

## **Environmental Impact Report**

Land Development Review Division (619) 446-5460

SUBJECT:

Project No. 31245 SCH No. 2004031041

Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from the Office of Emergency Services (OES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) COUNCIL APPROVAL to allow for revisions to the Municipal Code Chapter 12, Article 2, Division 4 to modify the requirements of brush management and revisions to the Municipal Code Chapter 4, Article 4, Division 3, Section 44,0307, et seq, to allow goats for thinning in zone two brush management areas, pursuant to the recommendations of the Fire Chief as a result of the 2003 Cedar fire. The project proposes a City wide 100 foot brush management zone consisting of 35' of Zone One and 65' of Zone Two. Project implementation on City property is proposed to be initially funded by a grant from the Office of Emergency Services (OES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), which is being applied for by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department. The project is located within the City of San Diego, public and private lands and includes the City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Applicant: City of San Diego, Fire-Rescue Department.

### CONCLUSIONS:

This Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (SEIR/EA) addresses the potential impacts resulting from, or related to, revising the brush management regulations contained in Municipal Code Chapter 12, Article 2, Division 4. The current brush management regulations in the Land Development Code (LDC) were developed in conjunction with the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The regulations were approved by City Council in November 1997 and by the California Coastal Commission in November of 1999. They were made effective with the entire Land Development Code on January 3, 2000. Specifically, the SEIR/EA addresses public (including Right-Of-Entry Permits) and private activities that would implement the ordinance on existing developed property; not for undeveloped property.

The primary focus of the 1997 changes was to simplify regulations, to improve predictability, to make them more enforceable, and to coordinate brush management requirements with the City's goal to preserve environmentally sensitive habitat. Changes to the regulations included replacement of the complex three zone system of brush management of varying widths (50' to 110') based upon classifications of fire severity with a two zone system based upon the location of the property's location west or east of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real. The dividing line of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real was selected based upon analysis of historical fire data in and outside areas of climatic coastal influence. However, analysis of the Cedar Fire indicates that if the Santa Ana winds had continued, it is likely that the fire could have burned all the way to the ocean. The climatic coastal influence would not have been a factor in this event. This has prompted the Fire-Rescue Department to re-evaluate the current distinction and propose a single citywide brush management system.

Brush Management Zone One is the area adjacent to structures and consists of pavement and permanently irrigated ornamental plantings. Brush Management Zone Two is an area of native plant material thinned to reduce fuel load. The width of Zone One currently varies from 20 feet to 40 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and 30 feet to 45 feet east. Zone Two currently varies from 20 feet to 30 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and 40 feet to 50 feet further east.

Current brush management regulations in the Land Development Code (LDC) were developed in conjunction with the MSCP. Since the adoption of the MSCP in 1997, brush management zone one associated with new development has been located within the development footprint and is not allowed within the MHPA. With the proposed revisions to the LDC, zone one would be increased to thirty-five feet. For some existing structures, zone one may not be able to expand to thirty-five feet without impacting native habitat. In lieu of expanding zone one into native habitat, the proposed code amendments would increase the width zone two one foot for every one foot of zone one that could not be provided, unless the Fire Chief approved a modification on a case-by-case basis.

In light of the size and severity of the Cedar fire, and other wildfires in October of 2003, the Fire Chief is recommending a City wide 100 foot brush management area consisting of 35 feet of Zone One and 65 feet of Zone Two. In addition, it is proposed that Zone Two would be expanded accordingly to achieve 100 feet of brush management where Zone One is less than 35 feet from existing structures. A standard 100 foot brush management zone would allow for a greater defensible space against impending fire.

Under the existing Municipal Code § 142.0412(i), the Fire Chief has the ability to enforce modification to the brush management regulations for purposes of fire protection on a case-bycase basis. As a result of the Cedar Fire, the Fire Chief is recommending implementation of the 100 foot citywide brush management regulations on a volunteer basis, until the proposed revisions to the brush management regulations can be considered for adoption by City Council. In the Coastal Zone, final adoption of the proposed revisions would require approval by the California Coastal Commission to modify the City's Local Coastal Program.

Project implementation on City property would initially be partially funded by the Office of Emergency Services (OES), via a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) grant that is currently being applied for by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department. Based on the results of the Initial Study and the proposed use of FEMA funds, EAS the Environmental <u>Analysis Section (EAS)</u> has determined that a joint SEIR/EA shall be prepared and circulated for public review in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to tier off of the *Land Development Code EIR*, LDR No. 96-0333, Sch No. 96081056. The SEIR/EA shall adequately address and analyze potential impacts in the areas of: Land Use, Biological Resources, Hydrology/Water Quality, and Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics.

Implementation of the proposed Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), which is included to in this SEIR/EA, would reduce all of the environmental effects of the project, except land use and biological resources, to below a level of significance. The evaluation of

environmental issue areas in this SEIR/EA concludes that implementation of the Project would result in significant impacts to the following issue areas: land use and biological resources, related to non-covered species located outside the MHPA. The significant impacts associated with these this issues are significant and unmitigated. The project does not propose any mitigation measures in the form of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). can be partially mitigated to below a level of significance through mitigation measures outlined in the SEIR/EA and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP). The Project would not result in significant impacts or contribute to significant cumulative impacts to: land use, geology/soils, hydrology/water quality, air quality, aesthetics, agricultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, mineral resources, population/housing, public services, recreation, or utilities/services systems therefore, no mitigation is required for these issue areas.

## SIGNIFICANT UNMITIGATED IMPACTS:

The significant impacts identified in the SEIR/EA could be partially mitigated to below a level of significance through mitigation measures outlined in <u>Section V.B of</u> the SEIR/EA and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), however the applicant has not agreed to these measures. Therefore, <u>However</u>, impacts associated with land use and biological resources, related to non-covered species located outside the MHPA, would remain significant and unmitigated.

### ALTERNATIVES FOR SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:

Alternatives that would avoid and/or reduce significant direct impacts are as follows:

<u>No Project Alternative</u>. Pursuant to CEQA, the No Development Alternative, the existing brush management zones would remain in effect. Current brush management regulation state that the width of zone one varies from twenty feet to thirty-five feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and thirty feet to forty-five feet on the east. Zone two currently varies for twenty feet to thirty feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and forty feet to fifty feet on the east.

In the absence of implementing any of the activities associated with the proposed brush management revisions, none of the environmental impacts described in Section V would directly occur.

<u>No Action Alternative</u>. NEPA requires that the No Action Alternative be described. The No Action Alternative assumes that there would be no federal funding available for the implementation of the brush management revisions within City owned open space areas and as a result, no federal action to approve. The proposed brush management revisions could still be implemented by the City; however, funding would need to be acquired from different sources. This alternative would not achieve the objectives of the project of providing additional defensible space from structures to vegetation because the City does not have alternative sources of funding for the project.

<u>Clear and Re-plant zone two Alternative</u>. Under <u>Alternative 4 this alternative</u> complete clearing would occur in zone two and would be re-planted with low height native or naturalized plant types. Proper planting protocol would be to lightly scarify the soil surface before planting for better seed/soil contact. Temporary irrigation would be installed for a period of up to two years for plant establishment. The assumption associated with this alternative is that the irrigation would not be installed or monitored properly thereby allowing runoff to occur down slope of zone two. This can be substantiated by evidence that irrigation runoff is the primary source of water in City drainages during the summer.

Under this alternative, significant impacts to biological resources in zone two would not occur as the habitat being replaced would be native or naturalized, non-invasive and low-growing. Potentially significant impacts to the habitat down slope of zone two could result from irrigation runoff from the temporary irrigation lines. This would include the establishment of plant types that thrive in wetter soil conditions as a result of the runoff. In addition, impacts to sensitive species, i.e. gnatcatcher would remain significant as the existing habitat would be completely removed.

The clear and re-plant alternative would utilize temporary irrigation for a period of up to two years to allow plant establishment in zone two. Based on the assumption noted above, monitoring of irrigation is not anticipated and would therefore create a significant impact to soil erosion down slope of zone two due to runoff from the temporary irrigation lines. Potentially significant impacts associated with water quality would also occur from the runoff which carries silt and sediment down slope and could potentially impact any off-site water body. Impacts associated with erosion and water quality would be considered significant and unmitigated.

<u>Increasing Building Regulations Alternative.</u> Under this alternative, proposed changes to the building regulations would occur thereby reducing the need for increased brush management zones. Revisions to the building regulations could include fire walls which would be constructed at the boundary between zone two and open space. Additional building regulations could include alternative architectural features for structures where brush management would normally be required.

While the proposed project allows development features as an alternative to or in addition to reduced brush management zones, under this alternative there would be no impacts to biological resources or sensitive species because brush management would not occur. The building regulations would reduce the fire hazard to structures and the habitat on site would remain undisturbed. This alternative would require that increased building regulations be implemented and would not give citizens the choice of either providing zone two brush management or providing alternative architectural features to structures as is the case with the current regulations. No impacts to hydrology/water quality/erosion or neighborhood character/aesthetics would result from this alternative.

## MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM INCORPORATED INTO THE PROJECT:

In an effort to reduce or avoid those impacts identified as potentially significant with implementation of the proposed project to below a level of significance, the following mitigation measures have been incorporated into Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from the Office of Emergency Services, FEMA Project.

<u>Biological Resources:</u> The thinning and pruning of sensitive habitat would be done at any time of the year and there would be no restrictions during the breeding season. This would result in significant impacts to sensitive species, specifically the California gnateatcher. Impacts associated with the California gnateatcher could be reduced to below a level of significance by acquiring an amount of acreage, approximately 198 acres per table V.b 4 in the Biological resources section, of equal gnateatcher habitat over a time period to be determined by the City Manager. or by restricting timing of thinning activities outside the gnateatcher breading season. This mitigation has not been agreed to by the applicant.

Limiting brush management activities within the MHPA, would mitigate impacts to gnatcatchers to below a level of significance, and is proposed by the applicant. Brush management activities would be limited to occur outside of the California gnatcatcher breeding season (March 1 – August 15). Since brush management activities will be limited, direct impacts to gnatcatcher nests would not be significant; therefore, mitigation is not required.

In order to mitigate significant impacts to <u>non-covered species located outside the MHPA</u>, a <u>mitigation measure biological resources as a result of the establishment of invasive species in</u> brush management zone two and possibly down slope, the Land Development Code EIR identified that mitigation would be required to the same extent as brush management zone 1, based on the mitigation ratios per habitat type identified in the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines. This mitigation however, is not proposed.

Chris field

Chris Zirkle Assistant Deputy Director Development Services Department

May 25, 2004 Date of Draft Report

September 23, 2004 Date of Final Report

Analyst: Krebs Black

### PUBLIC REVIEW:

The following individuals, organizations, and agencies received a copy or notice of the draft SEIR/EA and were invited to comment on its accuracy and sufficiency:

### Federal Government

U.S. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Environmental Planning Division (12)
Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar (13)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (19)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (23)
U.S. Department of Agriculture (25)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (26)
Federal Emergency Management Agency, Office of Emergency Services

### Native Americans

Ron Christman (215) Louie Guassac (215A) Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225) Native American Distribution (225 A-R)\*

### State of California

California Department of Transportation (31) California Department of Fish and Game (32) California Integrated Waste Management Board (35) California Environmental Protection Agency (37) California Department of Parks and Recreation (40) Resources Agency (43) California Regional Water Quality Control Board (44) State Clearinghouse (46) California Coastal Commission (47) Native American Heritage Commission (222)

### County of San Diego

Department of Planning and Land Use (68) County Water Authority (73) Hazardous Materials Management Division (75)

### City Government

City of San Diego: Mayor Murphy Councilmember Peters, District 1 Councilmember Zucchet, District 2

Councilmember Atkins, District 3 Councilmember Lewis, District 4 Councilmember Maienschein, District 5 Councilmember Frye, District 6 Councilmember Madaffer, District 7 Councilmember Inzunza, District 8 Development Services Department (78, 78A) Engineering & Capital Projects Department (86) Historical Resources Board (87) Library Department (81) Metropolitan Wastewater Department Park and Recreation Department, Ann Hix, Deputy Director, MS 804A Fire-Rescue Department, Samuel Oates, Fire Marshall, MS 603 Planning Department - MSCP (MS 5A) Police Department Real Estate Assets Department (65) Transportation Department Water Department, Nicole McGinnis, MS 501 Community Forest Advisory Board (90) Wetlands Advisory Board (171) Otay Mesa/Nestor Community Service Center (236) Clairemont Community Service Center (247) Golden Hill Community Service Center (261) Mid-City Community Service Center (295) Navajo Community Service Center (337) Carmel Valley Community Service Center (344A) North Park Community Service Center (365) Peninsula Community Service Center (389) Rancho Bernardo Community Service Center (399) San Ysidro Community Service Center (435) Scripps Ranch Community Service Center (442) Central Community Service Center (451) Market Street Community Service Center (451A) College/Rolando Community Service Center (455A) Tierrasanta Community Service Center (460) City of Chula Vista (94) City of Del Mar (96) City of El Cajon (97) City of Escondido (98) City of Imperial Beach (99) City of La Mesa (100) City of Lemon Grove (101) City of National City (102) City of Poway (103) City of Santee (104) City of Solana Beach (105)

### Other Organizations and Interested Individuals

University of California, San Diego (134) San Diego Association of Governments (108) San Diego Unified Port District (109) San Diego Transit Corporation (112) San Diego Gas and Electric (114) Metropolitan Transit Development Board (115) San Dieguito River Park (116) Del Mar Union School District (119) Poway Unified School District (124) San Diego Unified School District (125, 132) Solana Beach School District (129) South Bay Unified School District (130) San Diego Apartment Association (152) Building Industry Federation (158) San Diego River Park Foundation (163) California Native Plant Society (170) Sierra Club (165, 165A) San Diego Audubon Society (167) San Diego Regulatory Alert (174) Center for Biological Diversity (176) Endangered Habitats League (182) Surfrider Foundation (183) Dave Potter, Community Planners Committee (194) Jerry Schaefer, Ph.D. (208A) South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University (210) San Diego Historical Society (211) San Diego Archaeological Center (212) San Diego Natural History Museum (213) Save Our Heritage Organization (214) San Diego County Archaeological Society (218) Otay Mesa/Nestor Community Planning Group (228) Tijuana River National Estuarine Reserve (229) Janay Kruger (233) Otay Mesa Planning Committee (235) Clairemont Mesa Planning Committee (248) University of San Diego (251) Tecolote Canyon Citizens Advisory Committee (254) Friends of Tecolote Canyon (255) Tecolote Canyon Rim Owner's Protection Association (256) Clairemont Town Council (257) Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee (259) Golden Hill Community News (260) Kearny Mesa Town Council (263) Serra Mesa Planning Group (263A)

Serra Mesa Community Council (264) Kearny Mesa Planning Group (265) Linda Vista Community Planning Committee (267) Marian Bear Natural Park Recreation Council (267A) San Diego Mesa College (268) La Jolla Shores Association (272) La Jolla Town Council (273) La Jolla Historical Society (274) La Jolla Community Planning Association (275) La Jolla Shores PDO Advisory Board (279) La Jollans for Responsible Planning (282) City Heights Area Planning Committee (287) Rolando Community Council (288) Kensington/Talmadge Planning Committee (290) Normal Heights Community Planning Committee (291) Normal Heights Community Association (292) Normal Heights Community Center (293) Oak Park Community Council (298) Webster Community Council (301) Eastern Area Planning Committee (302) Marshall Community Council (304) Darnell Community Council (306) Midway Community Planning Advisory Committee (307) Mira Mesa Community Planning Group (310) Mira Mesa Town Council (311) Friends of Penasquitos Preserve, Inc. (313) Mira Mesa Branch Library (315) Mission Bay Park Committee (320) League of Conservation Voters (322) Citizens Coordinate for Century III (324A) Mission Beach Precise Planning Committee (325) Mission Beach Town Council (326) Mission Hills Association (327) Mission Valley Community Council (328C) Friends of the Mission Valley Preserve (330) Mission Valley Unified Planning Organization (331) River Valley Preservation Project (334) Friends of Adobe Falls (335) Navajo Community Planners Inc. (336) San Carlos Area Council (338) Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens Advisory Committee (341) Carmel Mountain Ranch Community Council (344) Carmel Valley Community Planning Board (350) Carmel Valley Trail Riders Coalition (351) Carmel Mountain Conservancy (354) Arroyo Sorrento Homeowners Association (356) Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Citizens Advisory Committee (360)

Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board (361) Greater North Park Planning Committee (363) Burlingame Homeowners Association (364) North Park Community Association (366) Ocean Beach Planning Board (367) Ocean Beach Town Council, Inc. (367A) Old Town Community Planning Committee (368) Pacific Beach Town Council (374) Pacific Beach Community Planning Committee (375) Crown Point Association (376) Rancho Penasquitos Community Council (378) Torrey Pines Association (379) Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board (380) Friends of Los Penasquitos Canvon Preserve, Inc. (382) Rancho Penasquitos Town Council (383) Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Citizens Advisory Committee (385) Sunset Cliffs Natural Park Recreation Council (388) Peninsula Community Planning Board (390) Rancho Bernardo Community Council, Inc. (398) Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board (400) Sabre Springs Planning Group (406B) Sabre Springs Community Planning Group (407) Carmel Mountain Conservancy (408) The San Dieguito Lagoon Committee (409) San Dieguito Planning Group (412) San Dieguito River Park Citizens Advisory Committee Project Review Committee (415) Friends of San Dieguito River Valley (419) San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy (422) San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority (425A) San Pasqual-Lake Hodges Planning Group (426) San Ysidro Planning and Development Group (433) United Border Community Town Council (434) Beeler Canyon Conservancy (436) Scripps Ranch Community Planning Group (437) Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee (439) Scripps Ranch Civic Association (440) Skyline/Paradise Hills Planning Committee (443) Sorrento Hills Community Planning Board (444A) Southeastern Development Corporation (448) Southeastern San Diego Development Committee (449) Encanto Neighborhoods Community Planning Group (449A) Central Imperial Redevelopment Project Area (452) College Area Community Council (456) Malcolm A. Love Library (457) Tierrasanta Community Council (462) Murphy Canyon Community Council (463) Mission Trail Regional Park, Citizens Advisory Committee (465)

Torrey Pines Community Planning Group (469) Torrey Pines Association (472) Crest Canyon Citizens Advisory Committee (475) University Community Planning Group (480) University City Community Association (486) University City Library (488) University Heights Community Association (497) Uptown Planners (498) Hillside Protection Association (501) Allen Canyon Committee (504)

Mr. Jimmy Ayala C/O Pardee Homes 12626 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100 San Diego, CA 92130

Mr. Mike Singleton 3916 Normal Street San Diego, CA 92103

City of Poway Planning Department/Mr. Jim Lyon 13325 Civic Center Drive Poway, CA 92064

County of San Diego Planning Department-MSCP/Mr. Thomas Oberbauer 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B-5 San Diego, CA 92106

\* Notice only

Copies of the draft SEIR/EA, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and any technical appendices may be reviewed in the office of the Land Development Review Division or purchased for the cost of reproduction.

### RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

- () No comments were received during the public input period.
- () Comments were received but the comments do not address the accuracy or completeness of the environmental report. No response is necessary and the letters are attached at the end of the EIR.
- (X) Comments addressing the accuracy or completeness of the EIR were received during the public input period. The letters and responses follow.

18 ×.

## BRUSH MANAGEMENT REVISIONS TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE EIR COMMENTS TABLE.

			IT COMMENTATIONER
State Agoncles			
Joint Letter from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services and the California Department of Fish and Game: O'Rourke, Therese and Chadwick, Donald	7/9/2004	A	A-1 through A-57
Celifornia Coastai Commission: Sarb, Sherilyn	7/8/2004	В	B-1 through B-10
oael Oganizations			
Building Industry Association of San Diego County: Moltoy, Scott	7/8/2004	с	C-1 through C-10
Joint Letter from Center for Biological Diversity; Endangered Habitets League; Friends of Los Penasquitos Canyon; Friends of Rose Canyon; San Diego Audubon Society; San Diego Chapter California Native Plant Society; San Diego Chapter Sierra Club; Thirty-Second Street Canyon Task Force; Hogan, David	7/8/2004	D	. D-1 through D-39
Dity Heights Area Planning Committee: Sprague, Michael	7/9/2004	E	E-1 through E-4
Community Forest Advisory Board; Hughes, Nancy J.	6/14/2004	F	F-1 through F-33
riends of Ruffin Canyon: Hough MD., Bonnis	7/9/2004	G	G-1 through G-16
riends of Sunset Cilifs: Ridenour, Dedi	7/9/2004	H	H-1 through H-5
San Diego Audubon Society: Paugh, James A.	7/8/2004		I-1 through I-31
San Diego County Archaeological Society: Royle, James W.	7/10/2004	J	J-1 through J-3
ierra Mesa Planning Group: Moore, Cindy	7/7/2004	к	K-1 through K-8
ecolote Canyon Citizens Advisory Board: Battle, M. Elolse	7/5/2004	L	L-1 through L-3
hirty-Second Street Canyon Task Force: d'Elgin, Tershia	6/26/2004	м	M-1 through M-34
iptown Community Planning Committee: Gardner, David	8/10/2004	N	N-1 through N-10
Toncemed Public			
iurkhart Environmentai Consulting; Burkhart, Brad	7/4/2004	0	O-1 through O-49
ege, Anne S.	7/9/2004	P	P-1 through P-5
eltzer, Caplan, McMahon, Vitek: Steinke, Thomas F.	7/9/2004	Q	Q-1 through G-10
itewart, Kay	6/30/2504	R	R-1 through R-27
Vilson, Andrew	7/9/2004	s	S-1 through S-3
GREET PLOTENER Aller COLEY OF PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD			
itate of Celifornia - Governor's Office of Planning and Research, tate Clearinghouse and Planning Unit: Roberts, Terry	8/3/2004	τ	. <b>T</b> -1

·

· · ·

.

.

.



Carlsbad Fish and Wildffe Office 6010 Fishean Vailoy Read Caddaal, Caftkarina 92009 (760) 4a 1.9440 U.S. Figh and Wildlife Service PAX (760) 431-5902 ± 9618



Comment Letter / CA Dept. of Fab & Game South Comt. Regional Office

I

•

ł

Í

4949 Viowridge Avenue San Diceo, California 92123 358) 467-4201 AX (858) 467-139

> City of Sau Diego Development Sorvices Department Savitomoental Planacr Mr. Allison Ramp In Reply Rules To: F473 SDG- 4072.1

JUL 0 9-2004

San Dicgo, California 92101 1222 First Avenue, MS 501

Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Boyinomental Assessment for Brush Managrment Revisions to the Land Davelopment Code and Federal Grant from the a a

Office of Brustgerey Services, Federal Emargency Management Agency (SUH# 2004031041)

.. -Dear Ma, Runp;

Substquent Environmental Jopart ReportEnvironmental Assessment (SERREA), which there off March 9, 2004, Ittler from the City of San Diego's (City) Development Service's Department to reviewed the Jamtery 21, 2004, City Manager's Report regarding the proposed revisions, and the the City's Fire-Resoue Department regarding the scope of work for the SERREA, and listened to deliberations on the proposed building code revisions for buildings adjacant to high fire havand The U.S. Fish and Wikilite Survice (Service) and the California Department of Piah and Garae (Dependence), collectively the "Wildhife Agencles," have raviewed the above-referenced Draft 2004, to learn about the proposed brush management revisions, and the Department wrote a reast. In addition, we nuct with Ms. Ann Hix and Mr. Ketth Grew of the City on January 9, of the EIR that was prepared for the City's Land Development Code." Final adoption of the proposed revisions would require approval by the California Coastal Commission for modifications of the City's Local Coastal Plan nocessitated by the revisions. We have also te January 20, 2004, recording of the staff report, public testimony, and Cily Council commant letter (April 3, 2004) on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of this SER/BA.

responsible for the conservation, protection, and management of the state's biological resources. decinisters the Natural Continuality Conservation Planning program. The priority contain and adiading rare, threatened, and and angared plant and animal speedes, pursuant to the California Sudargened Species Act and other acctions of the Fish and Came Code. The Department also Environmental Quelity Act, Socilizes 15386 and 15381, respectively. The Department is The Department is a Truatee Agency and a Reeponsible Agency pursuant to the California

The CRV properties that Development Costs EFR in 1999 the revisions to the Land Development Code (LDC), instants the bresh instantaneous regulations, that wave made in conjutation with the MSCP.

## Mia. Roap (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

mendate of the Bervice is the provedion of public fish and wildfife resources and their industry. The Service has legal responsibility for the wolfare of migratory birds, anadromous fish, and androgeved animals and planta occarging in the United States. The Service is also responsible fir edominatering the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et ser).

## Ertsting Conditions

The entreart brutch nisanageoment regatations were developed in conjunction with the City's Multiple Species Courservation Program (MSGT). Under entreat regulations of the MSCP, brush manageoment Zene Course the area adjacent to abundans and consists of pavement and paramaterial thirated to 50 percent planthags. Brush manageoment Zene Two is an avea of native plant material thirated to 50 percent planthags. Brush manageoment Zene Two is an avea of native plant material thirated to 50 percent planthags. Brush manageoment Zene Two is an avea of native plant material thirated to 50 percent planthags. Brush manageoment Zene Two is an avea of native plant material thirated to 50 percent planthags. Brush manageoment Zene Two is an avea of native plant material thirated to 50 percent planthags. Brush manageoment Zene Two is an avea of Internative from 20 to 40 feet west of the intersection. Zune Two vuries from 20 to 30 feet west of the intersection, and 40 to 50 feet cast of this intersection. Zune BI Camino Real, and 70 to 95 feet cast of this intersection.

Currently, brush management in Zone Two occurs on 3,753 acres within the City. Of that, 3,222 acres are on private land, and 531 acres are on public land. Of the 3,753 acres, 526 are within the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multiple Habitat Preservation Area (MRPA) (past, comm., Chad Kane, City MSCP, fune 25, 2004).<sup>1</sup>

The City's Park and Remvation Department (PRD) manages approximately 22,600 acres of open space, much of which is in the MHPA. This open space institutes 220 linear miles of urban wildfind interface. The PRD is responsible for conducting brush management in eity-owned open space areas within the City, including Zone Two.

## Proposed Project

The City's Fin-Reasus Department is proposing ravisions to the brush management regulations in response to the fires in the City and the County of San Diego in October of 2003, and pursuant to the recommendations of the Fire Chief. Their purpose is to allow for a groater defensible space against impending fire. The proposed travisions would ontail establishing a 100-foot wide heath management areas consisting at 35 field in Zone One and 65 field in Zone Two throughout the City. This would result in 15 -45 foot expension of Zone Two, depending on the existing width per the current requirements. In addition, Zone Two, depending on the existing decrease of Zone One fields allort of 35 feet. Existing requirements allow for the decrease of Zone Two by this fact part 1 hoot of interess in Zone One. The proposed ravisions would limit this to a maximum reduction of 30 feet of Zone Two. Brush management activities by the City would likely occur overy one to three years. 2 The Carly's povince of the MSCCP's (MH)A is approximately 56,831 access and includes approximately 47,810 access within the Carly a put about and action a Carlounced similar Approximately by provident (\$5,212 access) of the MHPA tends, within the Carly's extense is interned to be preserved for total carly for proposes, including 77 percent of the access including 77 percent of the measured for total preserved for total reserved for total of the access including 77 percent of the measured for total preserved for total access, including 77 percent of the access including 77 percent of the measured for total percents.

Ma. Basp (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

:

ì

!

