred Lands File maintained by the NAHC must also be conducted at this time. Information about existing archaeological collections shall also be obtained from the San Diego Archaeological Center and any tribal repositories or museums.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
HISTORICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	Once the background research is complete a field reconnaissance must be conducted by individuals whose qualifications meet City standards. Consultants are encouraged to employ innovative survey techniques when conducting enhanced reconnaissance including, but not limited to, remote sensing, ground penetrating radar, and other soil resistivity techniques as determined on a case-by-case basis. Native American participation is required for field surveys when there is likelihood that the project site contains prehistoric archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties. If through background research and field surveys historical resources are identified, then an evaluation of significance must be performed by a qualified archaeologist. **Step 2**: Once a resource has been identified, a significance determination must be made. It should be noted that tribal representatives and/or Native American monitors will be involved in making recommendations regarding the significance of prehistoric archaeological sites during this phase of the process. The testing program may require reevaluation of the proposed project in consultation with the Native American representative, which could result in a combination of project redesign to avoid and/or preserve significant resources, as well as mitigation in the form of data recovery and monitoring (as recommended by the qualified archaeologist and Native American representative). An archaeological testing program will be required that includes evaluating the horizontal and vertical dimensions of a site, the chronological placement, site function, artifact/ecofact density and variability, presence/absence of subsurface features, and research potential. A thorough discussion of testing methodologies including surface and subsurface investigations can be found in the City of San Diego's Historical Resources Guidelines.	

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
HISTORICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	The results from the testing program will be evaluated against the Significance Thresholds found in the Historical Resources Guidelines and in accordance with the provisions outlined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines. If significant historical resources are identified within a project's Area of Potential Effect (APE), the site may be eligible for local designation. At this time, the final testing report must be submitted to Historical Resources Board staff for eligibility determination and possible designation. An agreement on the appropriate form of mitigation is required prior to distribution of a draft environmental document. If no significant resources are found, and site conditions are such that there is no potential for further discoveries, then no further action is required. Resources found to be non-significant as a result of a survey and/or assessment will require no further work beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate DPR site forms and inclusion of results in the survey and/or assessment report. If no significant resources are found but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicate there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring is required. **Step 3**: Preferred mitigation for archeological resources is to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm shall be taken. For archaeological resources where preservation is not an option, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program (RDDRP) is required or is required to follow alternate treatment recommendations by the Most Likely Descendant (MLD), which includes a Collections Management Plan for review and approval. The data recovery program shall be based on a written research design and is subject to the provisions as outlined in CEQA Section 21083.2. If the archaeological site is an historical resource, then the limits on mitigation provided under Section 21083.2 shall not apply, and treatment in accordance with Guidelines Section 15162.4 and 21084.1 is required. The data recovery program must be reviewed and approved by the City's Environmental Analyst prior to draft CEQA document distribution. Archaeological monitoring shall be required during building demolition and/or construction grading when significant resources are known or suspected to be present on a site, but cannot be recovered prior to grading due to obstructions such as, but not limited to, existing development or dense vegetation.	

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
HISTORICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	A Native American observer must be retained for all subsurface investigations, including geotechnical testing and other ground disturbing activities whenever a Native American Traditional Cultural Property (TCP) or any archaeological site located on City property, or within the APE of a City project, would be impacted. In the event that human remains are encountered during data recovery and/or a monitoring program, the provisions of PRC Section 5097 must be followed. These provisions would be outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program included in the environmental document. The Native American monitor shall be consulted during the preparation of the written report, at which time they may express concerns about the treatment of sensitive resources. If the Native American community requests participation of an observer for subsurface investigations on private property, the request shall be honored. **Step 4**: Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared in conformance with the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) "Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and Format" (see Appendix C of the Historical Resources Guidelines), which will be used by Environmental Analysis Section staff in the review of archaeological resource reports. Consultants must ensure that archaeological resource reports are prepared consistent with this checklist. This requirement will standardize the content and format of all archaeological technical reports submitted to the City. A confidential appendix must be submitted (under separate cover), along with historical resource reports for archaeological sites and TCPs, containing the confidential resource maps and records search information gathered during the background study. In addition, a Collections Management Plan shall be prepared for projects that result in a substantial collection of artifacts, which must address the management and research goals of the project, the types of materials to be collected and curated based on a sampling strategy that is acceptable to the City of San Diego. Appendix D (Historical Resources Report Form) shall be used when no archaeological resources were identified within the project boundaries.	