I

## Project Objectives

The fluce objectives of the proposed revisions, as provided in the SER/FA are to:

- a. សាសក្រទៃស in a សំណាវិប្រ នាលី សាវរព្វរទៀសអន់លេ បានណាតា ម៉ែន សាវរំទាំណាន to លាវកុម្មរាំ brush រវាន់ពានអ្នកពាលជំ ពេទ្ឋានតែអន់;
- identify and implement efficient, officelive, and énvironmentally grasifive means to accomplish the revierd brush management Zones One and Two; and
- provide for effective and enchronmanitally armanitive long-term manneance of formal management zeroes in open space, private lands, and other environmentally sensitive lands.

## Afternatives

In addition to the proposed action and the no-pooject alternative, the SEU/EA described the following alternatives: (a) the no action alternative which assumes that there would be no federal findting available to the City for bruth management within the open space it manages, thereby reducing the amount of brash management the City would be shie to conduct; (b) the clear and replant Zone Two alternative which assumes complete elsari ag of Zone Two and re-planthing with form-proving native plants; and (e) an alternative involving strengtheolog the bruthfing code regulations as they parted to fire protection in high fire involving strengtheolog the bruthfing code considered but rejected are (a) education / training, and (b) preserviced burning.

## Inspects / Mittigation

The SERVIA indicates that the proposed brush management revisions would reard; in an additional City-wide impact of approximately 2,880 acres within Zone Two. Of this total, an estimated 715 acres would be within the MIPA, which represents an approximately 136 percent impacts includes of Top 1, behilts, 312 acres of The TI habitats, 222 of The TI starts of impacts includes 46 acres of The T15 acres, 242 ace within the MIPA. The 715 acres of magnets includes a supervirtuately 136 percent impacts includes 46 acres of The T1 habitats, 312 acres of The TI habitats, 222 of The TI habitats, and 63 of The TI habitats, 212 acres, 242 ace within the core biological resource aceas and 135 of The TI habitats. Di hubitats, 05 that 115 acres, 242 ace within the core biological resource aceas and 135 of The TI habitats. Di hubitats, 312 acres, 242 ace within the core biological resource aceas and 135 of The TI habitats. 272 of The TI habitats, 200 of The TI habitats, 200 of The TI habitats. Di hubitats, 312 acres, 242 ace within the core biological resource aceas and 135 of The TI habitats. Di hubitats, 312 acres, 242 ace within the core biological resource aceas and 135 of The TI habitats. Di hubitats, 317 acres, 242 ace within the core biological resource aceas and habitat timicares their the proposed project would feature the loss of the cast of 377 acemutes of gradeatcherer processed project would feature the the loss of the cast of 377 acemutes of gradeatchere in the habitat biological transmutes aceas and bible.

The SBUR/EA indicates that the impart analysis in the MiSCF HIB/Environmental Impuct Stateaismit (HIS) indirectly accounted for any potential project-stated impacts on preserve configuration, structural diversity, and habital interfaces of the MHPA. The SERVEA concludes that connervation of covered species would be maintained and thate would not be a significant increase in the likelihood that an uncovered species will meet the channel for listing under eithor the factor of the likelihood that an uncovered species will meet the channel for listing under eithor the factor of the likelihood that an uncovered species will meet the channel for listing under eithor the factor of the proposed break meangement revisions would result in significant impacts one.

a. lend user

biological resources;

- gnatostehters, when the brush management activities are conducted within the MEPA during the gnatosteher brushing acaam;
- d. Tier I. II. and IIIA and IIIB habitats within Zones One and Zone Two; and
- consitive species.

lo addition, camulative impacts related to biological resources are considered to no significant and ambitigated. Though the SERURA identifies accessares to miligate fire some of these significant impacts, the City does not propose to implament any of the miligation measures. Because the SERP/I.A concludes that the proposed action would reavily in algorithcant any immentativeffects, the Federal Etmangency Management Agency (FEMA) should prepare an EEs as required by the Mational Etwinommental Policy Act. In addition, the action us proposed may affect listed species. Therefore, FEMA should initiate section 7 consultation to fulfill its obligations maker the BSA. Of particular concern to the Wildlife Agencies are the effects of the proposed brush management revisions on the MISCP and MEPA. The proposed revisions conflict with specific requirements (a.g., regarding detring during fite avian incoding season and less of habitat within the MHPA) in the City's take permit for the MSCP. Further encaperating this conflict is the lock of multigation for these impacts. While we recognize the need to provide an adoptate defensible space against imponding fine, it needs to be done in a manuer consistent with the City's parant clottering about forcer consider the hereefling season as indicated in Table 3-5 of the MSCP Plan and condition 3 of the permit, and waveledabile for singlementation in the relevated about of final HIS/FA. we will have need to revealed for implementation in the relevated and/or final HIS/FA. We will have the should have the revealed for implementation in the relevated and/or final HIS/FA.

Z

control of the period, and a second a second as more activates and activation of the period. The period of the period, and any uray of able for implementation in the relaxed the fully initial and or implementation in the relaxed the fully initial RIS/RA, we will have the project for implementation in the relaxed the fully final RIS/RA, we will have the project for implementation in the relaxed to the period for implementation in the relaxed to the fully initial RIS/RA, we will have the project for implementation in the relaxed to the fully initial RIS/RA, we should be the relaxed to the project for the project for the fully of the relaxant for the black. Both the relaxant for the black is a substant of the relaxed to the project for the relaxed to the relaxed t

We realize that CEQA allows CEQA lead againes to mike statements of overriding considerations that adveces environmental effects may be considered "acceptable" in situations where the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other boundins of a proposed project outweigh the masveldable adverse arriterumental effects (CEQA Guidefibre, serion 15093(a)). The Givy may develop a statement of overlable considerations for this SERURA that satisfies the Give the statement of overlable control to consider the fibre series and the state of satisfies the Give the statement of overlable control to the statement of the series of the statement of

A. 2 ILLO UNY TREFARIOP & STRETCHER OF DYNOLLOUGH CONTRACTIONAL FOR A STRETCHER AND STRETCHER AND STRETCHER OF STRETCHE

Comment noted. The brush management ordinance has been revised to restrict hmah management activities within outside such habitat during the California Guatestoher breeding assoon.

A-1

A-2 Corunett noted.

Ms. Roug (FWS-SDO-UTZ.1)

1

հատի ռուուցերություն ություներիսը, թատիշակետի withput trying find to catabilish a reliable armot of funding to underwate the exate of calamonant. In edition, given our concerns regreting the preject-related potential negative theological inquerts, we question how the above project objectives "4" and "6" wordd to realized. Our detailed comments on the proposed brush ranoigenear revisions are attached. The Withlife Agarsaics apprecision the opportroidy to comment on this SERVEA. The Department finds that the implementation of the revised brush measurement repuisions would not be do minimus in its effects on fish and wikibility per spation 711.4 of the California Rish and Came Code. Frees context Libby Lineas of the Department of (85%) 467-4320 or then Rank of the Service at (760) 451-9440, or if you have any questore or continuents concentring this letter.

Sincerely, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service **Assistant 2561d Raphr**visor Thinks Offer 3

H. H. Develov V. Contract was Dentified Chartwick Electric Conservences Placering Supervisor California Despertment of Fish and Game

ca: Alessandro Anaglio, Pedarai Costgrovy Manugentent Agency, Office of Bunstgrovy Services

As Frank, City of San Diego Development Services Department Keinb Enser, City of San Diego Planulug Drewtment Ann Hix, City af San Diego Plark and Recreation Department San Ostes, City of San Diego Fare-Rescore Department San Ostes, City of San Diego Fare-Rescore Department Sate Clendregionzea Sate Clendregionzea

Mfs. Ramp (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Enclosure-1

WILD) JPR ACRACY COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE SELRIES for Bucker Management Revisions to the Land Development Code

## 1. The SEIR/BA, Shymid, Re, Rachenlated

Several of our comments identify where the SEIR/BA lacks information which we befieve is nepessary to determine whether flup proposed brush management revisions would affect (a) the assumptions flust were made (shring the MSCP negatiations) regarding the habitat that is to be preserved nucler the MSCP, and/or (b) flor covered status of any of the species covered by the MSCP. Absent this additional information, it is infeasible for us to make these by the MSCP. Absent this additional information, it is infeasible for us to make these determinations, and the SERVERA is indequate and conclusory relative to impacts on biological neconces and the MHPA (CBQA, Section 15083.5(9(4))). In addition, we believe that there are freakble miligation measures, considerably different from the offices proviously emaryzed that would lessen the project-related significant biological tenous the SERPARA (CBQA Section 15088.5(8)(33). In addition, we believe the SERPARA (CBOA Section 15088.5(8)(33).

The Department's NOP letter emphasized (last the SFBR/EA must coverte and vedfy that all requirements and conditions of the MSCP Subsrees Plan and associated Implementing Agriesments. The NOP letter also indicated that the dimension were spreved and implemented. The NOP letter also indicated that the dimension in the SEBR/EA about the projocy-related toss of habitat within the MFPA about flot (a three states assumptions that were mode regarding the protocion of MSCP-coverid spreica, (b) include full consideration of a solution of impacts from build management afforded by revisions to the building code, and (c) describe have the City would compensate for the less of sensitive habitats within the MHPA, the set flabitat within the MBPA, and the potential impacts on MSCP coversel-species. The SEBR/IA lecks adortable the second to the shore of leaver in the SEBR/IA lecks adortable the versions to the projocy-idlentified insure appeared to determine the velicity of several of the shore solarities regarding build give by MBPA, and the potential impacts of MSCP coversel-species. The SEBR/IA lecks adortable the velicity of several projections regarding the SEBR/IA.

ł

We approxists the efforts of City staff in preparing the SHIR/RA under the pressure of contagency conditions. However, becalize the Uniform First Code gives the Firo Marshall the authority to implement the recommended changes administratively, there is no emergency relative to a need to adopt the proposed revisions or some version thereof. Rather, the entagoney is in the need to enforce (a) the proposed revisions, or some version thereof. Rather, the management requirements by the City (in City-owned open space) and by private parties, and (b) the recent building node revisions (e.g., requirement of Class "A" roome assemblice,

> ъ Ч

 The conclusions that are not adequately substantiated are tist (a) the constantiation of covered species would b motivations. At that times would not be a stantificant are tise to the the Weithood that an uncovered species woll

erojnibition on wood shakes and wood shingles). The Jamary 21, 2004, City Managur's

The conclusions that are not adequately substantiated are that (a) the conclusion of covered species would matchined. (b) fait than would not be a significant increase in the lucalization that are uncovered species will strent the criteria for listing under other the sector of the lucalization draw and the configuration faits fulfed review for listing under other the project-related process with an uncovered species will be fulfed review for an entitient of the project-related process and the relation of the sector of the sector strent the criteria for listing under other the project-related process and the relation of the sector of the sector of the sector and drawed remain underscent, (i) that the project-related process and the relation of the sector of the sector of drawed remain underscent, (i) which is the factor of the factors of the factors and the factor of the sector of the relation for a factor of the factor of the factors of the factors of the factors of the drawed remain undifference.

Comment noted

2

4

0287; Solt No. 93121073) which assumed and analyzed a 200-loot induct The document incommutes by reference the MSCP BIRJEIS (LDR No 93bur. Recettse preential MHPA habitat and covered species impads were ordinarus language that prohibits hrush manegement schwittes in wastal species remain significant but mitigated with areas within the MHPA, by to part arts and asymmed bruch municipant to parts in this area (MSCP deemed less that significant, no componsation/addigation is roquired for immade to the California Gratheteiter during brending searon have been GUVEIS puge 4.3-183). As such all assumptions in the MSCP EUVEIS roviaions to the building code is analyzed as project alternative number implementation of the MSCP as described in the LDC RIR. However, The MSCP assumptions are discussed in Section V.A of the SERVEA. considered significant impuct. Additionally, please note that potential apparts associated with hadritat loss due to establishment of invasive diese resources. However, as noted in rection V.B. potratial project mitigated to below a Jove) of significence through incorporation of reference. A potential reduction of brush management impacts via eegateiing covored speedee are also included in the current SHIR by non-covered species located outside of the MHPA would still be age somb habitats during the species' buteding acusun.

This comment toes not address the edequary of the SEIR/EA. Therefore, no comment is required.

ŝ

Ma. Rung (TWS-SDG-4072.1)

" | Baolosure-2

i

ì

1

į

Report regenting the proposed housh antregentent revisione documants the serious shifting shortfatt free PRD has to meet its obligations for brush management. We note that the January 21, 2004, City Manoger's Report regarding the proposed raviatore, galas, "the Start and Federal Wildlife Agencies appear amonable to the ohanges in the brush meanagement regulations in proluntary discussions." At the macking on January 9, 2004, we ind unreal about how the proposed ravisions would affect the assumptions regarding the habit that is to be conserved under its MSCF. Because the estimates of the protential impacts on the acres within the MITP A and on covered species were not yet available, it was not possible for the Wildlife Agencies to areabance the estimates of the protential impacts on the acres within the protect for the 100-foot wide brush meeting. Therefore, whele we indextood the north for the 100-foot wide brush meeting. Therefore, whele we indextood the north for the 100-foot wide brush meeting. Therefore, whele we indextood the north for the 100-foot wide brush meeting. Therefore, whele we indextood the north for the 100-foot wide brush meeting. Therefore, whele we indextood the north for the 100-foot wide brush meeting. Therefore, whele we without notifies the north for adoption of the groupsed within for zones One und Two without notifies analysis of the their biological hupplications, and without mitteation.

9-6

## Recompreheider

The Wildliffs Agrooks recommend that the City revise the SBIR/HA to provide the information requested in our comments below, and recirculate it for additional public review. The additional information should be included in a recirculated SURVEA (CEQA Section 15088.5) or in the recirculated and/or final SURVEA that is made available for review to the public send continentfug agenders prior to approving the project (CEQA Section 15089). The gibble review period should be a minhum of 30 days.

A-7

# 2. Puppesed Widtlis for Zongs One and Two Require Justification.

The Wildlife Agencies admowledge the need to provide an adequate dufcusble space against improving the, and that the yroposed 100-foot wide break management area is constant with the Memoranium of Understanding, dated Tehnary 26, 1997, among the Wildlife Agencies, the Catifornia Department of Forénty, fao San Diego Comuly Fine Calefe 3 Aspectation, and the fire District's Association of San Diego Comuly. However, it is not class how the proposed widths of Zones One and Ywo were defermined. Specifically, the researchs for the disparity between the proposed widths of the two zones are not appared, and it is melear why Zone One, which is outside of the MifPA, is proposed to be the trantwee of the two zenes.

Recontraceptions

÷.

e. We recommend that the restriction of the final SERREA explain the rescording behind the proposed zone within.

ር ፈ 4 At 85 current elefting level, final PRO thinks an averagge of 70 eitres per year. The artifictation currenge nooching local maximagement of the yeboneweldiented interfaces at leves torse blockleby to 1,200 acres.

A-6 Cemm

Comment noted

.

A-7 Comment noted

This command addresses the metrics of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SERRAR. No response is required.

Å.

This comment addresses file modia of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SERAGA. No response is required.

Ş

b. Existing requirements sllow for the decrease of Zone Two by 1½ fort per 1 foot of increase in Zone One. The proposed revisions would limit this to a maximum reduction of 30 fest of Zono Two. We recommend that the revisions be modified to require that Zone One be as wido as a possible (i.e., not be limited to a 20 fiest of zono Two. We recommend that the revisions be modified to require that Zone One be as wido as a possible (i.e., not be limited to a 20 fiest of zono Two. We recommend that the revisions be modified to require that Zone One be as wido as a possible (i.e., not be limited to a 20 fiest increase - 30 + 1.5) when proceds meet all of the following three gasameters: (a) Zone One would be entirely outside the MBPA, as is chirently required; (b) Zone Two does/would encreate into the MBPA, and (c) there is more foun 35 feet in Zone One. This should be supplied orth retroasthely and to fract or overlepment, and to reader india, business, and restitutional development allor. This approach would reduce the City-wide need for our outgoing trush reasegment in Zone Two, thereby reducing the on-going biological impacts (e.g., edge effects and disjudinance of avian breaching activity), the need for on-going the two development allows of a spon set with brush management City-wide supplied impacts (e.g., edge effects and disjudinance of avian breaching activity), the need for on-going the two does of a specific with trush management City-wide supplied in the following the our-going biological for on-going the two does of a specific with trush management for the constraint of the following the specified with trush management for the specific for our specified with the constraint of the following the specified for the constraint of the following the specified for the specified for the following the specified for the following the specified for the speci

A-10

- a., The proposed revisions require that Zone Two woold be expanded by 1 fact for every 1 fact by which Zone One falls short. However, malike the proposed revisions for the freverse situation described in the preceding comment, the revisions do not establish a first fit increasing Zone II. We are concerned about the related potential implications for the MHPA, and recommend the previsions be modified to establish a first for Zone Two and securingend that the revisions be modified to establish a first for Zone Two areas within the MHPA.
- d. Please are common 8 for additional suggested modifications to the proposed revisions
- Mefinitology for Analyzing impacts on Habitat and MSCP-Covered and Non-Covered Sanative Specifies is Intelegence.

## Discussion

a. Dased on the SHIR/EA, it seems that very little consideration was given to the potential project-related impacts on MSCP-covered or non-covered stansitive species, with the orccoption of the graduateheat. For example, regarding narrow endemio grademic plant species, the SHIR/EA status only, "no impacts to narrow endemio species are expected to cover because these species are generally less than eightern indoes in height and would not be subject to thinning per the breach management regulations. The exception is Beginness that eightern indoes in height and would not be subject to thinning per the breach management regulations. The exception is Beginness to find the breach management regulations. The exception is Beginness of this species are within the proposed breach areas, include no breach to Beginness of this species are within the proposed breach grow to exceed 18 indices in Beginness of this order within the expended Edue Two areas, tachide Coup (applant (*Deinsulta configures*), dudleys sp. (i.e., their Hower stalks), and state cholia wattow species (though and the level in addition, willowy monordelia (*Monordelia lineide lineides* sequence). In addition, willowy monordelia (*Monordelia lineides* sequence).

212

5 The brush management regulations require that, "with Zone Two, at plants remaining effect 50 percent (of The percent of an application of the provided of

codemic species), grows to exceed 18 index in height and might occur within the

A-10

This comment addresses the merits of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SEIR/EA. No response is required.

This comment addresses the module of the project, not the accuracy or adequary of the SHIR/EA. The proposed bruch management onlinearco allows an overall maximum distance of 100 feet for zone one and zone two brush management zones.

11-7

A-12

management purposes necessitated by or incidental to those certain fire Understanding with state and local fire departments (1997), which allows committed to unplementing all required measures identified in the MSCP ELEVELS. Additionally, the U.S. Fish and Wikilife Service (USFWS) and included in the current SEIR by reference. All impasts, including fao impact area and assumed five management impacts in this area. The regarding narrow endernics has been included in the SEIR in Section V.A codangered, threated and candidate species. Additional information by the USFWS for three federally listed species and all state listed protoction measures described herein." Finally, the MOU authorizes inke (under Chaptor 1.5 of Division 3 of the Fish and Otme Code) for the take of species listed as threatened, endangered, or candidate species a 100-foot clearing radius from structures, states, "Tuis MOU anthorizes California Department of Fish and Gitme (CDFG) Measorandum of requirements of the plan. The City of San Diago continues to be regulations, and through implementation of monitoring and coporting through implementation of the MSCP subares plans and associated within the MSCP EIR/EIS were mitigated to below a level of significance management impacts within the 200-front indirect impact area, identified brush management within the 200-foot indirect impact area are also impacts to habitaty and species in the certified MSCP EIR/EIS related to proposed andinence would allow brash management in 65 feet of the 200-(12\$77; Soh No. 93121073) which assumed and analyzed a 200-foot indiract The SEIR incorporates by reference the MSCP EIR/EIS (LDR No 93foot impact area analyzed in the MSCP EIR/EIS. As such, all analyses of

ې 11

<ol> <li>Figo 45 Orders Plus status, Zone Toro, 'may be located in the AEHA, Accord, where corridors are inserve and violatific corridors to the bottley or wites, the horder of the MEPA. "In a disensation about wildlife corridors, the SERVEA statur, where corridors are inserve and violatific corridors within the MEPA." In a disensation are not corritor in the SERVEA statur, where corridors are inserved under the project state are providen any statysic of the MEPA. "In a disensating treasure world expend ananygenet measurement are set of location truth, mains il phyling. exciting registrations are inserved to a staty provide station of provide any statysic of the MEPA. According the management area world expended to the MEPA and the project set at the main and the state of the MEPA." In a disease, the interpret measurement areas, the advected in provide and the violation of the main and the main and the main and the state of the MEPA. The advected and the state of the MEPA action provide area in a state of the MEPA and the MEPA in the project at the project set at the project and indication of the appendent trans. According the MEPA is the advected in project and the state of the method interval or the advected in the main and the state of the MEPA action provide at the main and the state of the MEPA action provide at the main and the state of the MEPA action provide at the main and the state of the MEPA action provide at the main and the state of the method and the state of the MEPA action provide at the main action provide at the main and the evolution at the project at the main action provide at the MEPA action provide at the main action provide at the MEPA action provide at the formation of the project action in the main action the main action the state of the state of themain theoremain action the main action the main action the m</li></ol>			
<ol> <li>We bolicer that the project-related imparts on the MEIPA and the species it supports are under-seminated. The impact some for sharpy developed proporties, lands that are graded, and hunds that are graded, and index that are graded, and index that are graded so that in the City has issued protocoles, lands that no project. This how are graded for full project-related impacts on habites within the MEIPA and the species it. (Siy MECP, The 34, 2004) Decrease this standysis did not insulue future project. The impacts do not verified for full project-related impacts on habites within the MEIPA and the species it areas, the standysis did not insulue future projects. (Siy more 24, 2004) Decrease this standysis did not insulue future projects of the impacts do not verified for full project-related impacts on habites within the MEIPA and the species it supports for a provide stantism.</li> <li>Recommendations</li> <li>The meansulated and/or fine protectific project-related impacts on these species and movewed stantific projects and solution to the species it is not first to the project and solution to the species.</li> <li>We exame that implementation of the protect and/or fine interact 2004.</li> <li>We exame that implementation of the project and/or fine interaction of the impacts. Some provide a thorough stange of the MIIPA to be consistent with the MSCP. Some and the species that are the one of the MIIPA to be consistent with the MSCP Solverse Plan, The metabolic of the propest and/or fine interaction of the project and/or fine interaction of the species.</li> <li>The recommendation of the moduli provide an analysis of how this would be addressed to and to note the impacts and/or fine is stantis and is not into one or within the MSCP some the setting the exame and provide an analysis of the restriction of the restructiders and/or fine is stantine to the</li></ol>	states, Zoue Two "may be located in fite MHPAcxcept require it to be located outside of the MHPA." In a ins, the SERR/EA statue, where corridons are startow and ment measures are required, holarding implementing a lighting, excito predators and invasive plants." i provide any analysis of whether, or where, the proposed i zone Two areas, or focate fithure Zone fivo areas, in the MHPA and how this would be addressed.	A-13	Additional analysis was conducted to identify where all major wildhle corridots are less than 250 feet in width and how the proposed expanded 2000 2 brush management would impact these areas. The analysis concluded no significant impacts would occant, as the goue 2 brush management would to entraide thase marrow wildfile occard, areas with the exception of one area within was toosted at the ead of the corridor.
<ol> <li>The membradations</li> <li>The membradations&lt;</li></ol>	ed impacts on the MEPA and the species it supports are alysis conducted for the SEIR/EA endoanpassed extant eacy developed properties, lends that are graded, and used grading permits (pera comm., Jeame Krasch, City te fuis analysis did not include future projects' intuch is in the SERVEA of the serial extert of the impacts do not upsets on habitets within the MEPA and the species it	A-14	It is not possible to quantify or estimate future bruch management impacts However, given that compliance with the MSCP would mitigate any impacts to behint and species, quantification is not necessary. Clarifying language has been added to the Final SERVEA. Mitigation for future projects is not required under entreat regulations. City staff is currently proposing raviations to the CEQA Significance. Thresholds which would
<ul> <li>a. We assume that implementation of the potential project-related impacts on these species.</li> <li>b. We assume that implementation of the potential project-related impacts on these species.</li> <li>b. We assume that implementation of the proposed revisions would conflour to restrict Zons provide a thorough stabylis of the MHPA to be consistent with the MSCP Soberce Plan (page 49) of the Suberce Plan). The rectrodist of and/or final SEBA/EA should emily whether this is the case, and if it is not, the impact analysis abould be revised to include the impacts of foot the impact analysis abould be revised to include the impact this is the case, and if it is not the MEPA and the revised to include the impact the imposed revision from Zone One encourded and/or final SISR/EA should provide an unalysis of locations where the proposed revisions would express or locate finance Xone Two resets, in narrow wildlife corridors within the MEPA and for that Xone Two areas are not to occur within memory value cortidors and the recirculated and/or final SISR/EA and for that Xone Two areas are not to occur within memory value or the corridors with the tradical functions. Two free starts in advect that Xone Two areas are not to occur within memory value or the corridors and the recirculated and/or final SISR/EA should provide an unalysis of locations where the proposed revisions should be traditioned by the proposed revisions through the recirculated and/or final SISR/EA should be traditioned to a the recirculated and/or final SISR/EA should be traditioned and/or final SISR/EA should be traditioned to at Xone Two areas are not to occur within memory and the recirculated and/or final started beam of the tradition.</li> <li>d. We appreciate this restriction.</li> </ul>	10 Ath chambi stratific the MCCP around the start		consider Brush Menegement Zone 2 (mpacts to be significent, florredy requiring mitigation and/or fixelings.
<ol> <li>We assume that implementation of the proposed revisions would conflour to restrict Zons One to areas entraide of the MHPA to be consistent with the MSCP Sobarca Plan (page 49 of the Subarra Plan). The restricted antifor final SEIR/EA should elarity whether this is the case, and if it is not, the impact analysis abould be revised to include the impacts from Zone One encreaching into the MHPA.</li> <li>The restrict Cone encreaching into the MHPA.</li> <li>The restrict the impact analysis abould provide an unalysis of hostidents where the proposed revisions would expend existing Zone Two areas, or locate finite Zone. Two areas, in narrow wildlife, corridors within the MHPA and foor this would he addressed. Preferably, the proposed revisions abould be modified to reflect that Zone Two areas are not to court within memory wildlife corridors and the restrutiated and/or final SEIR/EA should evaluate this relation.</li> <li>We appreciate that it is intensible to quantify potential future impacts. However, the restricted that final relation.</li> </ol>	w likely to becau within the opparided 70as Two and, and be polecital project-related impacts on these species.	A-15	Refer to comment A-12. This information is provided in Tables V.B-2 and V.B-3.
<ul> <li>The testinulated and/or final SNSR/RA should provide an unalysis of located more where the purposed revisions would expand existing Zone Two areas, or locate fluxer Zone Two needs, in narrow wildlife, carridons within the MHP A and how this would be addressed. Preferably, the proposed revisions should be modified to reflect that Zone Two areas are not to coour within narrow wildlife corridors and the recirculated and/or final SEIR/IBA should evaluate this restriction.</li> <li>We appreciate that it in intensible to quantify potential finite impacts. However, the recirculated and/or final SEIR/IBA should discuss the funct that the project-related impacts would extend by the axpansion of the extant bruch menagement areas, and, if</li> </ul>	o of the proposed revisions would confour to restrict Zons PA to be consistent with the MSCP Softered Plan (page 49 ordeted and/or final SEIR/EA should ajmity whether this must malyeus abould be revised to include the impacts o the MEPA.	A-16	Under the proposed revisions, Zone One would continue to be restricted to access outside of the MITPA consistent with the MSCP Subarca ${\rm Pha}$
d. We appressize that it is indensible to quantify potential future impacts. However, the reminimized and/or final SERR/RA should discuss the fact that the project-related impacts would extend beyond the expansion of the extern bruch management areas, and, if	RR/RA should provide an unabysis of looudons where the ad existing Zone Two areas, or locate finants Zone Two ors within the MHPA and how this would be addressed. as should be modified to reflect that Zone Two areas are life corridors and the rosizultated and/or final SERR/BA	A-17	Refer to comment A-13.
	We appreciate that it is indeasible to quantify potential future imparts. However, the reminented and/or final SERVEA should discuss the fact that the project-related impacts would extend beyond the expansion of the extant bruch management areas, and, if possible, provide an estimate of the edditional accesse and species that would be directly affoctat. This discussion alrouch include the potential expansion of investive species beyond the projected have management feorphent (comment 6). Preferably, bresh	A-18	Roter to comman A-14.

ł

ł

i

" Bhclosmo-4

1

ł

ł

I

i

l (

:

!

i

ļ

Ma. Ram (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Ma. Rasp (ITWS-SDG-4072.1)

Enclosure-5

ramagement zones should be intorporated into the footprint of all induce projects. The recircuistand and/or final (SERVEA aboutd evaluate this requirement.

- e. The resirvalated and/or final SkiR/EA shruld also discuss the potential for additional impact areas within the MEPA that would arise fram fits orpansion of Zone Two areas within the MEPA by 1 first for every 1 foot by which Zone One falls short, as proposed. Again, we understand that this impact cannot be quantified, but it should at least be qualificatively identified.
- The recirculated and/or final SRIR/EA aloudd clacify whether the estimates include the potontial impucts from the construction of ataging areas, and access roots or paths, if any, that might the necessary to reach the expanded areas of Zone Two.<sup>6</sup> If they do not, the recirculated and/or fixed SBIR/FAA should also address this and any orgoing maintenance
  - of the reads/paths that would be yerrestry. 3. If the additional analyses recommended in the foregoing continents reveal significent
- improte that the oursait SERVEA has not addressed, we recommand that the recirculated and/or final SERVEA proprese mitigation to bring the impacts to a level less than ---- significant.
- Project-Related impacts on the <u>MHPA</u> and the Species it Supports Would Likely he Similifyent

Regarding the project-related impacts on the MHPA and the species if supports, the SFRUEA states, "Since potential impacts would be within the 200-foot buffer analyzed in the MSCP BRAMS for edge effects, an additional impacts to the preserve configuration, structural diversity and habitat interfaces of the MHPA would count. Impacts would generally be limited to arcss contaide the core biological arcsa and would not impact major inhibits linkages or wildlift contident interfaces for the conservation of covered species would be maintained and there would not be againfootat increase in the (iterfibood that an encoremed species will meet the criteria for listing under reliner the federal or state badangered Species will meet

Background

For the MSCP BIR/RIS, scrural assumptions were used to evaluate whether the proposed MTPA preserve scenario would trenth in adaquate coverage of species and habitats. A minimum edge effect of 200 feet along the inside boundary of the preserve was one of the assumptions. (City of San Diego 1996). The RIS/EIR, far the MSCP includes the following performatistatements. e. "Indirect inpracts to covered species would result from edge effects within and adjacent to the presence and inversed development pressure outside the preserve. Assuming a 200-

3 The Dopartment's NDP listics stated requested first the impact areayeds include the larged from screes mode, if surv.

The SEIR/RA impart arragges include expanded Zons 2 brush management areas where existing development is less than 35 fact from matty babitat. Please see Appendix E for full discussion of analysis mathodology. Please note that pursuant to Scetion 142.0412(h)(7) of the ordinance revision, only existing structures are allowed the provision to increase Zone 2 for one food for each thort of required Zone width that canon be provided and may use alternative compliance measures to offset the zone 1 reduction if approved by the fire chief.

A-19

The brush management softwirks allowed under the revised ordinance will be purfbrand immediately adjacent to structures accessible for realways. The mediance glows brush management activities only within the areas discensed within the oude and SERKEA. Creation of access roads is not facilitated by the project.

A-20

Comment noted.

 $\Lambda$ -21

Mis. Raap (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Enclosure-6

.

,

3

:

But wide strip of preserve boundary, it is estimated that approximalely 20% (34,000 acres) of the MRFA area could be solyter to edge effects depending on how well the local furiletitetions (replicment) their preserve management guidelines and land use planning too)s. Becomes these edge effects could advecably impact covered species, this indiffect impact is regarded as alguifform? [CMY of San Diago, 1996; page 4.3.151 -- the analysis of significance for the MHPA scannic (i.e., the proposed project for the MSC?) HES/EIR)].

- b. "Induction parts to covered species, muonexeed species, and smally regreation communities/habitats would result from permitted uses within the preserve, edge effects from uses adjacent to the preserve, and increased development preserve outside the preserve. These impacts are considered servicification. (City of San Diopo, 1996; page 43.159 - the malysts of significance for the MEPA scenario, in the section for the City's MSICP Subarca Plan).
- c. "These imparts would be mitilgated through implementation of the guidelines and outlinances identified in the City of San Diego Subarca Plan and the City's RPO [Resonance Protection Ordinence] to a lovel below significant!" (City of San Diego, 1996; pages 4.3.193 - - the discretion of misgation for the MHPA scenario, in the section for the City's MSCP Subarca Plan).

The MSCE File/EIS then alles the RPO and identifies seekons in the CHy's Subgrea Plan containing relevant requirements, two of which address burch monagement and investive apodes -- Sections 1.4.3 and 1.5.2 (City of San Diego, 1996; page 4.3.193 and 194).

Discussion

The 200-foot buffer for cdgs affects was based on the underspanding of the impacts on the MEPA at the urban-while demarface at the time the EGNES for the MSCP was over arch haplementation of the proposed revisions would result in an approximately 136 percent increases of Zono Two within the MEPA at the orban-while and processing 136 percent increases of Zono Two within the MEPA at the orban-wilding direction, plus the accessing the accessing the accession of the proposed revisions would again fracting the transition of the proposed revisions would again fracting the transition of the MSCP was present in the accession of the MSCP and increases of Zono Two within the MEPA at the orban and a significantly the accession of the MSCP. The Withiffe Agencies believe that the 200-flot brifter for adge effects in the accession of the MSCP. The Withiffe Agencies believe that the 200-flot brifter for adge effect in the impact and years are analysis for this analyses for the MSCP is missiplied in the impact and years for this assemble and that the orthogonal distribution of the MSCP. The Withiffe Agencies believe that the 200-flot brifter for adge effect in the impact and years for this second in the analysis are that was assemed in the subgrouted by substantiat evidence in the record.

A-22

Based on the above statements in the RIK/EIS for the MSCP, it is evident that (a) the 200fool wide strip around the preserve boundary was intended for analyses of edge effects only, and (b) artequate *milligation* for the impacts within the buffer is to be arbitred by implementation of the mandatory requirements cited in the MSCP BIR/EIS.

 We courside: the impacts resulting from activities associated with hush management within Zone Two as direct impacts because they result in direct disturbance/loss of the

A-22

Refer to comment A-12. The City hresh management regulations previously impacted a smaller portion of the 200 foot impact area analyzed, the certifical MSCT EIR/FIIS addressof indirect impacts, including fire management, within a 200 MHPA buffer area. The proposed regulation is consistent with the 1997 USFWS and CDFG Memoradam of Understanding which allowed 140 fact of brogh clearators. Subsequent dangers to the brush management regulations were evaluated in the UDC HRC This SEJR/EA is consistent with the findings of the LDC EIR.

A-23 Refer to comment A. 12.

Ma. Ram (PWS-SDQ-4072.1)

Enclosure-7

habitet within the bruck management footpath and the access route to the area, and direct distributes of withlife within these areas. As such, the 200-foot wide buffer used in the MSCP ERVERS for the turpest analysis of edge affects is not applicable to the direct (mpacts of turbh management, frongh it may be applicable to the induced impacts of bruch management (or g., establishment of investive plant species; comment 6) in the areas of Zone Two proposed to be widemed. It is functsmuchle to call the 200-foot wide strip a

A-24

buffer from adge effects if it experiences direct impacts from on-going activities.

b. Bvan if the application of the 200-foot wide buffer was acceptable in this context, it is obsert that bruch management-related impacts on biological resonances within like buffer are not being mitigated per the City's requirements. The providence of investive exotic plant species at the arban-wildland interface throughout the City, including bruch management areas within the buffer, area or brind in the Differ are species at the arban-wildland per the City's requirements, including the buffer the buffer, continue as leak of continuates with the City's requirements, including the buffer, accurate a for the continuates of the City's requirements, including the buffer the buffer, continue to continuate the City. Absent conformance with these requirements, the City cannot demonstrate that the extant impacts within the 200-foot wide area, much less than e impacts, will be mitigated to a level less than significant. The origing unambiguted conditions render the application of the 200-foot

A-25

wide buffer anjastified.

Concitivions and Revolutions

A-26

a. The SERR/EA currently lacks sufficient information for the Wildliffs Agencies to concurwith the City's conclusions that: (a) the conservation of covered species would be maintained; (b) threw would not be a significant increase in the fieldimond that an uncovered species will meet the criteria for lating under eithor the fashmal or state Endengened Species will meet the criteria for lating under eithor the fashmal or state Endengened Species will meet the criteria for lating under eithor the fashmal or state Endengened Species Matty in each the criteria for lating under eithor the fashmal or state Endengened Species will meet the introduce of the MEPA, would state an uncovered species with the table interface of the MEPA, which would significantly increase Zone Two within the MEPA, at the urbose-diversion, which would result in a net loss of habitat within the MEPA, we therefore restation fust that the result in a net loss of habitat within the MEPA. We therefore restance that the the interface which would result in a net loss of habitat within the MEPA. We therefore restance the final full MEPA. We therefore restance interface in the rub with the rub meet los.

A-27

A-24

Pursuant to the MSCP Biological Opinion (1997) 'general indirect effects' section. "The biological integrity of trahitars adjoining development can ha diminished by adverse effects of noise, lighting, contic plant and animal invasion, dust'sir pollution, predators, parasites, disturbance from fatman autritites, peckicides, fuel modification, and other factors".

A-25

Prior to file adoption of the MSCP, there was no overall requirement to weed zone two brush menagement areas, only the discretion to require weeding of areas that were adjacent to natural areas and which were disturbed and required to be revegetated. Therefore, the MSCP was adopted without the assumption that zone two brash menaged areas would be impleded. Prohibition of thrush mimagement activities during the Californin Gratestcher breeding season has been added to file proposed code change in §1(2). (M12(h)(1) as follows: "Brock manugement activities are poslibited within costail age screib fabritat from March 1 through August 15." The MSCP is contained to meeting its bahitat preservation soals. As noted in commant A-25, impacts associated with invesive spacies wore determined to be significant. Refer to comment A-25.

A-26

A-27 Refer to comment A-12.

Ms. Rusp (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Enclosure-8

i I I

ŝ

÷

I

 We do not coment with the City's conclusions that the project-related potential impacts would be multicity to affect the structural diversity within the MHPA, and first the habitat interfaces of the MHPA would remain unaffected. The sectored study of final SHR/BA arouted house adventages around remain unaffected. The sectored study of final SHR/BA

A-28

meanexes of the Moltre A would remean manufactor. The reproductions into a first Mikliki should better antistantistic these combinions, considering that both the shuchnal diversity and the habital interfaces within the acts of direct and indirect project-talated inflavance would experience significant negative impacts. The reductibiest and/or final SERR/EA should elaborate on the condition of the 125 acrea within Ther IV insbitst. If they are considered disturbed, the SERR/EA should discuss this potential conses of their disturbed condition, particularly for those Ther IV areas whose status results from invasive speedes whose establishmont was caused or facilitated by bruck transgement solphies.

d., Based on the recommendations above (a, b, c), we recommend gooldance measures for MSCP covered species, and mitigation for the identified impacts to the MIPA through presservation of additional in-kind habitat in a manner that maintains the dealer and atmotural integrity of the preserve. If no-mitigated, the loss of habitat within the MEPA, would significantly degrade the preserve, and may werrant recordidentation of the City<sup>9</sup> coverage for forme agreeter under the MSCP. We recommend that the re-cloudisted and/or final SERVERA clearity explain what mitigation measures will be taken.

A-30

5. Immedy on the Gratestyles Should he Awrited or Militerer

Information in the SERVEA

According to the SERR/EA, implementation of the proposed revisions would affect 198 acres of gnate atches tability, and 5 ont of 377 occurrences of gnaste atches in the MHPA within the Clty.<sup>7</sup> Fixowever, the SERR/EA also indicates that the database used to estimate the imparts on the gnatestruct occurrences does not contril a comprehensive survey of all lands in the City of San Diego, that occurrences does not contril a comprehensive survey of all lands in the City of San Diego, that occurrences of hobitst varies anomally, and that the true imparts to individual birth cannot be assessed. The SERVEA indicates that foresh management in Zone Two is currently allowed year-round within the MEPA.<sup>6</sup> However, private properties within the MEPA are normally required to restrict brach management notivities within Zone Two to outside the breating accound for the gratezetcher. The SERVEA states, "if the breat management activities [within the MHPA] cannot be concluded outside of the gratestcher breaching season, then the impact is considered significant." Neverthelese, the City proposes to allow bruck management within the MHPA during the breaching season. The 377 ពានអាកម្មលេខ of គ្នានជាចងដាំក។, នាម ដាស CBy's នូវសាក លើ ២៨ ដៅនូវ ( 1,918 សែវាការ (ocsBbhB /n 1,997) of ទូអេទីសែវាជាថា វាងដ ចោង to be conserved by the MSCP+ "Occurrence" is ទូក្រាកាអ្នកសារ, មណី "occillan" (path. សាវាក ស្រុមជាទំង donneset, July 7, 2004). We understand that the CAY's ourset reproduces do not specifically data this, but that it is implicit because the regulations do not impose accessed restrictions (now comm., Jachne Kessch, CBy MSCP, June 24, 2004).

Refer to continent A-12.

A-28

Purther malysis of fibe 135 acres of Ther IV habilial is beyond the scope of the document. Please more that the Ther IV designation is based on the coarse vegetation mapping performed during the creation of the MSCP. It is unlikely that a significant ansound of these lands are disturbed due to brush management activities; in the experience of sheft, many hands that are mapped as Ther IV habiliat are non-metive habilats due to consumed all plantings (e.g. Eucalyptus woodined, e.g.).

A-29

A-30 Comment noted. Refer to comment A-12 and A-26.

Ms. Raap (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Enclosime-9

Bruch management activities would lifterly occur every one to three years and last for one to two fasts. Hand tools and small mechanical tools, such as weed wheekers would be militzed. The principle concern relating bruch management during the grain breeding scator is the Joss of antivo nests. In addition, indirect action and activity impacts out disturb meeting that could result in nest abandomnent for periods long ratorigh impacts out disturb meeting that could result in nest abandomnent for periods long rator address the direct destruction of meat predation, or starvation. The SERVEA does not address the direct destruction of meat and stars, "Toue to the ehunt duration of the work and localized activities associated with brush management zone two, it is instantional that a significant noise impact would occur during the breeding scason of scattive species." The SEIR/EA identifies the following measures to mitigato the potentially stepificant projectselated impacts to the gnatratcher.

Impacts accordated with the California gnotcathler would be reduced to below a level of significance by acquiting an amount of acreage, approximately 198 acrea..... of squal value gnateadoher habitat over a time period to be determined by the City Manager.

Mitigotion is also available in the form of requiring a qualified blologist prior to commenologi brush management activities to survey the project sites for gratestoher nests. However, the City does not propose to carry out these, nor any other measures, to mitigate for potential project-related impude on the guarescher, nor does the SBIR/3A provide an explanation as to why, other than that the applicant, the Fire Resorce Department, has not signed to such mitigation.

Discussion

In addition to the uncertainty of the project-related impacts on gratesteder reflected by the SERV/EA, and the atready-discussed problems with the methodology used to estimate the loss

A.31 (comment 3), it appears that the estimate of impacts on guartarbler documentum does not account for the potential last of or effects on guartereleters in induitat adjancent in Zone Two. This batterement sections is according for a section of the offerent of the offerent mean section of

This habitat would be subject to negative indirect effects of bruch management conducted through the breating season.

Ragarding break menagement within the MFPA during the gratestriar broofing sensor, it is inappropriate for break management activities not to comply with the requirements with which all other prejects must comply. The MSCP states, "no eleaving of occupied [gratestriber] habitat within the otios' MHPAs and within the County's Biological Resource Corps Area may occur between March 1 and August 15" (entry for the gratestriber in Table 3-5 of the MSCP Plan).

Rogarding disturbance from noise and visual impacts (the latter is not addressed by the SERVEA) associated with brush managament activities during the gustoatofter breeding accord, we assimute that the description in SERVEA of brush management practices reflects.

A-31 Refer to comment A-12 and A-26

.

Refer to comment A-12 and A-26.

A-32

3
6
ģ
Π
Ē
(Tasap
Ma. H

Enclosure-10

í

the City's procedures. This these not necessarily reflect the methods used by others who conduct breach management. They may take longer and generate louder noise than does the City, and they may not keep their work area so localized as does the City. The SEIR/EA fores not address direct loss of naise and provides inartificient information to support the conclusion that indirect offsets from consincing brush management would not requirely affect gratectore threading behavior or not negate with the conclusion in any extinction frat indirect insteader from constraining trush management would not requirely management activities. Therefore, us do not support the conclusion in the SEIP/EA about potential indirect impacts on the gratemether during the more information generated indirect insteads on the gratemether during the more information generated indirect insteads on the gratemether during the more information generated in the sector integratemether during the more integrated in the sector integratemether during the more integratemether during the more integratemether integratemether during the more integratemether during

## Recommendations

A-33

n. In comment 4, we recommend mitigation for any identified impacts to the MHPA through measuration of additional in-kind hobbs in a manner that maintains the design and shundural integrity of the preserve. Therefore, we protect with the conclusion in the SBIR/EA that the impacts on 198 acres of gratentelist habitat would be significant and should be prifiquited.

A-34

- b. The recirculated and/or fined SERYRA should prohibit forrelt management within the MEPA during the breeding season (again, see Table 3-5 of the MSCF Play), and should modify the proposed revisions to reflect this prohibition (i.e., assume occupants by gustessicked). The recirculated *multa* from SERR/EA should explete how the City will be form members of the public who conduct breach management of the location of the he MHPA (i.e., whether it's within their Zone Two), and how PRD staff'contractors would also he so informed about the janda face brack meases.
- a. The entry first the gradienter in Table 3-5 of the MSCP Plan, statics, "Area specific management diventives [ASR4De] must include measures to reduce edge officet and minimize distrutionnes (ASR4De] must include measures to reduce edge officets and minimize distrutions during the masting partied, first projection measures to reduce edge officets and minimized transmission and management measures to maintain or improve habitist degradation, and management measures to maintain or improve the projecting vegetation structure." The final SERPEA should address this requirement as it relates to the across that the proposed ravisions would affect (e.g., Sun Claurente Canyen), and should be proposed ravisions would affect (e.g., Sun Claurente Canyen), and should be travision activitie Agencies prime of the MMDa. They ASMDs should be complete prior to the date leave of the MMDa. They ASMDs should be complete prior to the date brows that the proposed ravisions would affect (e.g., Sun Claurente denoted by the WIMBith Agencies prime to the davelopment of the ASMDa. They ASMDs should be complete prior to the date brows that the proposed ravisions would affect they. Sun Claurent denot should be implemented concurrently with the scrivities they are effective, and they should be implemented concurrently with the scrivities they are supplemented.

A-36

# 6. In traive Exorts Plant Speeles ( Lack of Alguage Buforestnent

intended to address.

a. Previous comments have alluded to the indirect impacts from batch management. The results of the City's Byrash Management Evaluation (City's Evaluation) conducted for the SHR/BA indivate that eight of the 25 sites observed had 50 porcent or more cover of exodic plant spucies (Brotsh Management Evaluation / Biological Technical Report - Appendix B3. This bears out the common knowledge that truth managed area are jughtly susceptible to being invaded by exotic plant species, even if the atmounding inghily susceptible to being invaded by exotic plant species, even if the atmounding

## A-33 Reflec to comment A-12 and A-26.

4 Tya California Graateancher habitat acquisition mitigution measure is no longer applicatole; potential impacts are now mitigated to below a level of significance through an ordinance cliange to cronessly probibit clearing artivities in goalcatedent habitid during the breeding acaron. Refer to

somment A-26.

A-35 Refer to comment A-26. Rathiction of 5µush management activities within constal sage some habitate is not limited to MifPA areas Ingracts for nesting California Grates tchers will be evoided through the prohibition of bursh management activities within the species habitat during the incading season. The MSCP ERCAIS anticipated indirect effects from the management and exotic species within a 200-foot buffer area. The City has developed several management plants and area specific management plane for MGPA hands (i.e., Mission Bay, 1990, Fannes Slough, 1992; Marian Bear Mentorial Fark, 1994, Los Perasquibs Casyon, 1995; Pacific Highlards (i.e., Mission Bay, 1990, Fannes Slough, 1992; Marian Bear Mentorial Fark, 1994, Los Perasquibs Casyon, 1995; Pacific Highlards (a.e., Mission Bay, 1990, Fannes Slough, 1992; Marian Bear Mentorial Fark, 1000; Mission Trails San Diego Ambrozia Flan, 2000; Rancho Enceotada, 2001; Marrou Valley, 2001; San Pasqual/Lake Hodges, 2003; First San Diogo Niver Improvement Preject, 2004) and is in the process of dereloping several others (i.e., Wester Canyon), and continues to be committed to preparing and implementing management plane for all City MHPA Jands.

A-35

A-36

Ma Rusp (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Enclosure-11

Institut is solely or predominantly occurried by unitive specifics. Based on the City's giventuminou, shaft comoluted that invasion of excitic species into brush memagement areas appears to be the greatest impact associated with biological resources and brush management. We classify the invasion of errotic plant epocies is the most biologically domoging <u>indirect</u> impact of brush management, for brush menagement itself results in direct impacts on sensitive helicits and species.

A-37

The prevalence of invasive exotic species in brush nameged arters posse several hiological purblems. These includes elteration of ecosystem functions such as muticut dydelse, hydrology, and wildfire frequency, entonuncting end exclusion of intrive plants (i.e., habitat type change) and animals, which results in refuneed interaction of the principle (i.e., habitat type change) and animals, which results in refuneed interaction of the principle (i.e., habitat type change) and animals, which results the entire plants (i.e., habitat type change) and animals, which results the entire plants from the animals, which results in refuneed interaction. Farst particulation, with native plants; and supporting non-mainers, thogic, and mucuoka. For example, the California Natural Diversity Dathlase full offs that 181 of the state a rune plant species are expuncted in fure of the observed (Bossail et al. 2000). Establishement of furwary expects also increases the plant species are spanted and increase the the availability of propagates to travelse in the Zoue Two width, would expend increase the fur fur proposed increase the deficit for more distant furthers. We are concurred that the proposed increase the edded Zoue Two width, would expend invasive exotio species both within the edded Zone Two area and surrounding habitate. This would effectively increase the edded increase the edded Zone Two area and surrounding habitate. This would effectively increase the edge

A-38

b. Many enotic species that samblish in the brush munuggment areas, including several theor observed by City staff, are as or mure farmuchs than the native species thay displace (City of Lagma IIIIS). Five-prone exolic plant species herinde perioping grass (Correaferia sp.), shar thistle (Centarrea melleausts), castor been (Rheiner community, black mustad (Breation algra), Reastlan thistle (Saleola tragra), the tobacco (Micotiana glauro), and wild eats (Avena harbaia), all of which were observed during the City's area dimension, and wild eats (Avena harbaia), all of which were observed during the City's area dimension, and wild eats (Avena harbaia), all of which were observed during the City's area dimension. Parmpas grass, star thistle, oasfor bean, and black mustered are also invisive species on the California Exotic Pest Plant Council's Lists A or B. The presence of fire-prove courdes in the prove courdes of the prove courds.

electric counterproductive to brush management efforts.

affect of brush management activities and the affected area within the MiffAA, above the

current estimates which now include only direct impacts.

(c. A report by the San Diego Coundy Wildland Fee Task Force states, "unBritanately, mary homeowners ignore the need for definable space, because they mismate the "infearance" concept. They believe it to mean the complete remarkal of any regention on the laws amound their house. Other homeowners do not want to touch any native vegention for exvirummental or sectively resona. Other homeowners do not have the times are money to remove and dispose of vegelation, which could have too times and land througes" (See Diego County, 2003). The City's Braination substantiates this relatement. In the discussion of the rejected education/training alternative, the SIAR/EA states, "it is assumed that not everyme who requires innah management... would conduct inush management for the required procedures in the regulations or as required in development permits conditions.". The SERVEA goes on to state, "beaved on the assumption..., these provided assumption....

This comment is consistent with the SERVEA, which includes potential non-native species invasion into netive habitats as a significant project impact.

A-37

Comment noted. Refer to comments A.25 and A.37. The MISCP BIR/BIS svalyzed a 200-foot buffer area and the proposed ordinence would allow built management activities only within the first 65 first of the buffer area.

A-38

"This comment withresses the means of the project, not the securatry or adequary of the SERVEA. No response is required.