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
HISTORICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	Step 5: For Archaeological Resources: All cultural materials, including original maps, field notes, non-burial related artifacts, catalog information and final reports recovered during public and/or private development projects must be permanently curated with an appropriate institution, one which has the proper facilities and staffing for insuring research access to the collections consistent with state and federal standards. In the event that a prehistoric and/or historical deposit is encountered during construction monitoring, a Collections Management Plan would be required in accordance with the project MMRP. The disposition of human remains and burial-related artifacts that cannot be avoided or are inadvertently discovered is governed by state (i.e., AB 2641 and California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act [NAGPRA]) and federal (i.e., federal NAGPRA) law, and must be treated in a dignified and culturally appropriate manner with respect for the deceased individual(s) and their descendants. Any human bones and associated grave goods of Native American origin shall be turned over to the appropriate Native American group for repatriation. Arrangements for long-term curation must be established between the applicant/property owner and the consultant prior to the initiation of the field reconnaissance, and must be included in the archaeological survey, testing, and/or data recovery report submitted to the City for review and approval. Curation must be accomplished in accordance with the California State Historic Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collections (dated May 7, 1993) and, if federal funding is involved, Part 36, Section 79 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Additional information regarding curation is provided in Section II of the Historical Resources Guidelines.	
The project could potentially result in direct impacts to human remains.	Refer to ***Hist-1***.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
TRANSPORTATION/ CIRCULATION		
The project could potentially result in significant direct construction and operational impacts to the existing street system.	***Trans-1***: During design of any proposed bikeway or other facility implemented under the BMP Update that would result in (1) the removal of one or more travel lanes that could affect intersection operations; (2) the removal of one or more travel lanes that could affect volume-to-capacity ratios for roadway segments; (3) the removal of any raised center median that could affect volume-to-capacity ratios for any roadway segment; or (4) the removal of one or more turn lanes that could affect intersection operations, an analysis shall be prepared by the project proponent to assess potential traffic impacts. The traffic analysis shall include an assessment of existing LOS and shall evaluate the feasibility of accommodating the proposed bike lane or route within the existing roadway so that it does not cause a significant traffic impact to any roadway segment or intersection. The analysis shall also include an assessment of potential impacts during construction for On-street Bikeways With Widening and Off-street Bikeways.	Potentially Significant (direct and cumulative)
	Trans-2: If the removal of a travel and/or turn lane would cause an intersection or roadway segment to operate at an unacceptable LOS, the project will be redesigned and/or mitigation measures identified in the project-specific traffic analysis shall be implemented to reduce traffic impacts on the affected intersection or roadway segment to less than significant levels. Such design or mitigation measures might include road or interchange widening, elimination of parking, evaluation of alternate bikeway routes, or other measures.	Potentially Significant (direct and cumulative)
The project could potentially result in significant direct impacts to circulation movements and access to public areas.	Refer to ***Trans-1*** and ***Trans-2***.	Potentially Significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
VISUAL QUALITY/NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER		
Bikeways implemented under the BMP Update could potentially block views.	***Vis-1:*** A visual study shall be prepared during design of a proposed bikeway or other facility implemented under the BMP Update, to adequately assess the potential visual impacts. The visual study shall include assessment of the existing visual environment, including existing views, aesthetics, neighborhood character, and landforms, and evaluate the feasibility of designing the particular feature that could generate visual impacts so that it does not cause impacts, including issues associated with blocking scenic views.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
	Vis-2: Recommendations of the visual study shall be incorporated into the design of the feature that could cause visual impacts. If the alignment cannot be changed, or the feature cannot be redesigned or screened visually by incorporating elements such as landscaping or berming to avoid the impact, or the bikeway cannot be designed to eliminate the need for that particular feature, the City's process for subsequent evaluation of discretionary projects shall be followed. The process includes environmental review and documentation pursuant to CEQA, as well as an analysis of the individual project for consistency with the goals, policies, and recommendations of the General Plan and the applicable Community Plan. The process may require development of additional site-specific measures to avoid or reduce significant impacts.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
Bikeways implemented under the BMP Update could require the installation of retaining walls, bridges, embankments, or shoreline protection that could potentially result in a negative aesthetic appearance.	Refer to ***Vis-1*** and ***Vis-2.***	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
Bikeways implemented under the BMP Update could require the installation of retaining walls, bridges, embankments, or other stabilizing structures, as well as removal of trees or impacts to landmarks, that	Refer to ***Vis-1*** and ***Vis-2.*** ***Vis-3:*** If trees or other landmarks could be eliminated by a proposed bikeway or accompanying structure, the first focus of mitigation will be on changing the alignment or redesigning the bikeway to avoid the removal of such resources. If avoidance is not possible, compensation will be provided. Removal of trees for the purpose of bikeway or accompanying structure shall be minimized to the greatest extent practicable. When avoidance is not possible, tree protection	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
VISUAL QUALITY/NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER (cont.)		
could result in potentially significant neighborhood character impacts.	during construction, tree transplanting or tree replacements shall be required. Any mature trees that must be removed shall be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio with like or acceptable substitute, as determined by the City. Trees shall be planted in a suitable location within the corridor where the trees can be maintained. No trees or shrubs exceeding 3 feet in height at maturity shall be installed within 10 feet of any water and sewer facilities.	
The project could potentially result in significant landform impacts.	Refer to ***Vis-1*** and ***Vis-2.***	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
Bikeways implemented under the BMP Update could include new lighting adjacent to or within natural or residential areas that may be relatively substantial compared to the existing condition.	***Vis-4:*** Lighting of Off-street Bikeways adjacent to open space or residential areas shall be limited to that required for safety. Lighting shall be shielded and directed away from open space areas and residences and onto the bikeway itself.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Bikeways requiring grading could result in potentially significant direct and indirect impacts to paleontological resources in areas with a medium or high paleontological resource sensitivity rating.	***Paleo-1***: Prior to approval of Reach Recommendations or development projects implementing the Design Guidelines within the RCA, the City shall determine, based on review of the project application, that future projects are sited and designed to minimize impacts on paleontological resources in accordance with the City Paleontological Resources 2011 Significance Thresholds and 2002 Paleontological Resources Guidelines. Monitoring for paleontological resources required during construction activities would be implemented at the project level and would provide mitigation for the loss of important fossil remains with future discretionary projects that are subject to environmental review.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	Future design of projects as noted below in accordance with the City's Paleontological Resources 2011 Significance Thresholds and City 2002 Paleontology Guidelines shall be based on the recommendations of a project-level analysis of potential impacts on paleontological resources completed in accordance with the steps presented below. **I. Prior to Project Approval** A. The environmental analyst shall complete a project level analysis of potential impacts on paleontological resources. The analysis shall include a review of the applicable USGS Quad maps to identify the underlying geologic formations, and shall determine if construction of a project would: ▪ Require over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation and/or a 10-foot, or greater, depth in a high resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit. ▪ Require over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation and/or a 10-foot, or greater, depth in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit. ▪ Require construction within a known fossil location or fossil recovery site. Resource potential within a formation is based on the Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix. B. If construction of a project would occur within a formation with a moderate to high resource potential, monitoring during construction would be required. ▪ Monitoring is always required when grading on a fossil recovery site or a known fossil location. ▪ Monitoring may also be needed at shallower depths if fossil resources are present or likely to be present after review of source materials or consultation with an expert in fossil resources (e.g., the San Diego Natural History Museum). ▪ Monitoring may be required for shallow grading (<10 feet) when a site has previously been graded and/or unweathered geologic deposits/formations/rock units are present at the surface. ▪ Monitoring is not required when grading documented artificial fill.	