A-39

A-39

•	This contract कोर्तनक्ष्डान्ड the merits of the project, not the accuracy of adaquacy of the SEAREA. No tesponse is required.	The SERVEA assumptions on how brush namagement would be implemented is described on page DL-6 of the DERVIA. The language in the rejected attemative section has been revised for consistency. City staff coverse over the formest measures on semi-months of illessi arrivities.	However, in this case, observation of non-compliance leads staff to make reasonable assumptions based on this fact, that non-compliance would continue, thus satisfying 15064([)(5).	This otommul addresses the marks of the project, not the accuracy of artequary of the SEEVEA. No response is required.	Refer to page V.B-35 within the Final Strift/FA. The SEIR/EA does not describe impage due to weed invasion downslope of zone two hrush managed areas. This conversion is still called out as "significant" in the Final SEIR; however, consistent with the LDC EIR, the impact is mitigated by MSCP (implementation (except for impacts to non-covered makes relation a across).	
	<b>₩40</b>	A.41		A.42	64-V	
would he a significant impart to structive biological resources as a peault of the establishment of non-native plant species in 2005 two and downalops of zone two."	Based on these observations and the City's Byahuston, it is apparent that, for the most part, hundi management is contractly not constructed or not consider bed perpetitiv. Therefore, it is difficult to understand new municiting a wider tread management area in Zone Two will exhibit or its internel perpesse of providing more defensible space, without adequate City-wide contracture.	d. One of the assumptions used in the preparation of the Still/JA was that wacding, at required by the City's current brush movagement regulations, does not ocsur? This assumption is valid because it correctly arflects existing conditions. However, because the existing conditions are unlawful, they should not serve as a frame of reference for costing trapacts from the proposed project.	e. An additional proof for orthonoment of the brush management regulations is syldenced by apposition to a requirement that area proposed in the building code revisions <sup>14</sup> - that all accessory afrectures (e.g., fancer, patios, pilly structures), on a lot aglement to ar requiprimus a high fire based area or anywhere within 500 feet of such a order of or order of non-order points, pations to structure the function of area or anywhere within 500 feet of such a lot, be non-order or nubulable. The City's current trash management regulations for Zons Ome already problem the construction that mervides a means for transmitting fire to to hold table.	structures, and state, "structured such as Pances, wells, and aonibabitable gazebos that and located within bruch muragement Zoue One shall be of noncombustible construction" - (Clapter 14, Article 2, Dytakisa 4, page 24 of the Manichyst Colds, No transitures are allowed in Zone Trvo. That even the Building industry Association (which was among those opposed to this proposed ravision) appetently did not know about the aviating requirement, again underscores the Building Labustry Association (which was anong those opposed to this proposed ravision) appetently did not know about the aviating requirement, again underscores the Building Labustry Association (Perleh was anong there are despite the interactions in 1997 (BLA, 2004), According to the SERPEA, when the City modified the lumb management regulations more calanceatio. It appeares that antispentent is longely leading the lumb management regulations more calanceatio. It appeares that antious is longely leading.	f. The SERK/RA indicates that the project includes a proposed code amendment to allow Zone Two throuting by gosts, and that the impacts analysis includes impacts attributable to gosts. The proposed revisions do not mention the use of gosts, nor is it apparent that the impact argebra in the MERFIA includes izagazis from the use of gosts. Potential impact argebra in the MERFIA includes izagazis from the use of gosts. Potential impacts from the use of gosts for brush management include, but are not fimitive to, over- gazing which in turn would litely teendt in an invessor to investor plantap sous and	9 The CBy's current brush missignment repeterions recurs that Zyne Two the multituded on a regular basis by priority and theming parts. <u>Contribution for sector</u> and praintabiling any temptorary integration system? (Sector) 442.04/2(h)(k), empires addied(, in edition, test addied in edition, to solve the Solve the sector for the prior for the prior of the ABCP Submers Plan, purching the more state and praintability. Sector 442.04/2(h)(k), empires addied(, in edition, test addied is a solve the sector addied to the prior sectors into a solve the sector addied to the addied to the prior sectors into a solve the sector addied to a solve the sector sector by the sector addied to a solve addied to the ABCP Submers Plan, purching the prior addied to a solve addied and the addient sector sectors into the the NUFA and meas adjacent to the MHPA, and calls for the confecting and connoval of investor exords plant species into the MHPA and meas adjacent to the ABPA, and calls for the solve the sector sector species into the APCP Submers addied to a solve the sector sector species into the APCP and meas adjacent to the APPA, and calls for the APCP sector sector species into the APCP sector sector species into the APCP sector sector species adjacent to the sector sector species adjacent to the sector sector species adjacent to the APCP sector adjacent sector sector plant species adjacent to the sector sector plant species adjacent to the sector sector sector species adjacent to the sector sector species adjacent to the sector

Å<del>.</del>42

A-41

A-40

1

i l i

ļ

ł

ļ

;

1

1

:

ļ

Ecclosure-12

Ma. Rasp (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

۰ .

-10 This was one of the proposed radiations to the building come for high fire hazard exercities City Cronics considered eduption of the monotime on Jennery 20, 2004.

ይምዋ

Mg. Raup (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Encloance-13

possibly ension, spread (a.g., 5y cout, foces) of invasive plant proprepules from one brush management eacherure to the next (and arcas botween), degradation of weter quality from buckeria in the goats' feces, and impacts on narrow endenic plant species. The SERVIA proposes to mitigation for impacts from investvo apecies, stating, "in order Development Code EBN identified that mitigation would be required to the same extent as to mitigate significant impacts to biological recourtes as a result of the establishment of City of San Diego Biology Guidolines. This mitigation howover, is not proposed." We bruch management zowo 1, based on mittgation ratios per habitat type identified in the currently considered impact neutral for the purposes of determining habitat mitigation agree with the mitigation measure, even though brush management in Zone Two is needed for projects for which the Cdy lance districtionary parmits. As discussed iuvasive species in imush managamant zone two possibly downelope, the Land previously, the impact neutral status is not currently defeasible (connect 4).

## Recommendations

isnd. This is not to be considered as tubilization because weed control within Zone Two is an assumed condition of the MSCP. However, not only would it provide a significant maningemeant by gradioniting the invasive species in the extent brush management areas epecies control) of the brush managravent regulations on both private and City-conned improvement overall for the MHPA. it is also essential to mosting the purpose of the proposed revisions -- to provide an effective defensible space for firtifichture. withing the MHPA, and provide on-going City-wide conneurent (such and a nearly a We recommond the City come into compliance with its regulations regarding brush đ

A-14

decisions on the proposed brush management revisions until there is adequate funding to To achieve " $z^{*}$  above, we recommend that the City take immediate action to establish a reliable source of funding.<sup>11</sup> Uptif the City has sufficient funding for enforcement, it is difficult to justify formally widening Zone Two. We upp the City to defer making consideration of the building code revisions for high fire bazard areas (comment 7). colume the existing and proposed regulations, and until there has been fluther ÷ Å-45

nagament program since 1986, but clashy does not served of the bruch manuagement regulations. The one-time grant for a of Ennergency Service is only for the initial implementation of the pr option, as owners and hetbologies (s.g., Un assment diablet) of resid its form the PEO ŝ y Managaria report, would be for the City to zecene a "pruch me astributh a benefit or natiogenment descenamint district) of resk and enline these space that is br sua structures that radio 2 7 stinent managera, brain of any lot-an at Gan Diego) who hi feet, in any charled Fund has supported the britsh ondes) and its City needs an ungality sound in the Jenuary 21, 2004, City M (68 control f/66 (9.0) te City has applied for to the Othics 10m08 prosibile to and the Cry's sings and multiferents of Star Diego, Universit The Cly's Genora B guna Barlux many demant. 

Comment noted. Refer to comment A-25, ŧ

Commant noted. ÷,

•	Comment noted.	This comment addresses the merits of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SBIR/EA. No response is required.	Refet to page V.C.14 for additional information regarding goets.	All sites were assumed to be intradited with invesive species. In first this comment notes that the alternative would not substantially reduce triangles imparts. The alternative has been proved to the "Alternatives Considered but Rejeated" section of the final SEIR. Considered but Rejeated" section of the final SEIR.
	. A-46	( <del>1</del> .4	8 <del>년</del> 	, б-ү Ү
re-14	n <b>the</b> spilace.	t basis r basis be weed te Suberca	code section und inularity stroutd	ns Two Pacta ange of ange of the type for the district th
Enchource 14	The finul ERR/EA should address the fact that mury excits species that establish in the brush managements are at or more flammable than the parties species they displace.	The proper aced revisions include the following (strikeouts are propersed deletions and underlined text is proposal additions): "Zona Two shall be maintained on a regular basis by printing and duinning plants, controlling woods, and maintained any temporary irrigation aystem <u>unit</u> planting <u>are established</u> and <u>by removany irrigation</u> <u>evolgans</u> <u>alter establishmant</u> ." We recommend that (j) duis nyelon he worded in such a way that it is clear that the veeol control areat be on-going and not only "multing an etablificed," and fish previsions better reflect the requirements in Sections 1.4.3 and 1.5.2 of the MSCF Subarea Plan registions invarive species.	The remirvulated and/or final SEDR/EA should include proposed language for the code antendinget pertaining in the use of gasts for bruth management, and specify the section of the municipal code to be granded. The nederal should final SEUREA should provide a discussion of the impacts from using goats for bruth management. Partualarly grands would be allowed for use within or adjacent to the MHPA, the discussion should apoclifically address how gouts would be controlled to casue that they. I. fifth, don't clear, the vegated the controlled to casue that they. i. that't thin beyond the required 50 percent of vegatation, per the code; ii. that't thin prove there equated 50 percent of vegatation, per the code; if extrict their grander to plants over 18 inches in height, per the code; iv. four t damage neurow-endemto species; and don't spread invasive species from one site to other sites.	The SERE/EA indicates that the alternative involving clearing and re-planting Zone Two with low breight univerplant species would not reault in significant biological impacts. However, it also identifies potential significant impacts an habitats downstope from Zone Two from impathen much from the transcess on the grashatticer as a result of the loss of the labitat. The restructant and or final SUR/EA should reflect that the prementout type change of the electron ind planted area itself would be a significant impact, as would potential loss of sensitive plant species, both of which would require aftigation. Regarding the alternative plant species, both of which would require aftigation. Regarding the alternative involving streughtening the building code regarding the attra- potential loss of sensitive plant species, both of which would require aftigation. Regarding the alternative involving streughtening the building code regarding the avoid potential loss of sensitive plant species, both of which would require aftigation. Regarding the alternative involving streughtening the building code regarding the state potential loss of sensitive plant species, both of which would require aftigation. Regarding the alternative involving streughtening the building code regarding the potential loss of sensitive plant species, both of which would require aftigation. Regarding the Department's NOP letter, we support this alternative, partoularly for structures that would-do require bruck transformer within or adjaceant to the MEPA. For shuch structures, we reformment that structured and management, alternative be the first line of defense against fire, ration expanded bruck management, alternative be the first line of defense against fire, ration at structured and management, alternative be and materials that redune the need for bruck management, alternative be structural and due three hrush management requirements determined. For new consistent structural and
Ma Ruap (TWS-SDG-4072.1)		d. The proper soot revisions multide the underlined text is proposed soldiflor by printing and dimming plants, con irrigation system undit plantings are ereigans, after estabilishment." We recommend that () dhis novision We recommend that () dhis novision revisions better reflext the requirem Plan regarding finyaarve speeds.	c. The reminulated and/or fired SRDR/FAA should include a menufation provide a discontaining to the use of grants for busin and of the main and of the impact afrom using goats if grants would be allowed for use within or adjacent apochlash would be allowed for use would be allowed for the set for each investor expectes from one site to the damage neurow-condemo species; and don't again are worked investor expectes from one site to the damage neurow-condemo species; and don't again are allowed investor expectes from one site to the damage neurow condemo species; and don't again are allowed investor expectes from one site to the damage neurow condemo species; and don't again are allowed investor expectes from one site to the damage neurow condemo species.	Alternetives Analysis a. The SERVEA indicates that the ab- with low height metro phots spects after the neurophon modifies potentia Two from intrigation modifies to that it or vestiones and after the change of the cleared and or fa- potential lors of actualitive planted potential lors of actualitive planted in Regenting the attentive involving partern to fire proteotion in high fin revisions would chiminate the mead with the Department's NOP letter, that would do require hrush manual attructures we recommend that an defense against fire, tather the need then hrush management require actual then thrush management requirement
Mfr F	A-46 °	å. 1947	° 8 H K	A-49 A-40 A-50

ï

Ì ;

ļ

I

í į

į

į

i I

ļ

.

' ì

ŗ

ļ

I Ļ

I . I.

Ma, Ramp (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Enclosure-15

realtrial afternatives abund be required, and not considered optional. As to existing astructures, the building code should be required to receive that certain features of structures at the urban-wilellend interface be upgraded to meet the revised huflding codes. We applaud the City Counsel for adopting building code revisions that requires Class "A" ronfing sevenables and possibilit the use of wood shales and wood shingles. We urge the City Council to further strengthen the building code revisions that inquires the protection of structures in high insert fire strengthen the building code revisions that in a protection would not eliminate extant breach menagement meds. However, they could reach breach minimize the need for, and particularly the proposed wide and y other strengthy minimize the need to the strengthen the proposed wide they for short bursk management activities, and particularly the proposed wide grading of Yoo.

A-51

As discussed proviously, the sections lack of enforcoment of the bursh management regulations points to the need for action that would reduce the need for that antionement. The abready approved revisions to the building code and the further steragthening of the building codes would reduce the City's brunk management operational costs in Zone Two. The resirentiated and or final SHIR/EA should theroughly address the issue of Concurrent and commensate layeds of effort to period the City's brush management regulations and building code to achieve protection the attendance.

A-52

8. <u>Suepeated Modifications to Proposed Brush Management Revisions</u>

We add the foilowing anggested modifications of the propesed revisions to those already recommended. Suggested deletions are struck out, and suggested additions are underlined. a. One of the assumptions used in the pregnantion of the SERVEA in that no impacts to wetlands would noom. The proposed ravisions state, "No brush management is required in areas containing wetland vegetation." This language is ander the section entitled Zone Two Requirements. We recommed that the statement by placed instead at the end of section 142.10412(b), so that it is clear that the statement applies to both Zones One and if wo, I, addition, we recommend that the revisions provide a brief explaration treapable of the functions provide a brief explanation tegetime what constitutes the revisions provide a brief explanation treapting what constitutes are not been that the revisions provide a brief explanation treapting what constitutes wellands.

59-4

- 1 wor, an excutuout, we recommond that the low rate a true to the Biology Guidelines), and indicatin which constitutes wellands (e.g., refer to Table 2 in the Biology Guidelines), and indicatin whom to contact to find out whether labitu is within wellands. This is an important issue as the City is correctly proposing bruch management that may impact wellands
- (a.g., Coral Gate development in the Tijuana River Valley).
  (a.g., Coral Gate development in the Tijuana River Valley).
  b. Section 142.0412(1) allows the Fire Chief to modify the brash management requirements under certain conditions which are identified. The language should be modified to clarify whether this section allows for the widening of Zones One and Two beyout the
- respective proposed 35 and 65 frest. In addition, the SBIR/EA startes, "the LDC [Land Drovelopment Code] allows for alternative compliance to brush management in the form of architectural features which can be included as permut conditions for projects requiring a development permit". If section 142.0412(0) is intended to mirror this provision in the LDC, the language abould be modified to make it more apparent.

2-51

A-51 This comment addresses the merils of the project, not the accuracy or adormacy of the SERIVBA. No response is required. This contruct addresses the meets of the project, not the scenary or adequacy of the SERR/EA. No response is required.

A-52

This comment addresses the merits of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SEIR/EA. No response is required. The section discussing wetlands has been revised within the Final SIIR.

A-53

A-54 Page (II-3 has been revised to clarify that the Fire Marshall can tedper or critend the brush management zone one and two arcses; buyever, the SEIR assumes a 100 font average impuci.

		:					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	The project does not sensed use provisions regarding the location of zon a one bursh managed areas relative to the MHP A.	This comment addresses the ments of the project, and the accuracy of address of the SBIR/E.A. No response is required.	This comment addresses the merits of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SEIR/RA. No respirate is required.	This communit addresses the ments of the project, not the aneuracy or adequacy of the SEIR/FLA. No response is required.	This comment adóresses the merits of the project, not the ancurary or adag eacy of he SU(8)EA. No response is required.	This commont addresses the meats of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SHR/EA. No response is required,	
	A-55	у-56	V-27	**************************************	4-20 V	Ą-60	
		· · ·		•	· · · · ·		
. ·				2007 - 2007 1970 - 2007	· · ·		
Buokogune- 16	To be consistent with the City's MSCP Subsrom Plan, the proposed revisions should be modified to clarify that Zone One most be outside of the MFPA.	The Clity of Laguna Halls requires property ownens to remove all dead, overgrown, or dried out vegration, plants, and trees within 100 feet of any structure including worden frances (Clity of Laguna Hilla). The San Diego County Wildland Fine Task Force recommends that ordhysness include language that "diedlared Ban" Dask Force accommends that ordhysness include language that "diedlared Ban" Disk Force accommends that ordhysness include language that "diedlared Ban" Disk Force accommends that ordhysness include language that "diedlared Ban" (San Diego County. 2003). We outlands, groves, vines, and trees as firs hazards" (San Diego County. 2003). We we commend that face City's handscopelmush transgement regretations he amended to include structurents, while remaining consistent with the prohibition on flammablo atmotiones with Zone Ones and a misorin um combined width of 100 fest for Zones One and Two.	Section 142.0402, Table 142.044, new #9. "All existing or proposed lots where any open space, park area, and indeveloped public or private lands combining netwo or naturalized vegetation, and/or areas containing antiformatically sensitive lands are within 100 feet of an accessing or proposed flatiments.	Section 142.0412(e). This asofton states, "Both Zone One and Zone Two shall be provided on the subject property unless a resonded assentant is granted by an adjacent purperty owner to the owner of the subject property to establish and mainfain the required browk markgament zone(s) on the adjacent property in perperintly." While this plactice is followed now, our randerstanding is that for future development, if a new structure is built that would not allow fuels and yould require allernative measures (e.g., structure) to meet the browfin management to prior to extend into adjacent property, the firs Marshall would not allow firs, and would require allernative measures (e.g., structure). We agree brow in anagement to purce the new development, it canned the with the latter approach for new development, and recommend that it also sophy to ediatene public property (e.g., City open speec), and that the proposed ravisions he modified to reflect it.	Soction 142,0412(d). "All existing and new <i>inneutures</i> subject to this division aball corrupty with all tequirements of Chayler 14, Article 5, Division 5 - Additional Building Standards for Buildings Loosted Adjacent to Hazardons Areas of Native on Naturalized Vegetation: " While the City Council subprict regulations requiring Class "A" roofing assemblics, and prohibiting wood shakes and wood shinglos, they fave not yet adopted afditional furtiling standards for buildings loosted adjacent to fateration strates of native of taturalized vegetation. As previously stated, we support the adoption of such building exturbates.	Section 142.0412(c). "Where Zone Our within is required adjacent to the MFPA or within the Cossial Overlay Zone, any of the following modifications to the Jand Development regulations of the Land Development Code or structures in the Land Development Administance are premitted to accommodute the increase on which 35 feet (at specify fithe Zang One with 5 making up for a subopticoming in Zane Two)."	
Ms, Rasp (FWS-SDG-4072.1)	<ol> <li>To be consistent with the City's MSCP Subscen Plan, the propos modified to clarify that Zone One must be outside of the MEPPA.</li> </ol>	d. The City of Laguns Hills requires prop drifted rart vegration, plants, and trees y fraces (City of Laguna Hills). The Sar recommands that orditances include is ordiards, groves, whest, and trees as fu vecontinued that frie City's handscaped include struilar requirements, while re flammobio atmotuses with Zone Ones. Zones ('no and Twn.	<ul> <li>Section 142.0402, Table 142.04A, new #9. "All exclaing open space, park area, and inderclosed public or private naturalized vegetation, and/or areas containing environme 100 foct of an eristing or proposed florimable structure."</li> </ul>	f. Section 142.0412(0). This acction stat provided on the subject property unless property owner to the owner of the sub- brueshmansgement zone(s) on the adje brueshmansgement zone(s) on the adje followed now, our vadarstrading is the that would require Zone Two to exten would not allew this, and would requi bruesh management toquirenceuts (pees with the latter approach for new devel edjacent public property (a.g., City op modified to reflort it.	2. Soction 1.42,0412(d). "All existing an corrupty with all tequincritesits of Charg Standards for Buildings Located Adja Vegetation: "While the City (conneil vescenblics, and probability wood shu assemblics, and probability wood shu actinuate fucibiling standards for built or taxturalized vogetation. As previou enturbands.	<ol> <li>Beetian 142.0412(c). "Where Zone Cur within is required within the Coastal Overlay Zone, any of the following mod regulations of the Land Development Code or straidards in Manual are permitted to accommodule the incorescript with One within its making up for a subgroomstig in Zane Tveo)."</li> </ol>	
	A-65	9 <b>5</b> 4	A-67	89 19 19	A-59	09-V	

.

. |

' | |

. : ·

}

:

:

i i j

i

! .

| :: |

ı I Ļ

ļ

: '

	<ol> <li>The reference to the MHPA shruld by spatial out, and a footnots added that briefly acplains to the reader the purpose of the MHPA and whom to contact to find out whether their land is within or adjacent to it.</li> </ol>	A-61	This comment addresses the merits of the purject, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SBB/RA. No response is required.
A-62	<ol> <li>We recommand that proposed section 142.0412(h)(7) be placed instead immediately after section 142.0412(f).</li> </ol>	A-62	This communt addresses the metils of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SERVEA. No response is required.
	k. Just as the proposed brush management revisions eite and require compliance with the proposed building code periature, we recommend that the latter eite and require compliance with the former.	A-63	This comment addresses the ments of the project, not the anomacy or adequacy of the SEIR/EA. No response is zequired.
	9. Djaterpuncies That Require Recordination.		
	Please reconcile the following apparent distrepancies in the SEIR/HA.		•
	<ol> <li>Pleases cisuify/correct the acreages on page IV-2, socion D. On muleraturding is that currently, brush management in Zone Two accurs on 3,753 acres within the GTy. Of that, 3,222 acres are on private land, and 531 acres are on public land. Of the 3,753 acres, 526 aré within the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multiple Hadriat Preservation Area (MHPA) (gen. comm., Chad Kana, City MSCP, Yune 25, 2004).</li> </ol>	444 A	Page IV-2, section D has been revised as follows: MHPA land within the City of San Diago is upproximately 47,919 56.851 acres.
	b. Page V.C.12 indicates that currently browin management affects 3,815 acres of vegetation, with no distinction between Zones One and Two, whereas our understanding is that ourself bruish management in Zone Two alone occurs on 3,753 acres within the City (pers. comm., Chan. City MiSCP, Juno 25, 2004).		Page V.C-12, Water Quality, has been ravised as follows. Current brush management regulations, based on the entron assunptions and extering GR data, would impact approximately 3,815 3,753 acres of vegetation. Implementation of the proversed hundh monascencer revision would interval
	c. Page V.C-12 indicates that the proposed revisions woold affect an additional 2,474 stores, whereas Table V.A-1 on page V.A-13, indicates that additional arres would be 2,880.		an additional <u>2,474</u> 2,880 acres, for a total impact to <del>vegelation</del> of 6,389 <u>6,663</u> acres,
ļ	d. The fammary 21, 2004, City Minager's Report indicates that the City boyes to thim the	A-66	Refer to comment A-65.
	cutto area writher Zone i we on an avaige or every two years, weaters no activitat. Indicates that hrush manighment activities would likely occur overy one to three years,		Thiming of vegetation is required as frequently as necessary to keep vegetation at the preserthed levels. Therefore, the frequency of thinning activities is dependent upon vegetation growth, not the passage of a specific period of time.
	References .		
	EIA. 2004. Letter from the Building Industry Association to Mayor Dick Murphy regenting the proposed building and fire code changes. January 20, 2004.	•	
	Bosserd, Carla C., John M. Randall, and Marc C. Hoshowsky (eds). 2040. Invasive Plants of California's Withiands.		
	City of Lagma Hills. City of Laguna Hills Weed Abatament Supplemental Guidelinas & fact shoet entitled Fine Prone Plant Species. http://www.ci.lagune-hills.ce.ins/penes/Meed Abatement, Guidelines.pdf	·	•

ł

į
Ma, Rame (FW3-SDG-4072.1)

Èncloser-18

1

ļ

.

1 .

I

ì

ļ

ļ

;

į

City of Sar Diago, 1996. City of San Diego, Development Services Department, Eavinonmental Analyzais Section/Poblic Projects and United States Field and Wildhff: Service. Recimentated Pyarh Joint BIR/EIS Issuance of Tales Authorizations for Threatened and *Badarquered* Species Due to Urbinn Growth Within the MSCP Planing Azea. LUR. No. 93-0287, SCH No. 93121073. August.

Sun Diego County. 2003. Matguaton Sreazgles for Reducing Wildland Firs Risks. San Diego County Wildland Fire Teak Rows Findings and Recommendations. Report to the Board of Supervisors. August 13, 2003.

i

Ξ

Comment Letter B 

### CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION TIME OF ORTHOGON - THE REDUKUS ASHION

))77 Mathamal Linn (quart guine guine Ko 944 aniazo, ch - sekre-haz [6:9] 767-2270 Kuth Dealm lows

July 9, 2004

Development Services Canter 1122 Pirst Ave., MS 501 Sen Diego, CA 92101 City of San Diego Ma. Allison Baap

Re: Project No. 31245, SCH No. 2004031041 - Draft SER/EA for Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code

Dom Ma. Rapp:

Commission staff has reviewed the above referenced environmental docoment addressing proposed revisions to the City of San Diogo Land Development Code buish munagement regulations. The portion of the City's Land Development Code to be revised it part of the City's Local Coasted Program (LCP) implementation plan; thus, the proposed new issima-will populae an LCP amentingut approved by the Consula Commission prior to implainentation within the coastal zone.

ġ

proposes a City-wide 100 foot wide brush management zone consisting of a 15 foot wide We pudershind revisions to the brush management regulations are proposed in response Zune One and 65 fixet wide Zone Two. The project will affect both public and private to recommission of the Pire Chief as a result of the 2003 Coder fire. The project dangs in the City of Sau Diego and includes impacts to the City of Sau Diego Multi-Habitat Plancing Area (MHPA).

ricitettional areas and preserved open space. As proposed, the project vrould implement a 100 foot brush management zone, what a 40 to 70 foot wide brush management zone sensitive habitat from damage due to fires and brust, cleanance. Development of a stable ourreatly exists for property west of initiaties 805, and 2 70 to 95 foot wide zone crists possible adverse long-term imparts to environmentally sensitive hubilat areas, public brondery of the urbun wildfend interface for both existing and new development will We support the need for twised regulations to protect both when development and reduce risks to personal property in the inture and avoid or minimize to the extert for property cast of 1-805.

Type IV (developed/disturbed/ag/encelyptus) which was likely included for connectivity, To aumuatize, the servitonmental analysis concludes implementation of a 100 Å. wide within Zone Two. Of that, 715 acres would be within the MRPA, of which 242 acres broch management zone will result in 2,880 acres of additional impacts to vegetation would be within biological core areas, however, 50 acres in the core area are Habitat but not susceptible to significant habitat disruption from brush management.

occurrences of guatestedier will be affected; however, the true impacts cannot be assessed Regarding impacts to gastostchet hahitat, the analysis concludes five of the  $377~{
m km}$  we

! |

Comment noted.

곫

Ma Allison Raap July 9, 2014 Fage 2

I

i

!

i

due to the lack of appropriate data. Approximately 429 arres (396 ac, high or very high quality) of gnateotolier hebitut in the City will be affected, including (98 acres (184 high or very high quality) in the MFPA.

Studies by the City hjologist demonstrate that the effect of thirming in Znue Two is a significant invasion of erotic weeds which deprades the habitet value and may result in increased exotics in adjacent natural areas. All of the induction furgacts to biological resources are nonsidered aignificant. Additionally, all of the impacts would be writin the ZOO fact buildered aignificant. Additionally, all of the impacts would be writin the ZOO fact buildered aignificant. In the ERPAIS prepared for the City Multiple Species are explored by the City Multiple Species are explored by the Section Sec

Regarding potential mitigation measures, the draft  $\overline{
m RR}$  suggests the following:

- Requiring houst management activities within MitPA hands to occur outside the gridestohar hypothing season (March I through August 15);
  - Requiring a qualified biologist prior to commencing tunsh managrammat soirvities to anyory the project after for gratostiching usats;
- 3) Acquiring an amount of annexide, approximately 198 water per table V.B.4 in the Biological Rewarders Section, of equal value gnatestelser habitat over a time period to be determined by the City Manager, and
  - 4) Requiring mitigation for Zana Two impacts based on the mitigation ratios for habitat typo required for Zons One hupacts identified in the City of San Diego Biology Guidebaca.

The draft EIR indicates all of the above mentioned mitigation measures are not proposed or accepted by the apploant and it is not clear whether or not these measures will be required as part of the changes to fue regulations. The first HII indicates that incorporating the identified mitigation measures into the project would redue, the impacts to hilological resonates to beiow a level of significance; thereforts, we believe stick mitigebien should be required in the final EIR as certified by the City, and stick mitigebien should be required in the final EIR as certified by the City, and

- B-2 suith mitigetion chould be required in the final EIR as cardified by the City, and incorporated into the reviect bruch management regulations. Although the LDC was approved allowing None Two implets in the MHPA as "imped neutral", the changes to
  - the regulations would affect a greater amount of habitat in Zone Two within the MEPA which is significant and can no huger by considered a neutral effect.

Regarding atternatives, Alternative 4 - Increasing Bulkling Regulations states that, under this alternative, "proposed dhanges to building regulations would neem thereby effortinating the next for increased brash management zones. Revisions to the bulkling regulations could include fire walls which would be constructed at the boundary between Zone Two and open space. Additional building regulations could include alternative medificational frastores for structures where furth management would normally be required. The revisions to include fire wells ins been added to the LDC regulations included in the proposed ordinance". However, the dath EIR did not include an analysis included in the proposed ordinance". However, the dath EIR did not include an analysis

The midgeston as outlined in the SBRAEA will only be implemented if the City Council directs the applicants to adhere to the mitigation.

Ä

Refer to cumutent A-12.

3

· · ·	The addition of fravalls or other architectural features in fieu of hund- menagement are identified as options within the ordinance and can only be approved by the Fire Marshall. Any imperis associated with installation	of a frewail or some officer feature would be smalyzed on a case by case basis. Per CRQA Section, 15126,6 (d)"the ERR shall reclude sufficient information about each alternative to allow meatingful evaluation, unalysis, and comparison with the proposed project."	Comment motel.	This comment dues not address the adequany of the SEIR/B.A. Therefore, no comment is required.	This comment and cesses the ments of the project, not thet accuraty or adequecy of the SERVEA. No response is required.	The two responsible property owners would have to work together to resolve the brush management issue between the two lots. Section 142.0412 (h) of the proposed ordinance includes alternativo measures which can be approved by the Pirc Manaball in firm of brush management.	
	Ť	÷.	ያ ይ	B-1	<b>8</b> 8	· 6	
· .			· · ·	· · ·	- - -	·.	
Ms. Alliston Rasp July 2, 2004 Page 3	of the impact of the fire wells on habitat and visual quality, or their effectiveness in reducing the need for branchemistry. We request such an analysis be provided.	Additionally, we believe discussion of the "functeesed building regulations" alternative should be expanded to identify the range of possible sinustanes, or other poofifications to a readd-midal structure, such as alternative inuliding or noof materials, sprinklar systems and furwards, that would actually have the effect of reducing an avoiding the most for additional Zone Two brash management. The regulations should require implementation of such structural modifications as the first line of defines, prior to allowing the additional inepasts within the MHPA, preserved open space and public lands associated with the revised Zone Two brash management.	The impacts identified in the draft BIR relate to implementation of the revised brush management regulations to protoct activity structures, some of which ware built prior to any brish monspenent requirements and some built in anomdance with a 30 fbot wide Zone One. We recognize that given the increased risk due to drought conditions and concerns evident from the Coder fire, that additional impacts to environmentally sensitive lands in the constal zone will contr. However, the changes to the regulations should be durined in a way that acknowledges these impacts, and malyans stud promotes alternatives to even the model and when the increased the Concerning and promotes alternatives to even the next model and the other Concerning and malyans and promotes alternatives to even the model and the formation.	man worth avoid some manuary is pressues. Other was appears to some conservation resources and steep hillstiles should apply to existing and mitigated As proposed, the regulations would apply to existing and proposed lots. Given what is known about the risk to urban development that is stred too chose to protect such such protocted open spence, and the realism teal for bruch absance to protect such and protocted open spences through the sited and designed to avoid protects and another arrived reprotect through the sited and designed to avoid protects for another arrended open spences through the sited and designed to avoid protects for the protected open spences through the sited and designed to avoid protects for the protected open spences through the sited and designed to avoid protects for	exivitonmentally sensitive lands, parks and open space. Therefore, the regulations should establish diffreent eventands for breath management for existing structures, existing modeweloped legal parcels, and new subdivisions. New subdivisions should be required to provide all the 100 foot breath management zone conside the MHPA and, when present, stoop hilleridea. New development on existing lots should be stratyzed on a case by case hasis, and avoid impacts to MHPA lands and steep hillerides when possible. This would assure new development is not located in a locardous location, will roman risk to properly and protect valued open space, natural landforms and attical habitat consistent with the MSCP requirements and the Constel Ant.	Our final comments relate, again, to the proposed regulations. Commission staff is particularly concerned when bush management requirements will adversaly affect public lands and preserved open space. Therefore, we recommend the Gity add aorus clarifying inguages as to the responsible parties when the attucture being protected is not located or the lot contributing the flammable wegetation, to protect both public and private interests. We encomage the Uity to comsider carefully how and when a distinction should be made if Zone Two brush management would impact public lands, preserved open space attive MHPA lands. The negatiations should incorporate measures that assure alternatives to reduce or avoid such impacts will be theroughly considered and implemented first.	
	4-8	с d	ዋ ወ	2 1	<b>សុ</b> យ	ም ይ	• •

Ma. Allison Ruep July 9, 2004 Page 4

Figalty, we've noted a change in the regulations where the words "out and cleared" are replaced with the word "thinned" in reference to vegetation in Zone Two. Please define each term and give examples as to their difference. 01-8

hoft, personal property and open space, and that both are highly valued by the ultizers of gan Diego. We woold welcome a meeting to discuss our concirns, if thme permits, prior Thatk you for the opportunity to comment on the draft EIR/EA for revisions to the brash menagement regulations. We recognize this is an important effort morestary to protect to action by the City Council. Please call me with any questions or comments.

District Manager Shoriyn Sarb Shuttered y,

co: Deborah Lea Cris Cameron Libby Lucas

Benjamin Frator

(O:Syiii Diegébiant) MasegrinadisO Revisor to LDC ago BR. anonata do

Per the Land Development Code, Section 113.0103, "Clearing" is defined as the outing and removal of existing vegetation fidm a premise without disputsance to the soil or surface or destruction of the root system. "Thimming" is referred to in the draft or filmsnee as proming of 50% of the plants over 18 inclues in height to a height of 6 inches. Clearing is not limited to 50% of the plants.

ļ

1

į I

ł

i I

1

ì

1

6336 Greenwich Dobe, 948-94 S-ai Diago, CA 97122-5922 P R58,450-1276

Comment Letter C

grownelbiteseteit.www F 858.522.045

A Lenner Faindy Biilide Greystone Homes, Inc. MBr Lowson PERMIT

Scot Sandabbam Trippark Pac**li**ic | [cthi05 PHOTO PROPERTY AND INCOME.

City of San Diego Development Services

Ma. Alliam Ram

faby 9, 2004

1222 First Avenue, MS 501 Bavironnantet Pisunar

San Diego, CA 92101

THEASTRICK / SECRETARY Herara Hagoy II Dreint Contrended

Ξ́2

Draft Land Development Code EIR for Brush Mgt. Revisions

transforme PAST passinger

Dear Altison:

The Crev Randi Company No and Anna

Ъ CINER EXECUTIVE OFFICE navel a Leven

that the proposed brush management revisions would needd in significant

impacts to biological resources

managrowers standard. We do not concar with the conclosion in the EIR

We have reviewed the BIR for the proposed revisions to the Land Development Code to implement a city-wide 100 foot wide breeh

> Cuttonia Building 21 PULVELE

And the restored molusty American

Program Implementing Agreement stipulates that Hrush Mgt. Zone 2 is to

create for development in the City. The Multiple Species Conservation

We are very concerned with the polarital problems this conclusion will

HIR is not proposing that Brush Mgt. Zone 2 be mitigated in uccordance

under this assumption. Although we appreciate the fact that the Druft

by treated as impact neutral and the EIR for the MSCP was prepared

with MSCP mitigation ratics, the Draft EIR has reached the conclusion

that this is the mitigation meeted for the impacts to be less than

significant.

of Home Suldes

3 National Assumption of Industried and Office Programma

occur; and the Draft RIR has not domonstrated that, were a significant impart to occur, the impact would be equivalent to the total removal of The Draft RIII has arred in this regards with respect to this conclusion. The Druft EIR has not demonstrated that a significant impact would habitat upon philek the MSCP mitigation ration. 3

determination of significant impacts to highgical resources invalid. The RIR is definition in accord fundamental ways that make its

report or "purely arcedotal" information. The FUR analyzed 25 Department conducts periodic brush manegenetat activities. Of ocour. 13 of the sites were sites where the Fark and Roorestion The EIR only evaluated a handful of sites and prevents the sites where bruth management activities have or continue to

δ

Comment noted. 5

3

- The draft SERVEA identifies significant impacts to biological resources as 1 result of investive plents (ypes retain)isfining in zone two enco fuiriting has occurred. The SFEK/EA is thered off the Liend Development Code EJR. which resched the same conclusion,
- City which were surveyed by staff Biologiste. The majority of these sites information is anomabut, evaluation of these 25 slopes can assist the City Appendix B – Biological Resources Report identifies 25 sites within the management. The Cuy's Biology Guidelines do not provide for a larger revealed that invasion of exotic plant species had established with some of San Diogo in determining general impacts associated with brush mitheation ratio in siteations where the lovel of impact may differ. While this two therefore impactives the sensitive vegetation.

3

that would contradict fae determination that habitat intracts would be less than startficant. It is unticipated that the purposed revisions to the hrash lotneowners when conducting brush menagement, therefore climinating Sce comment C-3 above. Shaft is not nware of any substantial evidence maraigement ordinance will provide clarification and guidence to confusion.

3

ASSOCIATEDING OF SAM DIRECT STRUGGY VIII UNG. NOUSTRY

purpuring brush management archvitics as potrarial code violations, even in arcas entirity outside of the MEIPA. As a result, mony landowness have been confused depertment is responsible for brush thisming svery two years, suproximately only suffucement entity such as an EIOA are leas likely to properly maintaining brush the ofter 12 sites, 11 of facm are thimsed by private landowners, and only one is neighbors, the City's code enforcement division has been overly aggressive in Department has been grossly under-funded. Of the minim 1,750 acres the by this initial measage from government agencies and intimidated into not litimed by a Hono Owners Association (HOA). The Parks and Rettration 40 arres are being frinned every (wo years. Private landowners with no managrament areas. Added to thus, often in response to  ${
m compliaints}$  from property resintaining their broch management areas. A through the RIR indicates that 96% of the size evaluated contained some level words, 64% of the sites evaluated were at a minimum 75% free of exolic spectes. sites evaluated, 16 (64%) had 25% or less coverage with exotic species. In other provided. The EIR also does not indicate which type of after had more or less exotic invasion. Hown the information provided in Table 1 of Appendix B, the Rush Management Evaluation and Biological Technical Report, out of the 25 with nine of thors sites 90% of more free of exode species. It is difficult to of exotic plant investors, no amessment of the average level of transion is conclude then that significant biological impacts with readt with Enush Management Zone 2 thinting.

ېږ ن

The <u>EIR</u> was not able to identify the frequency and quality of the brush management antivities that occurred for most of the sites evillanted. According to the Brush Management Evaluation, no information on when and how often orush menggoment activities have occurred in available for any of the private Isndowner sites evaluated. a

ŝ

- when the institutional landowner stice were first developed, no conclusions can be reached regarding the potential for skirificant biological inteacts from future Dy andiging only one 110A-manged area, and providing to information as to development. ò
- bruak management regulations, not mitigaton based on the mitigation ratios per habitat type established with the City's Riology Galdelines. Whichlar the weeding consistent with the regulations is not conurting in finish management 2000 two," inducting that the correct mitigation meanure is enforcement of Laady, the KIR status that 'sile visits conducted by City and revealed that
- conclusion that impacts to biological resources are significant can be validated or ounight hubitat removal, on which the biological mitightion ratios are based. dot, the City still must demonstrate that the type of impact is equivalent to

с С

considerably degraded. Please note also that the secondary of 25 hreat. management after was not a scientific study, but provided aneodotal Habitat with one quarter of its land area occupied by invosives is

ő

information about the state of brash managed sites within the City.

Comment noted. Such information was not available to the report aufhor.

3

Comment noted. It is reasonable to assume that impacts from future brush

<u>mimagement will be comparable to those from existing brosh</u>

management,

3

Neighborttood Code Compliance Department and is not a form of miligation. The City's Biology Ordelines do not provide fix a larger mitigation ratio in situations where the level of impact may differ. Enforcement of brush management regulations is carried out by

3

In moler to justify the use of the MSCP ratios contained in the Chy's Blokey Guidelines, the ELR would need to dromentate that brack fulloning activities need in the complete loss of biological function and value. The ELR data not descentule this.

•

.

3

in short, the Druft EIR has not pretacted valid evolutions that hursh memogrammi activities are resulting said will result in a significant blokogical impact and the HIR's conclusion. that a significant biological impact orists is, therefore, invalid. We request that the KIR be revised haved on a more theoreth coefficies of the potential for algorificant biological

Comment trated.

83

.

Comment acted. •

ŝ

• inopacita. 040

Very tody yours.

Scott C. Molloy / Public Policy Advocate S Ю  $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}$ 

- **1** 

"

ł

÷ ł

ļ ł

I

i

# Comment Letter D

:

I

į

ł

2

Į

Conter for Biolegical Diversity Ruizoyaned Mahistra Leegus Friends of Las Pensequitos Cargon Sas Diago Anthron Society Sas Diago Anthron Society Sar Diago Chapter Stative Nisht Society Sar Diago Chapter Stative Nisht Society Sar Mage Chapter Stative Nisht Society Sar Mage Chapter Stative Nisht Society

July 7, 2004

As. Alfaton Rang, Environmental Flutner City of San Dhego Development Survices Cather 1222 Fint Avenue MS 501 San Diego CA 92103 Re: <u>Brieh fremaggiter</u>t revisione <u>In fije Land</u> Develorer art Code

Dear Ma. Range

Thurk you the the typerburies to contrast on the break moragement meraions to the Land Development Code.. These constraints are provided on behalf of the Contre for Diological Diversity, fistlangered (Jabitats Langits, Phienda of Last Fersaquitos Canyon, Friendu of Scote Canyon, San Diego Auduhon Sooledy, San Diego Urapter Ceftikunda Native Phant Scotety, San Diego Chapter Silanz Chab, and Thitty-Sconned Street Centyon I add Ferce. Our groups strongly supports efforts for the City of 8an Diggo to reduce the rick has of life and property from whithin. Five activation and retarnal measures protection are lightly competible, and we are dedicated to working groupsly with you to address these goals. Unitzumenchy, the City suppare to wroughtly prost a cos-sizy-ille-oll larah meangranout goluthon without the consideration of alternatives that might reduce that in a twanter in grant. Code provident the consideration of alternatives that anipping functions and in transmerse in grant. Code provident the consideration of alternatives that the first of the consideration of alternatives that the first of the consideration of the constraint matter of the first of the the transmerse in the constraint and the constraint matter of the first of the transmerse and in the constant matter of the constraint matter of the constraint matter of the constant of the constant of the constant matter of the constant matter of the constant matter of the constant of the constan

Ē

This commont addresses the meths of the project, not that surgery of adequacy of the SEUVEA. No response is required.

Ā

- - - -	Tris impact is considered significant because the upplicant has Gaolined to implement the identified mitigrified. Rafet to commant A-26.	This concreat addresses the marks of the project, not that secaracy or adopted as adopted of the SERABA. No response is movind.	Comment noted. This costment addresses the firstingalenses of overdding sonsitionation which would be needed to certify the SERUEA as writter in duch form.		-	Per URQA Section 15126.6 (d) We EIR shell include sufficient information about coult alternative to allow meaningful evaluation, smilysis, and comparison with the proposed project."		This corrence: addresses the merits of the project, not that ascretey or adopted of the SERVIAA. No response is required.	This commont addresses fire meriks of the project, not that accuracy or adequacy of the SEHE/IEA. We response is required,		
•	ф.	ä	D4			ñ	۰.	ዓ	ĥ		
							· · :	· .			
		•	· · ·								
Community on Jacksin 1929 support navieviewe to Una Land Land Land Land Land Land Land - John South 1994 - John P John 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 2004 - 20	The City also agreets to wreaginity dismiss reasonable minigration measures for insparta to biological renormes and others. Insparts to biological redokrets are algority significant, are likely to measure the effectiveness of the Multiplo Species Conservation Program, and alroad he fully milligated. Many impacts and so that either the Cellforth gravatebar during the hereful gravat to the total with a substant of the Cellforth gravatebar during the hereful gravatebar total variancessary and anoty admested with reasonable famils on the fundate of Sanat elsentra. Yet the City propose no militation advected with the thresh hereful at the fundate of Sanat elsentra.	Code tratisions tequiliting the resident locating most this is a research is alternative to trush management, envecially in sensitive natural areas. Experted of head, management may often providue sense illuritori odditioned from satiry benefit. But due hest available data indicate that this subscript animal lensefit may be lest when highly flattun ble, weatly, could species invade managed areas and weat courses requirenteds are not enforced. The best available data also " indicate that ray transporteric is a litely so and that it is conside aporties invade indicate that ray transporteria iteratives are not enforced. The best arritiable data also " indicate that ray transporteria iteratives in the base of a the base of the base of the base of the base of indicate that ray transporteria iteratives in heavies. In the base of an also base indicate the ray transporteria iteratives and the process.	The City cannot partify any statement of overziding considerations for the proposed break management code sevelopes. The availability of recensivily a provestive alongance the limited becally of expended brock management restore the City's study in find first the bandit of the provested extern with entredin kipsticent restore the City's study in find first the bandit of the	The following are specific connected to the break management code zevicions.	– I. <u>Europeal stant</u> elopolitor of Ille-verteirent indel <u>igo, nagrianunt, n. an alberentre</u> in brueb faienenenen	The Hir/Ed.'s analysis of the "Increasion building remained." Alternative to form memoration topicans cannot and footfindant for G200A acceptioner. Possible matheds to implement this alternative altorid be descedied? in much grown detail prior to aclastican of the proposed branch management altornetive.	Code reviews requiring fac-vestsion or "the-proof" meaning for new another and remothen are likely to prove mean more affective then beneficial measurement in preventing floores has	οί ρισμοκόν καιο ίται το του, των επιστικό αρφατικτένη αντόπήτω καινή παταί παταιθρατικαι σους ταγάθωτα του ευροτία το "έλα-μποτά" Ιστιλίμας σούς καγάστας από νέην απόμαϊτα λαιάτη ταιατορατικας απολήμειά τγιάι απόα πανίκάται εκοριάτως "Ελε μτατα" buildings will από ακοιταιρίες αράιδα.	A number of setisles are grached industring the huportanes of the restatest building materials as a first determs against which (e. Date pressaid here sud elsowners strengty undentes that suborne-bunning restates (fireformals, contens, etc.) is the primery came of setuebart fightion – not direct ignition from burning trush increased at a reasonable distance from a surroure. Code		
	4	2 . 2	<u></u>	1		5°2		ŝ	24		

Comparis we have number to the Lord Correlation of the Lord Correlation Code  $30.7^{+2}_{-2.004}$ 

i

ł

.

ı ļ

i

revisions requiring the resistant meterable are Skely to be fee meat afficative tool in preventing. gtracture ignition from elmone hunling pasteriel.

Expend exercises of movies by all merabranish 

owners will carry out large management conduction with the Chy's proposed code revisions. City Yet the RIR/RA also invisioning that past firm predention consistents (e.g. wear control) have been ignored, and proposed mode reviations constituted suppressed sight have detraned that property owners will "perform the connect apports of thissing" in zone 2. Proposal ands revietions do not appear to provide adquate assessment that parparty .' ອ ດ

by the City in the BEARA

Additioned increases should be solded to the code courty mating that break management shall not exceed rearments extendence in the file/EA. The code almoid also ha amendical m specifically authorize code criteconnect and recreating for any largeh management exterding HR/EA purmochers. ۱. ရာ မ

- Candly the location of zone 1 estimaty within new development from the 님
- The KIR/EA is not close that muse ! will still he estively loomed within the footprint of any
  - <u>fiture</u> residential, contractial, or other development. "Can ELEVEA choold clarity that this is the 년 명영 S 02-13 13
- OUTETTON Will zone i aid to enthely located within the footment of any finance residential. commercial, or other development? . ' 2
- Clarify code trajaints en buen pompennent en coine ž
- Prepored brush memogeneent code revisions appear increasiont with the text of the ERAEA ard vice waze. The City almuld ensure consistency between these documents. ŝ, ; 1 1 1 1
  - Some break numery-ment proceabulies prisoned in the ERRAA to not appear to bo reflected in the proposed order tevialone. Eropeated ende zevisions do not appear to address methods of e C
- resources, and any required permits, clearances, or approvate. See BIRAEA at UL3. According to jirskinionry sine ovalvadoo, brush uzangenaeni implanentativo halioding jotyendizo of a bruah ញានាលន្ទទោកលោះ ២២១៨, មិឃុំរបសៃខ្មុំ នាមថ ព្រមរាមបន្ទ លេខាតែមជិន, ឧត្តមភ្លេទានាវ (Ypq, កាន់សេខាង។ ថា នាសង់ធំ មយនដែលក the Filther, "...[T]he regulations are stlart on methods for proving and thirning." The same
  - appears true fur other protectariss. Proposed code revisions shored to pavised to factorizable all докожных with шоралу имаать brush mensgeneral proposals / plans to provent exceedive of these proceedings at 10.5. Coule newsions should also provide for some foreal of City 5-14

- Refer to comment B-10.

Ã

- clearly states the regulations any violation pertaining to the regulations is stieguary of the SEIRTEA. No response is required. The first miliance This comment addresses the monits of the project, not that accertary or wardied by Neighberhood Ocde Complisace on a complaint hasia

ĥ

Future development will be required to comply with the approved

9 4

Ā

- and agains a
- Zous one brank management is considered to be within the freetenth of distantance for development.
- Comment workd

52

<u>-</u>

- Procedures for brush, managément within das SUG/EA are form a marcut SBJR/EA. This 14 Cornolism is currently available to home owners for irtformstional builtotio "The City of San Diego Fire Safety sud Bush guidelinus en hors to perform bruge minagement on privisity owned Munkgement Guido For Priverto Property", az ménemező in (be dneh in operative
- This correct addresses the metriks of the project, not that sourcesy  ${f u}$ edequecy of the SERVEA. No response is required.

4

	<u>बिंद</u> у 7, 2004 Page 4	-		·
				· · ·
	ekcering. Impacts to biologicial resources and others are likely to be even ment significant than militarized if the code ternains silvant on these topics.			
	QUESTION – What broth menegenean presented presented in the EURIEA at III-3 are or will be Included in the present code are force?	ф.	21-C	Refer to comment D-13. The proposed land development code smemburnt is attached, in its cubicdy, to the SERREA as Appendix C.
	QUBSTION – How will the City ensure procedures at 10.3 will be followed by property owners carging out independent brash nonsagement if these (no not folly incorporated into the code revisions, with provisions for enforcement?	<u>а</u>	. 91-Q	This contracts addresses the tracks of the project, not that accuracy or belequery of the 2BRR/RA. No response is required. The SERR/RA, traued on evaluations of arising breat measurement when make notice.
	V.			essurptions stort inte the proposal court encodeducer, wown re- simplemented. Compiliance with all aspects of the inflormational bulketin in not useessatily assumed.
	The ILR/EA does not appear to address likely algolificant negative inspects of burth parameters(at our for seledy of prophe and property. Investion of highly floatmatche wordy specien into memograf zone 2 areas as anticipated by the ILR/EA may increase the threat of fire, or at the very least gravity reduce the effectiveness of increat managed in addreat goals.	A .	D-17	The SERVEA agouttes that vegetation, whether native or netwolfcod, would be drimed correctly.
	Forject assumptions, includes a conductor that required wording is not according fin zone 2, $g_{225}$ KR2HA at 12.6. This assumption appress accurate given, which an apprecedant regrating the greatent impartance of cheming basis was shown by exceller. The RRCHA at 19.0 concludes that "immedian timpertance of cheming basis was shown by exceller, which is a solution of exceller like the "immedian provide the transformation of exceller like the transformation of exceller like the transformation of exceller like the like the associated with helicited matrix and provide the transformed with helicited matrix and providenting fractions are provided that with helicited matrix and provident the transformation and provident fractions are considered frach fractions of these exceller types are considered frach frach and ere likely to turn even more tradity (that active bruck species.)	<b>Q</b>		Construct trailed.
-	<b>E</b> 2	<b>A</b>	61-47	Refer to D-17. Fire risks would not increase. This continent addresses the mories of the project, not that accuracy or adoptancy of the SERVIA, No Pospurse is required.
	M. Excepted discussion set inprests to biologuesi resources			•
	The windysis of impacts to biological retearces appears insufficient and monasistruct with the Chy's biology grideitists. Analysis of impacts appears for below that normally encountered for intum development projects impacting inclogical resonces. Lealing any assemble scalings or proposed miligation, the Chy must make invest, catagorized, and dafluitive conductions that exponed involutionspectaters with a painfibeant jupicars to the fulliph, mittee vegotation and all potentially affected exected in significant jupicars to the fulliph, mittee	<b>A</b>	D-20	Refet to comment A-12. The dam provided for the Brush Misnegarent 3Ri/HA is consistent with the mapping and analysis required for projects reviewed at a Gry-wide level. The Biology Guidefines and to maputements for proposed developments at the project-specific tarel.
	Neither the biological treeners environmental analysis are biological technical report			

.

÷

•

ection (42.0412 (h)(7) when eithe cannot provided the prepased 100 foot Rafer to comments A-1.2, A-34, and D-20. Pursuent to SERS Section  $V.B_{\star}$ monuperneur zone 2 were detennined to be apprisizent for avera bein to impacts standared with the establishment of investors eacher is fromt Refer to page VIII-3, Alternative 4 - Increasing Building Rogafation. ហីទេ មធាវ៉ែន វាជន ៦ ពុរជាចុលនាជី នវ៉ាវជាចានដែក្ខទ ទាន់វារ៉ាត វ៉ោទ ពុរយក្ខារទេស័ លាវ៉ាវារនាល្ល wide brush menagement zons one and zone two. Roter to concourt A-12. Refer to communit A-12. R#fr to comment D-20. ond outside the MHPA. х А ñ Ä 22 6°A A A The revision to include fite scale has been added to the hund development code regulations (sic) is holded in the proposed ordinates which is attended to this Staff./EA as Appendix C. appear to provide adoptate detail on the specific targeds of expanded target clearing on biological much management will in that result in agetificant impacts to the MiHPA, netlys vegetations in thus Athalysis of biologicst researce impacts presented in the aging durbtases and Section V.B ratiose does not appear to comply with the City's biology guidelines at Section 10(A). The City stoudd articulate any specific measures taken to comply with the biology guidelines. The City should also articulate rationals retrates behind any conclusion that the sepanded truth measpenant l, R, ILA, and ILB, and all potentially affected state and rederally-listed species, narrow matemic 1995 (142 data fta tha 148022 and land one plane. <u>Soo</u> MRASA at 1-4. Tabbar V.B.2 and -3 orgoest The ERVEA else fails to address an spiars: proposed code amendment to construct fac must expand it's efforts to iteratify impacts to hiskogical resources, caustrant with Section [16(A) to provide the most continuizative numeritated of infinite is specific survaive accurated of an time of the biology guidelized OR fits (183 satisf categorismily and datinitively conclude that measured 8रत M at VIU.3. Constantion of the wells bitmon zone 2 and open space is a very eightfract eres. It is under from the EL2/MA and appendices which a this eriter is actually properly is The nopercut issue of required analysis issues the City with two chalters. Bithur the City olological resources so alysis does not appear to address the panelole afynifrond utiens of this Burdrammental studysis for chipsels to accelet species appears to have relied only on parated the conclusion for enconstituents but the METPA, but other considerer regarding the activity, including furgmentations of natural open space, the MHPA, and core habites and Myleage resources, reposielly with regard to uperial statue species what than the California granushing part of the questioned attenuation. If purposed, the MRAM should be expanded to address any the California generative. 1995 MSCP GIS data le likely to be significantly out of date. The impact to inchegical resources, usigitation of thousand characteriaties, and other resources. The speckes and any other potentially allocated spanial stalus specter. The City spectes to have Settion V.3) hulles are existingly cannot and appear to illustrate the plasmon of any comprehensive field surveys ar even core trienzion of influenzion caralised in the Network aigalficance of binaogical resource impacts in sol clour. See *JA* at V.B.24, <u>Computerto en la companyanta de trada in las 1 ané Davelonant Code</u> July 7, 2004 wells between zone Z sud open space. Acouding to the AUORA. proposal is not adoject to the biology guidelines. Diversity Deta Base of other records. significant fire wall impacts. Page 5 5.  $0^{-2.3}$ 0 19 0 19 AG 80-01 11 N Á N d

	<u>Controputs en lateit taistageinent avisions to ike Land Developteant Code</u> July 7, 3804 Page 6			• •
.:		, <sup>.</sup> ,		
. 1 <b>7</b> -0	QuIDSTROM – Were any field servoys conducted to identify the possible location of any solidive apeales besides the gustestates in relation to the satural of expended break messagement?		D-27	Mo field surveys beyond these described in Agrendix B were performed for the project, Refer to comment A-12 regarding the MSCF consistency malved
ព្ <sub>ំ</sub> ខ្លួង	QLIRSTION – What steps if any has the City isker to kizatify harve looshone of Manuel Diventity Data Base sensitive species and others in relation to the enteric of expended levels memoryment?		D-28	The MSCP database was reviewed for the project, and the California
62 (Q	QUESTRON — Has the City concluded foot impacts to any state or forbaulty-listed specing, nurrow endentic spacies, or sensitive species besides the California guarcatcher will be individually or categoriestly significant?		67-Q	Nethinal Liberatory Leaders was reduced in its income network of the second conducts within the sequended breath management area.
08-0	QUISTION ~ Does the proposed action under consideration in this SUR/EA helpede onder revisions to repute construction of any fits wells? If yes, how will the environmental impacts of fire walls he addressed?		0:-0	The revisions to the brush mengement regulations becade alternatives such as a freewalt in fism of brush menagement section 142.0412 (h)(7).
	VIL <u>Clair by avtent of anticipated trunk</u> memagament in avta <b>ព្</b> ន់មហ័ពន្លើV <u>statificated as</u> ប្រជុំត្រូវជាន់ថា ព្រ័ព្ទ ក៏ចកមនិនាធនាន ពេលចេសន			Firowalls could be epiroved on a case by case beels beels by the fire adminial. Fire wells are not a required.
18-02	The RRFA does not appear to address Impacts to biological resources which may hrive hear set early provide a multiplical land for specific downlywraut yrojects. Pravious hundi montegement impacts may have been considered "impact metral" - administrationally resulting in no impacts to biological arcsmore and an considered "impact metral" - administration for an analgement code reviews will require elseving ast/see thismedry for grees beyond the proposed force) management code reviews will require elseving ast/see thismedry for grees beyond the proposed force) management acro interval indicate the extent of financing the grees beyond the provide "impact another advisor advised in the first in financial and the impacted arcsmoder to biological mitigation. The ERR/EA should indexible the extent of financing meeted arcsmode and identify measures to fully mitigate these inpacts.	-		Rused on the review of the regulations regenting minigation imade, the City does not anticipate that there would be a significant imager to minigation lauds doe to the purposed increase in Bunkh Meangement Zana Two. Acceptable minigation pur the City's Biology Guidelines increases offseitu acquisition, purchant from militation bonks, and peyment ista the Habitan Acceptable from a in the City's Biology Guidelines increases offseitu acquisition, purchant from militation bonks, and peyment ista the Habitan Acquisition, purchant from militation bonks, and peyment ista the Habitan Acquisition, purchant from militation bonks, and peyment ista the Habitan Acquisition purchant from MHPA generally increase from the being experimed within areas of the MHPA generally increase of an them uncertaines (i.e. areas adjacent to brush manageduct arease of the them uncertaines (i.e. areas adjacent to brush manageduct arease (i.e. areas and increased to brush manageduct arease) would not
	VIII. <u>Clarkfor tha optend of Closedel Compression, ignivitation gver progeneed axie revisions.</u> The EURAA is manage on the subset of Chemenical on subsorie over the monomed			generally be exceptible for on-size preservation/miligation. For existing projects where withgethen has <u>potentially</u> experted adjacent to head to strongeneent areas (these areas are located adjacent or within the MIRA),
8 0	action. Some iztrals immegrarect will obviously occur within the costel zuna. QUESTRON - What multonity does due Costel Cosmission hold over the proposed action? W Recommendations for service intervention and millionten			spiptionuls would have been allowed to either deficient faul in fac to the City or place on comment over the property. The City's ensement lengunge, which is based in Department of Fish and Gamo's conservation essenant, allowe for fire protection activities and fire breaks as required by law.
	e te		D-32	The proposed outimenes will require approval by the California Cuntai Commission for adoption and inspirementation in the Cosetel Zone.
° ₽ 2	abould include internoversed of the prosseed onde revieword and fillighton of inpact to sensitive biological resource, at a minimum.	• .	D-33	The proposed SEIR/EA will go forward to the City Commit with Findings and a Simianant of Overriding Considerations, which is subject to thair inforwal. Refer to D-4.

;

I

Communit noted. The City's Biology Goldelines were approved by the US Mish and Wildlife Service and California Department of Fish and Game as requirements, are proposed as yant of the Branh Management Revisions to proposed. However, the staff proposal is subject to change at snyimus before or at the public hearing. Changes may or may not aritist the sbilly The dwit SERVEA in cleat on which minigation meanings are and are not part of the City's MECP Implementing Agreement (Exhibit O). No Schneational putneach is currently protervery through the Park and zevisions to the City's Biology Guidefings, incluting mitigation to use the draft SERNEA as written. Refer to contenent D-15. Recreation and Development Services Departments Refer to comment D~16. Refer to comment D-9. Refer to D-2. the LDC. Э А 0-36 놂 卢 2 4 86-4 ê A yediminary afte ovelention, prepeation of a brush menagement plan, thimshig and pounling methods. other development activities rationized by the City to ensue successful MSCP implementation. In winar's binkh mengeneat propriets / jitans to prevent exercise thinning or oberive. Jinystet to Jiohogical resources and others are iltrify to be aven mere significant then anticipated if the code The CBy should aggreed/vely pixate an elucation avaination camplysizing the importance of proper break meragement constitute with RUR/RA parameters, builteeting the fare askey and lagel aut interactive of the location of impacts in relation to the MHPA malor one and one idor area Protective regulations for sensitive biological recorded must more sensity be experided for adfectes paraties, enforcement, and tenedics (e.g. textuaties) of mains regetation) for any large provals. Code revisions should also provide for some kvel vf CBy oun erance with property ()nde revisions should he encended to ongreesly probibit any bound monopement exceeding consequences of excessive insult numagement (a.g. none flammande weeds and penalties), and th education compaign storted insingle reputerly scheduled direct mailten, extensionly meetings, and sultion card type, measures to a variet soundary resources, mid any required permits, charances, or example, the City should modify the biology gridelines to require h-kind (vs. in-Net) midgation nture outerach offeets targeding property owners at the urbon - wild leads interface. Printing and distribution of bruch menospanum branchurcs alone is backenate to ensure processory fire satisty Sensitive species location records though be carefully raviewed in relation to anticipated broad for furgets to retive vegetation coulding from any other City-automized development rationies Please specify which it my of the shore reconstructed code ravision prodifications and biological resources consistent with the biology grainfilmes. All imparts to mirive very sertion abouid be unbigated according to biology guideline minimition rector, just like any other project, tin svest that recommended biological recreace mitigation werames are needeneed. For effectivences of thre-emident building materials over brush management. At the very least the The City altered also suc to fully avoid, minimize, and mitigate all investor to available paintroture considered in the RIR/RA. Code revisions should also be expended to encounsily Code revisions should also be expected to include briefs management protectures ilentified by the EUR/EA at UL-3. Code revisions clouded capteraly require or specify a namegement, and activities at these sites problemed or modified to protect the species mitigation mendets with he reasonmeded by Chy staff for adoption by Conneil. <u>Comments on known myseptiment bruktone to the Jand Perchaptiont Code</u> July 7, 2014 Prue 7 should the City doct to forgo healt management withation. management exceeding RUR/RA parameters. contracts silent on these trajics. sublic education. 5 ì j 00°-0 88-0 0 20-01 ì 997-10 10 180 A 999 13 -

:

<u>Connects on brush managankat jevisions to file Land Drovckomant Cods</u> July 7, 2004 Page 8

Thack you for your consideration. Please contact me at 619 574-6806 if you have any que tions regarding these comments.

ר ז Devid Hegen Sincarely.

Editor for Biological Diversity Endangered Habitats League Prinnels of Los Petusquitos Caryon Frinnels af Rore Caryon San Diego Audatora Society San Diego Chapter Siletta Club San Diego Chapter Siletta Club San Diego Chapter Siletta Club Thirty-Second Street Caryon Task Force

es: City of San Diego Mayor Diek Murphy and Councilmenthers California (Ynartal Cremministon

•:

I

DOM CAN DE LOY
15 Y N 3 12 Y 11
IO MORE THE AL
PC1755-01710-01

Alien Gross Jarassian and Fire. In the Seasonal Schmodtana Zone of Hawai'l

Filmt Hughest, Peter M. Vitrusek; Thmothy Turison

Ecology, Vol. 72, No. 2 (Apr., 1991), 743-747.

Damie UREz hutrificies jane: organie Inig-AD12-96588284 1991044212732434 23434234342344071479442622,00094213-2-9

Entities is currently publicient by The Realinghal Sectory of America

ધાયૂટકીપાળ કંગ્રેમ્પ્ર અભ્રુમિળ કાંગ્રેલ્વા કો તેમાં. 15702 ન પ્રૈક્તાક કાર્ય Confidence of Cas provides, in part, first onders you દવાર દાકાર દાકારેટનાં વ્રેમેંગ્રેટ વિગ્રેલી ક્ષેત્ર, પ્રાયા જ્યાપ્ર અન્દ વેલાસ્ક્રિક્ત છે. આ બાદ બાદ કાર્ય છે ક ૩૫૫ મારુ મારુ નવારંગ્રી a the 1570R સાદલિય ભાષ્ટ્ર દ્વેષ્ટ પ્રચાર personal, દભા commutcial text. Zouriese of the JSTOR working infectes your screptures of 18100's Teams and Conditions of Use, availables of

ខ្លាំនេទេ បានផែង លេខ ព្លាធីនៃសំណេ អេង្គមាសិន អាទ សែវាទេ ល័ ដែន សុសភ. Phylicher លាលាន នៃត្រមានវាស កេខៗ ៦៩ កុងមាស ឯព្រះសិទេ មន្ទ្រីន័យ កុន្ទាំស្រាសារដំលែក និយា

सित्री राष्ट्रप्र व तस्य क्रम्प राष्ट्र से SSTOK एउक्तमांख्रीला जावर राजवंशी पीक क्रमार राष्ट्रमांक्षी दर्भाष्ट मेंग्रेस प्रकृतकर का फ्रेंक इतरहरत क इंग्लॉर्क क्रिक्स वॉ डाक्नी स्वाय्यनेम्यीक.

ISTOR is an independent met for profit agenization dedinated ta carafag and prostoring a digital archive of Redolutly journals, Tyrt rotte infortantien proparates ATTOR, planet context 2016 (1933) (192.

bitis://www.jetourup/ Maas.fram.20.16:36:40.2004

 $f_{\rm AM}$  L . Cover of marks and after spectra (%) to the suscend softmentance solve of Edward V docated. National Park, Means this show the superconduct structure do not expect the solution of the soluti 393 333 E) 333 23 ž 333 24224 333 Ŋ 33537 5 <sup></sup> 탄출합하는 MH 335 Plant over Fire felority 22,123 1 333 Ħ, 111 111 Naum ande Ŗ 232 11222 5 Main 1223 8 191 Dadasete arbetand Referencia philiperificie Native Actob about ೇಗವಾಗಿಕೆಂಬ ನಿಯೆಗಾಗಿನ್ನುನ್ನು ಭಿಕ್ಷಿಯಾ ಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಕೊಡ್ಡಿದೆಂ ಕ್ರಿಧಿಯೇ ಗುಕ್ ಕಡುಗಿಯವ the second second atelia hun Sector dan Sector da Nutra fata Thus had

1

I i

Ħ 122827 23 2323 Я 323233 101.01 2.101 2223 29 2 33 2222222 1000 3233 2 2 333 23 8498888834 % ¥9999 1.15 101.00 33 9333 8538888888 P. 33 32 3 23 2322222222 22. ĥ 23224 ser ser i 3233 33 3332 2 Ş 834884 23 222222222222 197.0 59 5686 3886 Ż <u> 3333</u> 33 Parastrant references Parastrant references Constraint and the second Constraints and and and and Constraints and and and and Parastrant and and and and and Native (this second Erépensi anudénte Bulhaépin anudénte Stadipisebera famatia Alia tari hukana Value species address téjyékaz jégye Alisat tekse tudoktal Apen Species actions Aline grants Schlandyrtum cand Anthruppen Krynin Achter Mitmillion Ryjamhenia rufa ijas hadjubutu rajid Alijan grust avlitida ्वमा कुटक्षेम व्यापट Hide forth 1010

th sumplies? OB - de buin (18 se priorie a (19 م misersed (10 reached history), 23 – 2000 burk (1997, 15 mo 2010). مستوادول: 18 – 1644 haven (1970 and 1937).

because Melinits is potentially much more diamaging to Moreover, upfile Schizzehurben, Melinis eta apresi والصخاب عمدا فيادعن عتامها العمد صواطايا فاعد لتده لتد hed by Schinarthytinn (National Park Survice 1989) undive speciet. Fine (ite)ed by Mediatributa with greate Astink epison Solitarighten et the dominantallen relatively constant. If a second the occurs, MeGain invering the mice-humed area to a *Melinix-dominant* eren species. As posting recovery continues, Malinis oover increases while Schlassingham cover remains <u>gresses</u> forther while Schizezhjation dottelses, congrawkad.

The change is dominance from Schtzachurken in uniqued areas to Meilinis in burned areas is important

While alien grass cover increased after fire, the cover weeked why by this muce as well as by seed, it forms donie mati cepable af dverproving and anothering hative species in vinc-like folhion.

į

and diversity of mation should and tree populations de-cafends shortdy. Shortly after her, *Dedimates* was the ordy shuth found is significant mandres, and shuth consystems that chartantian at fan wall remit in fas resettilisintek te malve woody spocies (Shydausada 1968, itaarliiste mai itaafing (1970), Newerniekan, soocover in areas borned [3 yr before sampling represent m ther fouldfur to disperse, they are ainong the first species to colonics relatively young lays flows. Instead, institute of most and vestimate to creatabled in termed cetative firms intransify the pegative impact of grasses on a further development of trends observed in recently shreb species from bureed areas probably is not due their fallure to recolorize is more likely a function of the dense grave canopy established soon after fire. The areas e ten alliar natafy taug decedes of postfine recyvery is contrary to total whole from studies of confinence bigged areas. The absence of those of the four common oedva verenoion.

Although our manyling was hupbed to the effect of free they protection to be be the persistent and people and. Meast of the addies spectra in the area developed in solation from fire and are unable to toke the largeical invanions by anotic appoint can also which soo-system characterize where the invalue alters two fites in one area over a minimary about 18 yr pe-riod, the results suggest that the communences of biolocical invasion by alien grated and the atherpetat. relatively diverse Mernetidnas paymengha weedland is converted to a genetized dominator by highly firmclassing the candidate codengated apocks. Pimeporum terminativides, may be driven to exchanges as a conexpected Barlier stadies have concluded that histogexcipation-level coonce evaluability or traphic trueure (Vitousek 1990); dus stody demonstrates dart an invader that alters distributes type and intensity can sion by Soldzoohyviem construction along is zygerently setticien to iniciate a sycle in which long-lived, methe Methois relativities a Some parties apected in alto aller consisten characteristica.

Acknowledgements We thank Greeny Actes, Francis Editory McTurel-Grates, India Landon, Elizabeth Lo-garaell, Iufic Price, Son Wowlward, and Christopher Zitrater for liefs with fieldwork, and Direptry Aples and I area Fürter Huembelse for their comments an the weakty, the Undergraduals Research Opportunities Program and the Department of Human Biology, Starmanuscript. Support was provided by the National Set ande Foundarien gesat BSR-871 5003 to Standard Unifoct University, and the Naplantal Park Service.

### Chevalure Cited

Bydwnein, J., 1960. Burang and manical American sa-varmas Pape 1-14 is S. V. Komane's athree Proceeding of the Phyth Austrial Tall Limbers Fire Bealong Confe-

A REPORT OF A R

cost. Tail Thirbers Recented Stalion, Tailahassoo, Flatda. 1964. Boouliste, Fr, and M. Madiny. 1970. The excitogr of bogined seconds. Anamy Rosbov of Ecology and Spectraliss 1: 1754-12.

Christensen, N. L. 1985. Structural for expires and dual-controlourycomegeness: Pages 83–(0) /AS, T. A. Pickert and P. S. White, enforts: The exployed frammed distributes and paids dynamics. Academic Press, New York, Now York, 193A.

Christenen, B. E., and N. H. Burtown. 1986. Fire an eld nord along an ergen System (1996). All Course and J. Burdon, adfine Ecology, of Noilogian investment and all the foctorecifier Antrophysical Investment. Ant-ence, Australian Christen, Australian Forta, Australian Christen, Australia Forta, Australian Christen, Australia Coulding regulator efforts of Intender and the financial Ecologian regulator efforts of Intender and Australia Ecologian vegetuidate efforts of Intender and Australia.

Elon, C. S. [336. The coology of low ultimities of minipuls and found. Medicare. Internet: Reference. Medicond. R. 7. [197. Encloive laboray and long-next the harder of Killaren. Velenue. Ja F. W. Dacher, T. L. Weight, and E. E. Sanette, officer: Velenue. Ja T. M. Dacher, T. L. Weight, and E. E. Sanette, officer: Velenue. Ja T. M. Dacher, T. J. Velenue. J. Under State Grown. Velenue. Ja T. M. Dacher, T. J. Velenue. J. Under State Grown. Velenue. Ja T. M. Dacher, U. 20, Under State Grown. Under Chinake Physics. Weblington and State Grown. Distribution. Editor, Weblington.

0,0, ugA. Lad Story Barner, 1955, Dhulkal and Caudhaghy. Jound at Mawris. Upivarity of Rawith, Newoluku His-

war, t. C. M. Murller-Dambert. 1959. Currenser-lang, E. L., and D. Murller-Dambert. 1959. Currenser-listica of investor inducts, with spaced information bitwain. E. J. & Danke, W. Belssensky, and M. Willsmurth, effects, G. J. & Zhanger, M. Belssensky, and M. Willsmurth, effects, G. J. & Zhanger, M. Belssensky, and M. Willsmurth, effects, G. J. & Strager, M. Belssensky, and M. Terspechts. John Welly, A. Ston, Herr Vork, Kasev Vark, 1954. Melly and L. A. W. and G. W. Teshans, 1984. Thein reason of harmoluck freedom for the more scenars for merged se-vients and dry woodlands, Effelogical Conservation 4467– 2018.

<sup>10</sup> N. 1944. Alica plant investor from the foreit fromulant. When z care inmost, Regar 191–213 for H. A. Bonzey and J. A. Rahz, solution. Boldurg of Monograd Investors and J. A. Rahz, solution. Boldurg of Monograd Investors and R. A. Rahz, solution. Boldurg of Monograd Investors and R. A. Rahz, and Rawall. Spectree virus. New York, New Work 103A. Mealing and Reveal for exception in foreit arms in transformed and strategies and franking for the Reference of the strategies of the strategies of the Reference of the strategies of the strategies of the Reference of the strategies of the strategies of the Reference of the strategies of the strategies of the reference of the strategies of the strategies of the reference of the strategies of the strategies of the rest of the strategies of the Resources Study Using Inter-tion of Resources Study Using Park Corporative National Factor Resources Study Using Inter-tion of Resources Study Using Inter-sting Inter-sting Inter-Resources Study Using Inter-Resources Study Usi । बेथे

A सर्यव्यक्त व्योजन जिन्ह ल्यूवाल कार्य देवव्युक्तका (१९७९८) जयस्वतिष्ठा या येट २०१६४२४२६, (१८३४६ १९९९ टिक्युक्ताकर) भी स्वित्यक्षाक्त Geoetal Technical Ergon WOM. -. 1981. Fwe in buyers systems for the second with Boundederg, N. L. Christianski, J. E. Lotan, and W. Aller Boundergerg, S. L. Star, and W. Star, and W. Star, and S. Star, and star, 1981. Fire in tracked systems, by M. A. Montey

Muther-Domboir, D., and H. Ellenberg. (974. Men and methods of separation scolegy. John Villey & Sola, New Net York UBA Vet, J

Modifier-Dombini, D., and P. R. Fockers, 1914. Vesenation into of Herball Vokenares Periodan Fork Cat 1:22,0501. Co. #Partaive Mational Park Resources Study (this, University

ti Si i

ŀ.

1

- **1** 

- Santa

ķ

ž

! I

of Plansh'i Techniked Report 4, University af Harwich'i Bol-ary Decontemp in Resolution, Facture, 11, 12 and Decontemp in Resolution, 12 facture, 12 and 12

processes toryards an integration of papediation biology and woodfarm straints. Choos 57:1-13. Woodfart B: M., and L. R. Walder. 1985. 1986. Stratograf Investor by Myntes figur in Flavard'. phant domagnity, ultrupod frank, and sensyment officer, Eosleythal Managraphy, 35: 247-245.

<sup>ويير</sup>يو م

Contraction of the second seco

Wug, R. J. 1973, Kipe a dependent manage of a paired protect Page 261-242 of 3. Colored Jr., K. L. Dickson, and E. Harrishy, efficient Research and definition of domaged competence. University Press of Winjang, Cass-lotterellie, Ventual, USA.

Manarta exercite 20 Oreober 1995 redeel 6 dorit 1996; anoped 17 April 1996; . fotal reador roothed 13 June 1990.

Stadie, C. W. 1983. Expose of alter plants on Howal's naive later. Ages 100-2018 C: P. Story, and J. K. Casa, solver. Energy Ages 100-2018 C: P. Story, and J. K. Casa, solver. Energy 10: Story and the energy story and the addi-tion of the energy plants of the adding of the University of Research, Howal's, Howal', USA, Solud, R. F. and F. J. Rohlf, 1950. Blonucy, W. H. Free-rater, D. Randon, Collocate, ISA. Topore, P. M. 1970. Biologoch for story and storythen Vigore', P. M. 1970. Biologoch for story and storythen

## and the set of the of the of the office of the office of the set of the set of the office of the off

THE SELP THIMMAG RULE DEAD OR UNSUPPORTED'-A REPLY TO LONSDALE Share & Weller's

There are above - W in a large long plan of strand blowmere va. planet densities (non review by Westober 1324). In them, Langing (1994) from the set writefully from the ideal - for white and wester existence of systematic, variation than ( field (Weller 1967's, b) and, considuated that, white Recent recontrigions here rejected for plast wil-thindate rele(2006 1985, 1987, Weiter 1917a, 5, 1990), itere is no evidence for a litinoing rule, the evidence is intentioner for rejection. Here, I will discuss some noblems with Londole's requiring the fyrige sume prints them only work, and consider whether flucher texting of which had been widdy screpted as an ecological law stations that converted, even-aged stands from a streight the ubbaring rule is preded.

wed to fit the thisping Tose inclusive of pre-thinking hinning stopes in stry data base (Weller 1997.c) const To. St. and the mean this ning slope becomes steadily hyllower as one rises the required amount of density troduced a systematic bits and prejubliced the subse-quent remits and conclusions. He difered thes reasons रो*ए कोळ स्कुम जेल*्क पाए केंग्रंड डल with leas than helf an order of membrade of density variation actuate the stands dars blaces therefore shore covered acorders, the storner وتووير ولواغ يعدد سأنل فيبعلا للمقشان مسرود (للاستخفاف 1994). (posisies applied a data-somening procedure that [athange (Lonathala 1990:Fig. 4). Smitheonine Extremented Research Center, P.O. Box 38, Edgewater, Marybrid 21037-0028 USA.

Aleo, the thinking constrion distance that should wilk sharp thinking lines will be abserved over norrow den-(if rates. Therefore, the partons that restriction Lenstok's data ezetning (Lenstale 1990; Figs. 3 and Although true, these observations neither justify nor reliables the screening procedure. A neuron density range dues not recessarily result from including prethinding drad, and a large density range in no way ensines the earthelion of incorporations polars (Fig. 1). d) are actually naround gatherns that an actually narotend of the issue of data scientical (Fig. 2). Furthermore, a population with a storper thimble fore many activity



The second secon lindiamar af h. Abhuibne Eina

日本の時代であるとして、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円、1000円 ĺ 一个学校,我们有这些问题,我们会们的一种,我们们有一种,我们们的

STRUCTURE IGNITION ASSESSMENT CAN HELP REDUCE FIRE DAMAGES IN THE W-UI

lack Coloco and Jia Saveland

The wild land-urban (interface (W.U.U.) refers to realifectifial areas surrounded by or adjacent to wildband areas. In recent years, significant W-UI reastoration fire logger layer methods withe in loss United Struer ficture foculard ottenhoe on the principal W-UL problem-desce of E.F. and property for the.

W-Ul frees with significant considerial losses affice from typical tradential fraces in that W-Ul Advances untaily includo the following:

prevonted large insats during recent W-1.11 fbrax. Severa W-0.1 fires and defray veolemetabordands in a few bouts-outek fauter then the

tesponse time of the best Frefigiting services.

fircificities to the work of the most of the most effective the most effective the figure of the most before the figure of the most before the

 Longa intrimbers of strond bareously axposed structures.
 Rapid Involvement of residionical concertions.

artes; Cherothelmari free-jardieoBones patribies, and Total fars of residence per stracpari United.

Lear Choire an ensemble physical connected for the UNL Symmetry Particle American and Choire Schemer Johnspreison, Rach American Schemer Johnspreison, Rach American Schemer Johnspreison, Rach Manness and Properties Research Changes and Properties Research Changes and Properties Research Connected Schemer Schemer Schemer Director

This tertification of the section of the first test dependence of the section of the section of the section of the section of the first of the section of the Dependence of the section of the first of the section of t

To essess potential ignitions. SIAM uses an temploisal approperti and worst-case assumptions to estimate traditionality between the design of a sourches and its exposure to the Whatter P. W-Uf fire occurs in Obliand, CA, as in 1991; Spoisner, VA (in 1994); Caryling, Mi (in 1994); Ne Pabin Coast, PL (in 1995); Ne Pabin Coast, PL (in 1995); Ne Pabin Coast, PL (in 1995); A teamt a teample occursul in October 1993, when the Laguna H(lus Fire in southers costing a teample din 19 bioutecentry all din 266 homosticat during that fire. Because these fores awitty structures do not acreative din part fire. Because these fores awitty structures do not acreative din part fire. As a mouth, ypical acreative din fire partodon stud acreative stabilities terteal that booses

Continued on page 20

significantly "Inpringed rehea komeanners Inplement B. U Inverse recommendations. "Phone: Ionics S. cane, USDA Forest

As the authors of this article arginos. Dis charae of innecs estrevities of M-Lifler and as the Strang's Chryson Pize an An Wisnick-Christerhalmal Pararts



ediner servivo or are tokuly dearoyed. Actuévely few anothres suffer partial denover-

i

i

i

:

ļ

The W-UI fire purthern can be characterized as the erpreare of a residence to fluctes and firstrands reaching in jonking that you'ne wideorpart, currente baset. If wideorpart, currente baset. If a estacatad fire, have our during wijelland fire, the W-UI

widespread, extreme locates. If residential fire-locate at on occur facturing wildland fires, the W-UI factor problem and walk they, the problem is an elat.

#### History of the W-1-11 Periods

Problem Blaze 1985, the public liest become increasingly power of the W-U file provides Linux devoted increasing annound of time devoted increasing annound of time and effort to prevention and effort some of W-U files. Since 1995, structure lower during withfree corrected in study threes: New Merchan, and Cohomolo. However, the W-U files problem b and new.

Historically, large utlear losses have accompanied withland fires. For ecample, anich lossen occurred in Peaningo, WL, an LFTL, Wolfser, ID, ar 1910, Bertuelsy, CA, Malser, 1973, and the State of Maino in 1977 (Martin and Stynia 1994)) Over the last four derestes, fraquert subtres resoluted in conficturis have resolved in conficturis have resolved in generated reports free identification WJ, frie problem and purveled magnets of fully more generated sector stree identification WJ, frie problem and purveled magnets of fully condity Supervision Association Condity Supervision Association (Condity Supervision Association) Condity Supervision Association of California 1957; Coliformin Department of Rowesky 1980, Condity Supervision Association of California 1957; Roward et al. 1973; Rudice 1983). These

resonancendarions, including reasonancendarions in V-191 rectantical synchritications in V-191 vegetskua analaganderi, end madding construction. However, recent reveit indicate froi V-191 films remeint a predokon in Celifibralis and oksevilates, which angrests a held, of scredel angrests a held, of scredel angrests a held, of scredel

survivel, but he doores for home survived can be significantly iow some bonce survive and the behikamise, a lack of control, and While these placest row mean-netly describe the continual states homeownens cannot decrease fine a detection of from responsibility. implanent W-Ui finsvise-room veridentes. These words imply 'lock'' deca phy a part in home Ceople after as a trans such as miracle" or "tock" to describe heatruction, of their neighbors' of these who just argenianed lotses is incorrect. Chance or wildlines, the atomption that inproved when homeowners nendeboos

En Erethotically socrateble pants recognized that fromeowners and rearestree began to understand firewise recommendations. Draing Wander Will hereit Oale and Cottoer 1967), actentists fhat societal attitudes we'ne a crifithe "Wildfin Suffres Home!" canconcluded that homeowner south tonce depended on their marked inplanating the available W-UI cal part of the problem. Partici-(Lsughtin and Page 1987). The scottarcore mode the fiblic virg During workshops in 1986 and (987 (J. Atteghtin, and Page 1997; in W-UL seese were not readily facence, the respects arbitrary socytable firowise messares olalerationAng of W-UI fire research psampatedations: becards and aestication

Linductured the relationship of beilding design and stransmarks to first iscards,

 Learn more about ignitiving from buming calbes
 (fitebeauds) (list have been montedively trans-paded; and

 Derelop tochniques to evaluate and identify fire side. These recommendations radiacted ដែរ ឧស្សតិនសូខេ មុនដល់មុននៅថៃ railissuine that the protections មន្លោះសំខេ សារដែរ ហេតុ សូវដែលជំ 14:441, កិតe ព្រាស់ អំពា សំវែងនៅ ដែកសំខេត សំពោះ ទានាំ សំវែងនៅ នៅខ្លាស,

#### Ignition Assessment for Improving Structure

Survival Tar and the second se

Structure garviral involves Bartors that influence for ignition; and if an igniture increase, the nurvival of a fluence fine engineerica. Thes, structure nurvival seasaccents require comprehensive runsidentition of structure ignitedity and anyprossion effectiveness. The fluence influencing supreesion effective nues (availability, combility, and succas of any controvenes) goestly furces and formervour) goestly depend on the read-line ablation.

Fire Management Notes

5

Voluino 57 No. 4 1997

สปัตชร์การ คือ รอกการสมัท ใหญ่สมชื่อส ภาวิกอ โลง สมุทรระณ์ที่ สปัจจริงการสร สมพัทธร รัสโตชิ สมุคร์สร ទីផ្លូចចុន 1-52សាជាមិម លូបសុទ្ធជា ព័ទ្ធមានជន ល្អា ពែលបាន ម៉ានី រូវរដែលកាន ស្វាន់ដែម វិសា nheißfendes.

5 Binjewer Surfrat Studsen, site, we Ē alfooths. Demode Protection Surfice

nees in very low. Thus, improving of Experies ion effectiveness unreliable (Colum 1991). Figure 1 oloccolectics of en ignition. The proving ignition redshare, at least pootsti tiin sappreedon elikelive-्रात्रान्त्रेण्य क्षेत्र्राण्डं का हेत्तtime situation makes descriptions loss. As the fighter illustrates, the initially. Improved structure ignition residence leads to improved pase through the occurrence or dischotomonts mallanc (aurohoa) or locs) of statistics almont structure structure survival process must The impredictability of the real ending to streetite survival as оптомиета and fire несполь. true और जायुद्धिक के कि का कि ಚಿತ್ರಯಾಡಿ ರಿಂ ಶರ್ಮಾಜಿ ಶಾರಂಭಿತ Suppression effectiveness by

SIAM, homorements can achieve a

hazarda moli na vugelation and

méghbocing structures. Using freetise condition by roading

#### <u>A sensament Resuments</u> Structure Equilities

Research retregrizes the need for a greater trederstanding of the W-US USDA Foret Service Pare

kuoseporatus kuo jarevionisty liiskud W-UI acseanch meetus in particular. The Fire Bishavior Unit at the Brs publican in general and for a nisk assessment process that

antery and identity potential W-UI film publicans. In the basic form, the model has a range of Missionals of existing single developments in the planning structs. The basic model can mptications, from providing bornes to successing horsehug movide five following:

A means for local

- A musua fot indegrating a resident's exterior home design and landscaping filewise regularments besed on potential leython A Mean for integrating p ridk for a mix of flotury deteiloper's hunc and regulations to establish nteests with firewise requirements: .
- A means for free agencies to attents Wildlife make िक्ष हाच्डणकुण्टिड्डांगा हाखे interst with threads anginession-rolational ान्वणंत्व्यान्द्रार कार्य

considerations. The SLAM design economic for interactions between hurtee design rad anaterizets and fire

factifiate V-LR direwise

directophics the Structure Lynkion. Assessment Model (BLAM) to

Laboratory in Missoulo, MT, is

Internovatiain Fire Belences

neighborhood deagn

is stirrent to a structure will bum To schöve (hese ryg(lizelfore, SIAM 11963 in midylical approach lo csiblish rehibuships barwoat nswones (pot no fire protection will is rupredictable. Therefore, SIAM and in what sequence the wegets-tion, and other fishmonthic materiprocesses are not explicitly underpotential junitions. Bocanes actual assumes all fearmebles will hum at the same time. The model also suggested by the restrate of W-L0 itté cooditions of a future fine are unknown, SLAM nees word-care Structure design and fire copenary resemptions. For crample, how utera, a worst-cade condition tice bases. When ignition

> premise that streature survival is the essence of the W-UI fire probhuming in vegetation and other structures. SIAM is based on the

strocture ignitions from wildfing

SLAM assessable potential for

काटण क्रिस्टि कडरी स्ट्री ज़िल्ला खड

pretectls according to their apertific desires, and thus,

critical element for survivel. The

the twodel appeciately with essent

lam, but stouchure ignifice is the

the potential for structure (guiling

rather then the potential for

structure survived.

Continued an projectal

SLAM is designed to improve fire

stord, e.g., furctored expressure and ignition, the model's developers bave hesed descriptions on croatares and an unstanding of the dysical processes in the bar

fireforends, greefly increasing the chartes for ignition. Double-pear, plate-plate windows also fracture Experiments have allown that win-कर्ष से॥ कर वर पिन टाएक्वास्त्र केलारी. ingerbadly, equiposes showed the transpered glass bars a much bigher priotware to heat fracturing The SIAM recent has produced professionary results that refine our consideration (Coben and Wilson ficket to tente admin wood Janexpected to heat for longer periods before poperial wholen collarse, down are on impartant W-UI fine 1995), Single-root, philo-gian windows om direnally fractime then plate-glass window glading. exposure and window breekage indentanding of how fisma and full out, but they can be tudals , A window opening provides on extry point for inflatence structure ignition.

However, shurkures colonomity as with whent thes are at distrances too Whiteland. Vegetalion mongement Additionally, experiments such surdet readits indicate that flamos fightness to a structure (actual dia bire ignidans. That is, vegetation ers an ignition threat only at close 1995). This flading suggests that ब्ब्रिस्टर्सन्द्री प्रेम्स सिन्द्रीमाल्लेंड लग ल स्टर्भनार्थ्य आवष्ट वर्ष्ट हि served the structure's immediate scattor instructor vegetation and naighbachde staactaces are imporbateons depend on the frame and etriceture characteristics) (Cuben tant factors in structure ignetions stracture would prevent levelons greet for flame-hosted ignitime. gainity has little effect un strochereitigenent odjacent to the ution on and adjoirnt to a from figure oxposure; but

## Background of the Wildland-Urban W-UI) Interface And SIAM

theorem. In poorling structures survived failsfory depends on fin-proving lyndison reducence. (152)A Frances Service Une manuscience are grittebliky and suppression a feodevelophy the Structure tynkhon Astreasticut Kodia (GAM) to asters residential lightica real statico.

The Item - workered unten inde-these (W-UK) or withkend unten intentify, more to readential en-con in Kowations audient in wick-land fire, Although the W-UF fire produker has recieved inceresed withouther has recieved inceresed withouther has recieved inceresed

problem. Future systems about the systems of the systems about the systems of the systems and residential local in addition to exp-pression. Utherfuture so. These con-depts and positivat form a teristed and mataged comparing. Current for Investory systems do Act attentiated address the W-U technical besia for a stretegy of self-cullicitation,

locates. Titled we observe after a V-ul file is, in varying digness. structure survival.

struching negule comprehensive considention of squarture Assessments of the aurivitiation

.

characterized as the exposure of a residence to theneas and fina-brands restding in ignitions that produce widesigned, contrare

the trut fire protenced be

the periodication in the most make

regetation management away from (46 m) requires more time to ignite represents a very about distance for altauple, a filence front 60 freet (18 10) bigh et a filenner of 1.50 freet wood shiing from rationien dan the vegetative fuels burning time. gritten from firme exposure and would not significantly reduce ignitions from firebrands. For क्षिंह शानात्मीक अत्राति गुल्द वर्तिव्या Намете, 190 Бес (46 ш) fireborods.

## fire farentory Implications

Slove (Beir maption, wildland fire fice report as fits fundamental unit States have focused on imporving Protection in the California Forests" established the individual inventory syntems in the United effectiveness. In 1914, Court duBois" "Systematic Fire wildlend fire suppression

i

;

,

:

.

fire inventory systems have been used to seems and thereby interact inventory systems have been withing acros farmed, ramber and inprove this processment. Since then, type of suppression resources astime. With this focus on wildloads tow wing that information could traveling to and extinguishing the United States that adequately desuribes the W-UI problem or can र्ज करिलाकोट्स, स्पूर्व तेल्लालस्टरस्टर्न जाते आफ्रास्डरोका समिकामिल्यास्डर (त aligned, and the time brooked in or used to study to and improve those wildends, it course as no available public detabase is the surgence that there is no reachy ररिकन्द्रांड वर्त सैल ज्योग्रीकार्त्र तिह wikitand fim suppression effectiveness. The primary fue programs in the wikitand-wixen interface.

defined as the change of loss, a fire skillty to Enk to denographia databases wild provide lofarmetion Information on the magazitude of loss, the likelikood of bes, and the emotion of insured loss is one way to use it to make junke. The risk, and nanoslibility. The livening system should provide التحطفي وللمستعلمات فللمستعلمات والمستعلمات والمرازع The minimum characteriality of 1 fire inventory system that would address the W-1A are footback. inventor system must powlds offectivenes. To address risk, rreipient of locs. The dollar on who is concerning the loss. ७४ सप्ती ३५ व्योग्रास्टरनेक

consider collecting and articulary . the following information on cach ginianan, a fica innautory systiat control dynamics flats jobses. At a Argenture within the periodes of faster honoorseer responsibility A pood keveninty system can assumption that pomecomers by beipting refuto the faulty in, the United States should nojor %-Ul face:

The jarvashisted value of the

 The value of the structures in-2000 H155, structure

. The shucture's ignition reaistauce, pou

) Suppression effectivenes.

Conchuston

Past reports and recommendations Eco-loss miligation, should concortrato on the tasidence and its imss well as experimental research and moduling suggest that W-UI nediete auronidiege. Any stategy far offerively trakeling nitially focus on residential the the W-101 firs problem rentst يعاقلهم.

Sections for wise building and nvallory systems shoeld else and in resistance and that to andscepting prections. Fire SIAM is designed to exercis helade 7/-UI information.

|

!

i

These concepts and methods form. a lachnical basis for a strategy of representing for assuring foreway provides followedton, coordinates वेश्वसिक्कर वर्ते केलॉन उद्धरोगिलाव्यक केलिंग्स become a trigumatity partner that wijdhund Bres. The fine egeneries regrownhibbes residing with fire and assists in meeting firewise requirements, and provides fire entities and managed community self-outificiency. conditions and the initial fire agancian, kumawatata take natead of all fire protection

### Literature Cited

enopuestion assistance.

California Department of Crossreviets. 1972. Recommendations to univer-Conference validated file positioner (Da-rige at the Chillianta Urgentiment of Flor-cary and File Elecendron, Statementa, EVI at File.

soldy guides the residential development In California (On Sic as the California Department of Formity and Fire

simutanze at the wide authorith in interlier lar Noshin, Segisar C., Walderg, Theas A., alk. Fransadings of the Fire and the Embrances Sectograd and Onliver 1999 Mirch 20-28 Kowalie, TN Gm. Tech. Rep. SE-GTR-99, Activalla MC. 118. Department of Activallaria, Verst. Service, Boutheatter Force. Portation, Secondrew, CA.1 35 P. Calcut, Sect. D. 199 L. A Silv-gravific op-pioach fac reasoning the fac cick in COLUMN Symposym 

Presedung of the Free Managements for Wildinfathen Interface, Stating Subface: Symposium, 1994 October 2-4 Katematik Villigg, AB, Cristia. Boggdoron(Smithal: 222-256 Colora, 4.0.4, Wilking, P., 1995. Cacreet nearly from Standary legition Assessment Medel ElAMS research, for Typelin, Condy, ad-Education, ABC Pertanet for PMIRATION 130–135.

unt witzbert Burgeham, 1934 Friedwig 1941: Valabat Cornel, Lo Can. Tech. Ben, FEWATTENIS, Allang, Car. US, Urgustrong of Argicalham, Facari Su-ving, Parille Southware Research Suder: ES D. Colorr, Jurg D. 1995. ' Structure Japidon Assessment Model (SLAM), in: Weise Devid B.: Kardin, Nahoff R., with The incolling of the Wardel Symposium - Fic issues and Solvebase In Urden Lington

2. 32. Coursy Superclass Association of California and USS Filts andrey gales for California superclass (The Afric & the California Fragmentic Transmiss, Cull Afric A fragment of Transmiss, Cull Afric African and Africa Africantia Africantia Bayes, ICC Chronsmond, Response assists in the California Africantia, eds. Bayes, ICC Chronsmond, Baharra, Jask Stath, Robert Da, Chrossen Africantia, eds. 1961, Respirato Africantia Africantia, eds. 1961, Respirato Africantia, Edstantia, eds.

social effection, Admittle, NC, April 64 1989, and sectal.) Weshington, D.C.: US Dependent of Aggindun, Ferret-

Service 71 p. Service 72 p. Houral (Sould A.; Mich, D. Weuset, Offensmark, Fried L.; Saurt, Castrie M. 1721, Decients may the first paratelas 1721, Decients may the first paratelas an under secondar 100, Saurk Stanfor Research Institute Maulon Prek, CAJ 159

Longling, Arryy Penge, Cylinthe, odd. 1981. Vol10files, and an bound (Berpous & The me down of inflatobration Berpoustation conference, Donsey, U.S. Stapmann, 1. 1988. IMPTA No. 397-861. Quilosoy, MA-1700 rtat. For Proceeding.

Association. R) p. Martin, Robert R, 9 april, David B., 1995. A gaugaical Right of Alamona Millard Res. Di. Wabe, David R, Shalin, Robert E, etc. Proceedings of the

Edwell Symposium, Fink Tsues and Selatan Ia Licka Interface and Wijalawi Estayanan, 1994 Rebum

LSAT, Walnu Coott, CA. Den Perk Rep. PSW-DTB-JSB, Alberry, CA: U.B. Department of Agriculton, Force Bervice, Pacific Southment Research Station: 35-97. Rothe, 80045 W. H. 1944, Living more

athr in the chapart when linedate. Gen. Tich, Kap. NSW-47, Beduty, CA. 118, Department of Agrhadium, Foren Bertles, Poelto Soutrwed Resurds Station, 31 P. O

An Evantination of the Summerhaven, Arizona Home Destruction Related to the Local Wildland Fire Behavior during the June 2003 Aspect Fire

USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station Research Physical Scientist

August 1, 2003

Summary

the wildfire in the Summerhaven area largely sprewd as a surface fire not as a high Intensity erown fire. The differtness in the direct flaces and firshmard arpoances related to l exsurinced the horner destruction in Summerineven ascoolated with the 2003 Aspen Pirc wittine in the Summerinavan area. The evidence revealed by my ensmination indicates that on July 11 and August 1. My extending was promoted by questions regarding the wildfire behavior related to bane destruction and specifically whether homes could have survived the the bound classafterfatter remarked in one keese surviving most to its destroyed neighbor. Atthough the wildiand fire krysely speed on the nurber, high internetly burning occurred in several locations of high structure detaily. The burn pattern suggests that high intensity fire pread nonned from structure to tran canopy to structure.

Bestationation

ghemeter of the wildfire. Crowa fire occurred in limited perches and on the slopes to the west Tuesm, Arizzona. On lune 19 the fire spread into the mountain community of Swinnerhaven. Over 360 homes and cabing burned in secondation with the wildfife. Photos I and 2 show the The Aspect Fire started on June 17, 2003 in the Starta Catalling Mountains north of and above the nexidential area.



Juck D. Cohen

Missoula Fire Sciences Laboratory 406-329-4821 joobon@fact.us

Fligh Intensity serven the sciened divide to trans fit the factors of the main gubbit when Constructeness, residue. Flacio 3 denned the year burn structure along the rando most down steps and up which from structure furwions. Photo 4 convergenties fits Speed districture jurvide under the confirm samopy. Althetigh fits surface the quest, down and profits fits the was typical under intensides and directions produced dyrifteen concept, speed bath.



ไว้คร พบเร็กษ ไม้ยะ ยุพระห์ does รอบ yaonhars ยังหลาว floars hotoing สมที่มีdeal the ignatis lac wood activities of ครามการกระหรุงอาต์ 2004 (2015 ให้คร. Electros 549 ครารก่อย ครามรูปตร สิยาร varians Jocaflous พร้าวักก Simenerlaryen Stat acystang ประ ตัวสการปรีเหท เมไว้ตะ ธอกไท สิทธิ.



. Fiende 3.6 - monthly down opped around the monthly by machined the many of fighting with the state of the



Produce its parameters and any personalise source produces of parameter basis of the parameters of the parameters and the personalise source produces of the parameters and the personalise source produces of the parameters and the personalise source produces of the personalise source produces of

enie cognerity careled hade adjesent konstarten. An cools strummer ignited acted warring igeried. The destruction are orbital with their activity and the errol focale patterns of constraintion, not unifold លើនិន័យ ដែលថា **គេវិទេយ វ័សថិន៩២៦** ដំណើរដំហា ខ្លែពនៃទៅ ចេច បុណ្យមាន អត់ខ្លាំណាង៨ នៅ នេះសារខ្លះ Loom kurdieum. Service 10 starts have been been by the service of the service of the service been been been been been been been Die solt with is charted but bith temptat. Without entering the jurge scale performe of hears iriotas directure donsity, the usidence mugents first burning house lighted the tree securpy that and cenopies as the distance work from a structure functions. Note the manufacture permanents ខ្លស់ វីវ័ល លោកលោងលេះ ដំនៅ៖ អីស. វិវ័ទ្ធនៃ ចេខភាពស្វែ លោកសា បែក ទង្គារទស់ ភ្នំស្លា យិន សាស់៤លាក់នាំ ដាច់ន ខេរសំ លាទនល the hest works. The method purified is where all back were consumed indices for the cherring larges. retrich. Plastas 13-14 above evidences er itbressatig consumption and the charding of her heads ોમિક દર્ભાતેળાજા નિવેત્સકાર વેક્ટો પ્રવાનપણ કેલ્પ્ટલક ભાજાવાનીય દાગવાની વેક સ્વીત્વકારે કાલે પ્લસ્ત henging teas. The caugy huming bages of totally chaincyrd structore, in sectoral areas of destruction. Flottes 11-42 show the butter destruction and cancery connected within series by incombinated area outstyr. The narrows fire congutates and outs for respondent with lotted អ៊ីន សេចជ័មជាតែការដែល ប៉ុនែរ៉ាអ៊ីនស៊ី សព្វធវ័យនេ ៩៣ ភ្នំណាន ជា ក្រំណាន ដំពោះខ្មែរ ខ្មែរជំរុញ នៃ ភ្លេង conciny fite lawah conne.



occurs, the ubility to directly ignite a home anust occur within a few feet of or in context with the poolburition can occur from one house to an adjacont house. These differences in the direct flame fizationable parts of the structure. A structure may ignize directly from finaltandia that have come from an interse wildfand fine at over 24 mile away, but these ignitions are dependent on the materials and design of the atments. Thus, significant differences in the requirements for and firebrand exposures related to the horde characteristics result in one house surviving next to That leaves the question of timy one home can survive adjacent to total home destruction reguirements for combustion or not. If a high intensity recover fire had spread through the earline residential area then the distances between abuetance would not have made algoritheant differences in the requirements for combustion. But even arown fires do not have the ability to Photos 15-16 show such a skuation. Fire does not behave capriciously; it either meets the directly ignite wood at distances preater than 100 first. Thus, when surface firs principally its destroyer neighbor.



i fa the fire and home characteristics accessory to ment the requirements for house typHom. ullfarmer and

	E-1 Convector hours for approve ades and habitration operies and habitrations considered significant	cuic provide prepertion from cos not seem seevers. This was rejected as an elected as an elected as an elected as an elected as	ហើយ be () ភ្លាមនេះថា to ba regarding from to product the ទាំន កែក ក៏ចាតា មន់ទង់លា by badi លិទ្ធ ដំ មនិយ័ង ទទាំងជួសជា ម៉ានដ៍ លើ	B-4 Continuati antará			
The City Heights Area Pienning Committee wheel July 7, 2004 by a vate of 11/045 to recommend four continents regarding tha Bruch Nanagement EiR;	<ol> <li>The rowmanusted clearing to incorrecting aneshalt appress to provide adaquate protection to mathing species and habitation.</li> </ol>	2) The educational requirements that could provide projection (hour clearing of sensitive mini protected species docs not seem activitie.	3) Ethicational requirements do not see in places or to be required the would determine information regarding how to product the helpitual to general and appendiculty the compart from enclose by brids to funding supfairies near hourse bit registrating it with separation that will be recailed reaction and topeable runnif.	<ol> <li>Every after short be wade to require the protection of the Gast Catcher habitat.</li> </ol>	ರೀವರ ಸಿಕ್ತರಾಗದು, ಗಿರ್ಧಾಟಕ ವ್ಯತ್ತಾಣ ಕೆ.19, 255-7302	ចេសែងសំណើមិញសំណើ 4343 Vanmanita Daha Sign DHSou, Dahlismia 93205	

ļ

i

;

Comment Letter E l i

| :

Comment Letter

THE CITY OF SAN DEGO

June 14, 2004

ABISON RAND

Environmental Planner

City of San Diego Development Services Contro 1222 First Ave., MS #501

San Diege, CA 92101

Reference: Druß RUNRA (JO: 1193) fer Brush Management Revisions to the Lund

 Deroboginatin Cools and Fedaral Grant from the Office of Emergency Services (OBS), Tederal Emergency Managentent Agency (IEMA).

Dear Mas. Raap:

On June 9, 2004, the City of San Diversity Community Furrest Advisory Roand world unimimonaly to provide the following comments on subject RIR/EA.

General Companies

Though the Cedar Fire had mony develoting effects on our community and environment, one potential positive effect that the fire provided was a "real workl laboratory" to test the dynamics of fire, fire spread behavior, building matrical reacceftbility to ignition, hundh management effectiveness and species-specific flatmoshilly. However, we see mething within the brach management ordinance or the EIR first reflects any rationary the comporting the effectiveness of hundh the approximation of hundling the weight restored or approximation of an analytic provess of hundh the approximation of the first management some or supporting the effectiveness of hundh thinking in general. A kimple comparely with those that did not would have either proved or disproved the effectiveness of the proposed otherges to the ordinance.

Ŀ.

The flot is that large wind-driven fires are induitedly affected by the implementation of brush runnagement thinging. Small fires are very defensiole given the 25' Zone J apprench and rund and the 25' Zone J inputed and the second second.

<sup>24</sup> positive affect from thiruthy in Zone 2. We are not convinced that the positive beactify oriverigh the rogarive impacts. However, if the ordinates is to be implemented, then all possible alternatives and impact mitigations must be considered by the fills.

The CFAD is concerned that the equilaxia on a "une size fits all" hench management poincy that is not clearly defined and without actentific basis will result in excessive clearing of native vegetation and the removals. Some sloper would not require a 50% reduction in fuel with

Page 1 of 7

Cumunity Forest Advisory Bosed as forest then bod to the mars set of a fortug di truntary (dith 534518 - (dity 245014 for

 $F_{\rm c}$ l This commute advices see the merits of the project, not the accuracy  $r_{\rm c}$  adoptate to fine SERV. $P_{\rm c}$ . No response is required. This comment addressed the merits of the project, not that accuracy or adequary of the SEIR/EA. No responde is required. CBQA requires

2

evaluation of a "tensorable range of attematives (evidence)" and "feasible

uritiention meantres" per section 15126.4 (3)

This continent addresses the merits of the project, not that scorrary or sticgnory of the SERVEA. No response is required.

ĥ

others are likely to need more than 50%. The CFAB is expectably concerned about the negative publicity that frees (maive or nur-redive) are resolving from the press and city representatives. This is despite the well-known principle that effectively proved trees represent a very low fire heared. Photo after ploth of large trees still standing ecourtic residences, often singed on the inside from the house fire but unofflected on the other side, went common after fac Calar fire. It suppore that these charges to the bursh margoment plot are motivated more by publical evpediency and visibility three science or tracented.

> уг Са

Specific Conversely for Alternatives in the Droft Anninomental Lepaci Report for the revieed "Reveals heavingement Place" a) An alternative allowing the teplacement of highly flattenable nutives with low flatmable indives was considered to know significant impacts based on fite assumption that supplemental integrition would create significant impacts based on fite assumption that supplemental impacts based on fite integration would create significant impacts the supplemental impacts of the break measagement ordinance, which allows interacts, This is incrusificant with the impact of the break measagement ordinance, which allows interacts, This is incrusificant with the impact of the break measagement ordinance, which allows in medif that will create impacts in pipelenetable. An effectively orighblicht mative some of low flatmable vegetation is the best solution for that will create impact to biology, evolve, and water quality, how flat measagement and vould creatific hy radiitonal insight on the test solution for the array of some print at 200 to some the solution is the best solution for the array of an array of a solution at 200 test. How flat mative some of how flatmable vegetation is the best solution for the array of a some provide matives the interaction induced area in gravy of a some arrays area to biology, and the abilitional assume that an inside a some that an earlied spirey of a some arrays area to biology and the arrays and interaction the array affected by additional flaw. How flaw the flow of the array arrays area arrays area to be additional flaw flow of the arrays area arrays area arrays area to an array array area. The conclusions of this alternative are art sopropristes and should be array area are are appropriate and the arcs are arbitration.

ñ

n H

> Any proporty owner that chooses an almonetive fitels requestion expressed about to callowed to apply the absendive conformence under a ministrial permit if the application meets important conditions and findings. Approvolves allowed under this alternative conformance should include:

- The pheneod replacement of highly flatmuchle unity vegetation with other sustainable partice vegetation that has a significantly lower fuel index, utilizing accorded standards such as the flatmuschility hat of netives provided by the California Native Flants Society.
- 2). For these existing properties (prior, to 1959) that do not have a full 35' stound fin construct because some or stork of this distance is on shores the terminativ constr
- structures horause some or stort of this distance is on slopes, the property owner should be allowed to plant and indente non-reality or native tow-fixel species. Interview

Ż

- recommended for he temperate and the active active active active allows. The intervention would be recommended to be temperaty, but histed under certain conditions, the inightion should be allowed, by penuit, to be permission.
- 3). Allow for the use of inigriton hystems (comportry or permanent) during Static Anacombinations or other official fire instant warning conditions to help reduce the nisk of fire. Restrictions an inigration practices and types of inigration would need to he put in place to discourage encessive hund, growth, numoff, or the support of non-univer the mixing thermical field. Anonymmodulation it the orthogone (for night investive that must find. Anonymmodulation it the orthogone (for night).

Page 2 of 7

J his communications are the meeties of the project, not that atour of an advention of the SUDR/EA. No response is required.

Î

Vegetation within brush menegenest Zone two is not allowed to be irrigeted. Termoury irrightion any be allowed under energies of manymatness. For example, when any plants are glaried, withis hereit managettent some two. Tasza plants any plants are glaried, withis hereit managettent some two. Tasza plants are glaries are glaried, withis hereit the plants have been established. It is well documented that water in excess of flat formed in natural amounts are advorsely impact native plants by increasing publicies in the soil, noot red, and immedie flat water in from more bytrophytic plants. A prohibition of orefored aprintices in fucer none that optical spiteles would be interface. Staff before that overhead spiteles would be interflat regardless of the regulation for fire protection purposes.

Refer to contrarget A-49

чо Сч F-7 Commentanted

िर्मान оплинант eddrasses filo आतोड of the project, not that accuracy er भर्षवत्याक्ष्य of the SEILABA. We response is required.

> ц Ц

or perail) should be made to indude the use of special purposes int<u>gen</u>tan syntoms designed for fire protection of the standare or genuads. b) The inclusion of a gublic coloretion program was an afternative considered, but rejected (VDI-4). It is stated that there educational scatterials are already available. Knowner, many of the materials are contradictory and do not provide enough specifies related to the City of San Diego Brash Moresteness Dirac for bresh managetament of difference equality on define which purperties will have fite bresh managetament ofference equally to them and also multivation is required to Rf the radii? More of their magnetic fields, a specifie from and also multivation is required to Rf the radii? More of their magnetic fields, a specifie to the other and transing the issues through up in (its lable: know of their magnetic fields). The intert was not to have public effection as a stand-allone alternative, but ratios to have it serve as a possible milgoriton to covered imports

> ം പ

Read in the ER.
A public education and training program is needed as part of the ordinance. This would include definitions of prunting transitions, within a model of the architecture from the transformation and other terms with materials are been independent to prunting transformations with materials are been to be the transformation with materials are been to public, it is difficult to the transformation of the model of the transformation of the material of the transformation of transformation of transformation.

guilt is the project output a bound of important restance to get or get on pound, it is numerical is the project output of the important. The outbut shall be important of the project output of the project output of the important of the outbut shall be important that would train eith eith eith error states in contrast thinning methods. The outbut shall be important to a contrast of the outbut shall be important of the states in contrast thinning methods. The outbut shall be important to a contrast of the outbut shall be important of the states in contrast of the outbut shall be important of the state of the state of the state of the outbut shall be important of the state of the state

 Removal of non-matrix plants first to bound to wands developing 50% covered soil arts: with find network on within that rectaining vegetation that provides 50% coverega.
 Recognition that there are notive plants and reduralized plants that are maturally low fool, or

F-32 that can be easily mininged to the low in first and investive plants that are both high in fuel and another that are both high in fuel and barrene plants that are both high in fuel and

- Priming should shares be dune from the bottom up, removing deal yrood with up "bedging" of the top of the plant, which causes externally stypested woody bunches to the dying effects of the sun and increased growth of small diameter firsh of growth which increases the plants' association's to ignition.

ह-14 - Removal of sensor latents inter 18° high shotlid he done prior to the fire season but after the miny season to avoid transion and runoff.  An appropriately pursed shrub will need to be pruned every four to six years to remove desaiwood that has accountisted, or to reduce the cover agen. Avoid simually threefog off new bud growth which itsy result in pulitimation of combreshile twigs if done in the growth season, or nery still the shruh if done is the dry season.

 Avoid definition of healthy protect broadled everyment native shurds in Zone 2, which would lead to type conversion to exotic greenes and annuals, which extrand the fire secon and ignite more readily turn builthy protect astive shuft.

Refer to commund D-35.

2

This comment addressing the marks of the project, not that accuracy of edequary of the SBRASA. No *response* is required. Education would be unardistictory on a mitigation measure for the same rasson the abstrative was rejected at moverbuild.

Ë

This contracts addresses the marits of the project, not that aroarary or adequacy of the SRIR/BA. No required is required.

E

F-12 This contrust addresses the meths of the project, not first mouns or subequired of the SB/R/EA. No response is required.

This commant addrawees the meries of the purject, not that sourcery or submany of the SERVEA. No response is rounded.

This comment addresses the maries of the project, not that accertacy of adoquecy of the SERR/EA. No response is required.

F-14

23

F-15

÷

This commut addresses the metric of the project, not that a contrary on elequany of the SEIR/RA. No response is required This comment addresses the media of the project, not that securecy or adopticy of the SE(R/R/A). No response is trajhined.

F-16

ij

l'age 3 of 7

Specific Comments for Inspect Analysis in the Druft Rurbounnented Unpeer Report for the vening "Britch Mangemant Nor"

- Monagement" to alter the publicit precession that all brank (regenation) is deagerously flammable. The complexits should be on mensging fuel, not bruch, ence fuel is it all different forme of vegetation, whether network or planted intenferal, as well as fumilibilings and CPAB reconnends a zhatiga to the title of ordinance and the text to "Voyatistive fixed ombling materials. 71-1
- up to three times the height of solitators understory, will result in the complete removal of malectula. The lack of public editation and the excessive requirement to remove humenes civeryfining excert the trutik of many types. Most saliva bruth is often five to seven feet in isteld. thereby requiring up to 2.1 feet of largnon strando, which is muse then the total 2), CFAB balieves that the medery of potential naighborhood character / ambedies in totally height of most of our native or pullyeness trea. F-10
- pranches, leaf huildup or losser brunches, the ardinance should provide a policy and emoved as part of either zone. Froning of labitar facils assume a 10° clearance storm a ordinance, trees or large true-like stariks are likely to be removed, resulting in a significant Asnal / mäigbberbood / zestistic jimpast. Native, nebusližeč or non-native trees should not be CFAB is concerned that without public education and clarification in the havin management structure should be enormaged. For trees on stopes with maleoimy notive vegatation, fallen <u>لا ال</u>
- This would mean that ident native and all non-native and indigenents trees would be subject considered to be fire-realistant natives can runnin. Most plants, except fire young succulents To make methen works, the endinence language is not clear. It shows that only trees that an are not fire-resistant. Only those that are in riparien area are even potentially fire-name good states on the fool wave periods, 07 1
- 3), CEAD is also concorred about tree reasonals in Zone 1. The ordinance states that treas in reasonal. In addition, it appears that groves are to be climinated since the ordinance only fire to the structure. Based on these definitions, many trees are likely to be transved, creating allows for angle stord-sions specimens and l or specific first are altasted so as not to transfe ao eoergy, erosion and acathetic impact.
- of the species, so this guideline is confraing and exceed to. We believe for existing code in is no rost dete to support it. Throwing members at the public via undimensed based on guesswork is not justifiable. The pust-fire demana teacament fermed that over 60% of fae bouess in the Creder first labored thes "within 10" of the house." The data guideting was shall be at least 10 feet withy from a structure, monstand at the drip line based on the mature size of the bree. If the tree years transmod regularly, it would never expend to the matter gize sdegrate, fecemae un real data suggests etherwise. The fire code says frees should not have over the house nor be 10" from chieneys. This stardard seems consider but the fact is these ų L

very hsphrazerd (so we don't know if the two trick of tree cantry was within 10', not do we

Page 4 of 7

H-11

Connacet noted

zones. No changes are proper ed regenting the way trees are dealt with in fite ourseit ordinance; frensfires, the additional invelo wanagement zone Comment noted. The ordinance simply attached trush management iwo area in expected to look like atiging zene two actas, only larger.

12-13 12-13

Rofur to comment 17-13. 'The printing raminements only alloct new trees

ମୁ

This is existing, not proposed, build development code language aftering now, not existing, trees.

2

Titis is adding, not proposed, land devolopment code imignegs.

171

•		
ŧ		
4		
g		
ğ		
any cases, the tree		
Ë		
2		
d elso. Y		
3		
z	•	
Į.		
Ξ	đ	
빌다	S.	
ä	R	
f	, BOL VICE	
ā,	营	
ã	8	
4	Ę	
8	H	
臣	μ.	
₿	R	
ĕ	Ť.	
if there were other rees further away, an	Ē	
B	6	
₽	iave been b	
111 121 121	ЦЦ.	
Ę	5	
뎍	Б	

This requirement also takes away the ability of a honseowner to shale their house. Many homes do not have sideyards or backyards expeble of supporting a tree at its full mature size drip-line with an additional 10° buffer. The inability to shade fullability inspaces. The Codar Fire an energy use impact associated with it as well as related an quality inspaces. The Codar Fire does not support the requirement of 10 feet from the drip line. A more effective model

F-22 quots not support the requirement of 10 foot from the first of more encrored proposed the variable from the first tree branches are primed to allow for a 10 separation between the structure and the free. This separation can either be horizontal or verifical, thereby allowing first strate on the structure. Also, contain trees are considered to be first treeshy allowing allowing allowed to be first on filter on the short pression for a structure or other transfars, and could solvely help to filter on the short free and stands and ranken that from figuiting allocant structures. The short from theory which is the primery cason for the dates, often help to filter on dying out, which is the primery reason for the dates.

4) Under previous analysis of the existing brasit management ortipance and as listed an page V.B-27, brash management in Zone 2 is considered to be "impact mental". This is contradicted by a statement on page V.B-37 would result on page V.B-37. The proposed brash management revisions would result in potentially significant impacts in the proposed brash management revisions would result in potentially significant impacts to sensitive species". These impacts are contradicted to be reduced to be reduced to be submouted at the matter in potentially significant impacts through the document is provided at level of significance intrough acquining other habitat. Impacts inough the document has provided scientific branch accuration of the majority of stense through acquining proof that this has occurred in the majority of stense through and the muchaned fully arguidefines, working noof that this has occurred in the majority of stense through and the muchanesed babitat, while head muchanes the best midgation is to offset the impact, this plan submuchance in a net lose of babitat in the region and the midgathon is other at a grast distance from the inspact. Alternatives should be looked at much closer, including methods

5). Impucts associated with hydrology and ension specify that since the soll is not being distanched, impacts are not anticipated (V.C-11). This assumes that all individuals involved in brack management will underchard that roots should not be removed and that low impact the 25. It humang techniques and equipment are to be used to litnit soil disturbance. Without a public education campaign, broohness or impoctants, soil disturbance is very likely to occur. It would be butter to list the impact as potentially significant and show fast it can be maked in a potential of the function.

that allow fix real accurate of native vegetation with large envouts of fuel with native or non-

native (non-investive) species that produce less find.

Under the section on Eronion (V.C-13), data supports fine claim that erosion does occar on steep alopes or erodable solis where brush management has occarred. The MOU listed in Appendix D, indicates that woder Section II, paragraph a, a property owner in allowed to do nucce than thinking. For example, discing is silowed which exposed numeral soil to erosion.

through a public education comparism.

The study does not attempt to quantify the amount of the city's brush menagement zones that are located on atem slopes or evolable soils, even though the same GIS trols used to detrutive many of the impacts (or lack of impacts) can easily be used to quantify the trols

Page 5 of 7

Per the cuttent brush minisgement regulations, a lear front horizontal separation is required between structures and the edge of free canopy. This regulation is not proposed to be changed in the revised writingnee.

22

F.23 Per the outrout brush management regulations, invasive plants that are established after brash metagement has occurted are to be controlled by weeding the invasive plants within Zono Two, Thia regulation is not proposed to be changed in the revised cofinance.

The clear and re-plant Brush Mausgement Zone Two afternative is avaiyzed in detail on page VIII-2 of the draft SBR/EA.

12-3

Current brish menagement regretations require that fluming solivities not distorb the not system of the plant, Refer to comment D.9.

F-75

The 1997 MOU is an servement with wildlife agencies and the Coulty Fire Chiefs. The ourreal and proposed bruch management regulations for the City of Sun Diego do not allow discing within Brush Management Zone Two.

F-26

The proposed ordinance does not include grabbing or grading of soil in zone 2 and zons 1 is not allowed on steep slope, flverefore no precise quatatification of brush manugernant zones on steep alopes is required for the analysis in the SERVEA.

I-27

SERVEA. The preactived burn alterative unalysis is on page VIII-5 of the resorbed hams is an alternative that was considered but rejected in the SERVICA. Composited grazing by goats is discussed on page 71-4 of the This comment addresses the ments of the project, not that accuracy or This continent (iddresses the media of the project, not that are narry or edequecy of the SEOM/EA. No response is required adequacy of the SERVEA. No response is required Comment moled Comment meted. Comment noted SEDRABA **F**-32 F-30 5 F-28 F-31 6.3 9). Though the ordinates is based on vegetation that management, all information from the Cilly needs to continue to amplantary the most to modify britizing codes for properties bordering on open space. The real solution to llupiting property denotes from fires is not lunck management in Zons 2. If is the proper use of fire-safe construction materials Envever, if the ordinance provides a definition for high priority fuel consigement, fluca fishility would be reduced even when all areas are not treated in a given year. Vegetation 8) The city should research and make recommandations for the use of controlled burns or use of goets or other livestock to reduce fuel. Controlled burns may be risky and increase liability. Unstay, which might be useful to reduce fast-growing invasive annual groups vegetation on vysedy lands, or after shrets have been thinned and proved, are not well antiof for methodically thereing or eliminating deadwood in shub stands, and so allould not be es autvartages to the trade of year that this thirting should be done. First management data would indicate that many highly flammable materials would grow back in 2-3 years. This is probably unrealistic and may organively imput the habitat. Some guidance is needed, since it will not be able to give all atoms the same level of care, due to the limitations of manteness or the more supported on the second structure. with thich lovels of their should receive different priorities for fuel management. Areas that timestands that support vigorous stands of fast-growing anneal exotice such as musical or Given the realities of limited tradents, areas with stasp slopes and heavy fuel loads adjacent to inhabited structures should receive a higher priority for fuel management contain such dimension fuel and deadwood should receive a higher priority than areas that are abready quite copen in obstateder, or tiparian areas yolfh yezr-round succutence in all plants. compared to areas with lower foci lowis. A "one size fits all" management zone, with all eityfound should be considered as a bigh priority blue to high flash fuel fia movement, while low Also, actions such as requiring difficed vegetation to be placed over all alopse is affective in 6). A determination needs to be made as to the cycle of thinning that may be required as well desired "50%" reders to area of soft covered by the numericity plant smopy after thinking and muning nut a requirement to take away half of the existing vegetation. This is ortical: if the case scenario that break removal, thinning and the backing of soil will result in mosion. This srosion impact can be reduted to balow a level of significance by public education to prevent full plant removal, tree removal and the use of soil-damaging equipment and techniques. radiating arraine and provening invasive proliferation. Studies show that chipped vegeneries is much less flammable then shutfing vegotation, due to the packing of the matter which purkaps a minimum of 5-year maintenance cycle. The public needs to purkapand that the vegention is already sparse, it may not be necensary to remore very much to achieve 30% owned izorie being heid to the same standard of conformance, will expose the city to Bability scass of starp slopes and coolable slopes. Again, it would be better to reco<u>mize</u> the worst orevents air (oxygon) from being available for ignition. uative gressiands may pose a very low fuel risk used indiscriminately. COVerage. Page 6 of 7 ŝ F-29 F-28 ж Ц ۳-<u>1</u> S S

parking lots, large roads, etc., designed into the community layout to reduce exposure of house to flying conbers during high-wind wildfrees and to create defensible spaces for (including moding, windows, screaus, vents, caves, siding, decking, soffit enclosures and fereing), the prohibition of small-dimension wood construction (such as trelifses, gractors, frecing, submall enclosures, bulcanies, consumantal trim and devis) and the proper guidenno fix new development that provides adequate and defeasible baffars such as perimeter parts. firefighters to stuge their attacks. The Bowed wants to expectedly recognize one of its members, Milke Singleton, ABLA & AJCP, for his leadership role in reviewing subject documents and compiling faces comments.

Thank you for allowing the Contamarity Forest Advisory Board to comment and for tompidening cour topout

Sincorty.

Marcu & Hughes Namy J. Highes

Chair, Countinuity Forest Advisory Board

(C/C/ABL Letter Toi)& VSAccOnDargaM(grade III. dool)

 $\Sigma^{1}$ 

Pege 7 of 7

ł

	 •	· .				C-1 The comment addresses the sterifs of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the Accuracy of the ApiR/EA. No response is required.	G-2 The SBIR/RA acknowledges that the impact is significant since mingation is not proposed.	G-3 Mittigation is now provided for potentiel impacts to gratestrathers as described in Section V.B of the SEIR/RA.	G-4 "temporary intigation will not increase the amount of groundwater, nor would it morease fault load. Temporary intigation within Bresh Management Zone 'two is provided for plant establishment only when existing wegetation does not most coverage requirements.	G-S Current and proposed regulations soquire thimming of existing vagestation within Bansh Management Zone Two. It is not anticipated that large areas of bare soil would be exposed.
Comment Lattor C						. <sup>-</sup> .				
· · ·	1132 Periorast Place Rae Diogn. Ca 92,123	, 2004 s. 2004	- Allisan Ram Eporinduzadal Plannis Cisy uf Stat Diory Development Services Center 1232 Plant Avenes, MG #501. Sen Diego, CA 92100	RB: Draft Safessgrav ERMBA (JO: 1193) for Fiturth Managembat Rev(alume to the Land Development Curle and Federal Grant from the Office of Fractigatory Services (ORS), Federal Procepary Management Agaocy (TaMA)	Den Ma. Rany.	I was not able to first any spicetific or assentiant documenation in this documents traventing the proposed intak management of minimates changes that yould justify such motumental environmental env	Mitiagnicae - the Chy of San Diegorb ackeal to sullgate: Whenever the report statisd there, "Mitigation is available, to multigate the postential significant impacts It is fubbrowing the superior that	Chandidative effectes of this proposal are report should consider the Chandidative effects of this proposal, yet it does not in the following sincerbasis: Concernitive bouserships are sensible to an area provent to gradient behint. Would this increase sensible to a fight for distumences to the gradient behint.	he field? Would the "teapuresy" would all gover soveral years factrand the surround of ground/user down the allops of teapyrow. Locateding plank growth correction but Dimeserations are suit, and softwerpointly hereaveding that plant estimated and the sector and there is less software to appear increased the danger of the sector mendation of ground water but the shops increase the danger of manifeld the hereaver the soft is a also shops increase the danger of manifeld the hereaver the soft is a also shops increase the danger of butter the is by the proposed mediation to allope sectors the danger of the software the soft is a also shops increase the danger of butter the soft of the hereaver the soft is also also software of the danger of butter the soft is absorbed water to the software of the danger of the software the soft is a butter the soft of the software of the danger of the software the soft is a butter the software the soft of the software the soft of the software the software the software the software the software the soft of the software the software the software the software the soft of the software the softw	"Overgoidy and neurificant that in the spatial as spall but drift at flow the expected to restate of nutlive or patentized versention." The does for uppear to restated doep valuating that could flow unideground down the campool. What are the countibulive offereds of demoking such a large area campool.
						. <del>.</del> .		5- 2	<b>6</b> -4	ъ ъ

.

The ordinance does not authorize demuding of all veyetation, but requires a 50% reduction in fuel load which includes plant coverage of 50%.	Refer to comment A-12.	Landfills purvide areas for green waste dispesal which is malched for xe- use.	Current regulations tequire that mative or non-irrigated, low fuel and fire transfrive plants for planteet within Brush Management Zone Two. for plant is not a native plant and therefore is not allowed to be planted. This regulation is existing and no proposed change to the language is proposed.	Comment noted.	The comment nddresses the marks of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SEIR/BA. No response is required. The draft SEIR/ISA does address cumulative impacts informuly as it has a citywide focus.	Comment noted. Potential crosion while performing hush management solvethes is dependent on the scale type and stope factor of the arra, if mry. A sendy soli type with the protentially impacted more than a clayery soil type. The hydrology of an arra is also dependent on the sull type. A sandy soil has larger void spaces between the grains of soil and will he able to shorth more muisture when encountered.	Refer to community D-36 and P-10.	
56	C-D	G-8	6-D	<b>G-10</b>	6-11	5-15 -	6-13	
· .								
			•	· .	-			
			· .			· ·		
				· . · ·				
			2			· .	t,	
પિયરે સંસાજ્યક્ષક સંગ્રેક આવેલાંક ભર્ન થયા. રચ્યભરાજ ૧૦ વીઝ કહોવી? Whet is the comulative બંધનારે of redesing bability के रक्त conditionals, bluds and	inspects to the oversall heathin of the correspond ? Tow does this potential reallyction in previaments have advante and burds of prev?	Disposal of sensio matchal from frumi numetacatter: There is no unseasured show the disposal of the large values: of plast radrated channed. The import states that over four and a hold sequare mides of hold would be import states that over the stat a large semanar and a to a valid be fragment by Fifty parcent. That is a large samound of hold would be read in our limit fills, or sames, instat down into converte to using the formerowner from having to pay to into it to the dump.	Intensive Flants. The regulations proprese that: "All new plant methods for Zone' Prov shall be realive or nem-derigenter, low-thed, and fre-resistive" if consider the bAITPA, which is now ZOOB surves. (Draft Orithmere Amunules the Breath Management Regulations[42, 64:22 (b](5)(A).) This meases that it is OK to plant things like non onlive the plint that is entremely investive and destinations to non-makine plant. The pupped methods of entremelves comments the function for the proposal methods of entremelves comments the function of the	active prime and not not a converse outloor with a many prime from the source of the s	Moive: Storalizer V.A. states: "Currendly, there are no kimbug resultationer on brunch management antivities and no changes are proposed with his project." Why nor? The induction region of thinness could reduce the impact on existing gaugestaters and other operate. Also, the committee the impact on existing of a number of residents doing brunch transgement was not coptibilised.	Elyukulogy and Brusian Seroise V.C.: Masted upon my experiseon dolog and observing reducation work in open areae starynus, lowth menugement will fileturb the excisting acid conditions. Thuse starying lowth menugement will be a serving the individual process the slopes with evynet in our domin their fooling. This excelt my work the ico further enserthered when mains which my the allottabed sold and review for the evynet to main similar grouter storage the allottabed sold and review of allocol less wetter mains which my the allottabed sold and review of allocol less wetter main grouter supervised in the medically reduced and will allocol less water mid, in combination with the medically reduced and will allocol less water mid, in combination out which will supervise . This southhustion could lead to hold the meased erroden and a selence in the water than rative inter read reduces the shelly of the jond is any the metive treated reduce the shelly of the jond is any second the metive vegatation before the interial managed zone.	Heal Management and Regulation Training: The proposed fough management méranos doos unitrayine pecators during this work to be baland or demonstrate that they know what they are doing or what the regulations are. This is deepite the City's own dooursenbetion at 25 bruch menagement sites that demonstrated a universal problem with property owners not following the clarent regulations.	
9-0	6-7	8-0	6. 5	010	11	21 <del>6</del>	en Line	

ļ

· | :

ι.

i

:

; .

İ

;

ļ ļ

· ·

.

the heart of the CRY risk barrow wavedwate. Compose properties are reacte of the mast society after heares in San Diago. This would ratically therefore the reaction to other character and could even reduce property value ctockeles and Matters Trees. The proposel states that beer are protected in Zone Two because they may not be series foot myon or lemonadeterry to 6 justice, you m moger here a tree, ev f tiss game required. And the property owner could cleaved to carful to trace under the filly percent rule, known a vest-pool. These the t specially clange the obstackeriaties of canyons from (usb oasts in wever, the ordinance gapes that fifty rented of all plants over 18 there permits, all the targe cricigies tattre struke and track. This inches all be cut to six inches. If a property owner cuts a fifthen roperty awares are allowed to tability decrebe (thin to six fuctual), Neighliorhood Char the inset

9-14

I

i

Parmeurent intigations - Zane Omer: Thear is an year/silon to allow a property overs to fuertio using intigation if they are native inter that are not summer-dorment. Why? <u>6-15</u>

feedboring peoperty lates).

ue they altraved to pluct 24 justs plants when 18 inchest is the mat Rewszehnion: Why is it OK to revegatabili fifty parcent of the area with player that do "part grow hiller than twendy four hichter" and "the cicers away every plant and replants, they due put in twenty from linch ting plact material in Zune Two." Does the mean that if add soo reart to site inches (a tailad of twomy. Ove parameted all plants), or stay have to subsequently prune 500 of these plants is site inches? whethat alkall be meintaland in accordance with the requirements for consisting pleating ally be planted with talks material, but this decay and the rest with talks that they doed brow to thin fifty dsr fine liking relet? (b)(1)(B) and (D) are in conditot. 9<u>-1</u>8

Shatenely.

Bornic Hough, MD

**Chait, Friends of Ruffro Carpon** 

District Commanity Representation in the Open Space Conyons Advisory Commainer, City of Sun Disgo Department of Parks and Reactation

The proposed broth menagarbant revisions are not clian ging the standards except for when new trees are planted on a property.

õ

Brush Management Zone One requires permanent irrigation as a part of defense from potential wild fires. A property Owner may ward non-irrigated, native trees that are not summer-dormant within Brush Management Zone One and would have to be approved by Fire-Plana Officer

0-IS

This section does not allow clearing, rather it allows new planding if musting plants do not meet the 50% coverage standard.

0-16

HIN ALL TOLL

7611 P.81

IIS ERS FEIS

# **Comment Letter H**

Doti Ridenour, Euriraturental Chair Prienda of Starset Cliffs 1071 Sanast Cliffs Blod.

3an Diego, CA 92107

Alijson Raap Environmental Planner City of San Diego Development Scrvices Center 1222 Ritst Avenne, MB 501 Sau Diego, CA 92101 Boall DSDEAS@studiego.gor SUBJ ECT Frojeet No. 31245, 8CH No. 2004031041 Draft SIELR/FA\_JO:1193 Bruish Mürnigement Revisious to Land Devolopment Codo

July 9, 2004

The Friends of Sourset Clifty would like to ack the City to create categories of jand that would not be subject to Bruth Management due to careful create. Surget Clifth Natural Park is an example of