Table ES-2 (cont.)
PROJECT IMPACTS AND PROPOSED MITIGATION

IMPACT	MITIGATION MEASURES	ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE AFTER MITIGATION
PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)		
	When it has been determined that a future project has the potential to impact a geologic formation with a high or moderate fossil sensitivity rating a Paleontological MMRP shall be implemented during construction grading activities.	
GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS		
The project could potentially result in significant direct impacts due to geologic conditions, including by being located in an area subject to geologic hazards, unstable geologic materials, or erosion.	***Geo-1***: A project-specific geologic report shall be prepared during design of a proposed bikeway or other facility implemented under the BMP Update, to adequately assess the potential impacts due to geologic conditions. The report shall include the studies designated in Table F-1 of the City's Significance Determination Thresholds (City 2011) and defined in the City's Guidelines for Geotechnical Reports (City 2011). The report shall specify possible mitigation measures for potential impacts due to geologic hazards, unstable geologic materials, and/or erosion. Measures may include the following: ▪ Faulting: Applying the most rigorous building codes governing seismic safety and structural design; allowing for setback; revising the alignment to avoid fault areas. ▪ Landslides and Slope Failure: Providing protective barriers such as drapes, nets, fences, barriers, and catchment; allowing for setbacks; grading to reduce slope angles; removing vulnerable deposits and replacing with compacted fill; providing stabilization; and providing signage on bikeways in areas of potential rock fall or unstable ground. ▪ Liquefaction: Conducting ground improvement (densification and hardening); providing appropriate structural (foundation) design; removing or treating liquefiable soils; modifying drainage to lower groundwater levels; providing for temporary or permanent dewatering; allowing for setbacks. ▪ Coastal Hazards: Similar measures as above for landslides and slope failure; developing evacuation procedures and routes and providing signage on bikeways in areas where tsunamis and seiches could result in damage. ▪ Erosion: Providing erosion control and drainage facilities as specified in City regulations. ***Geo-2***: Recommendations of the project-specific report shall be incorporated into the design of the feature(s) that could experience impacts due to geologic conditions.	Less than significant (direct and cumulative)

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK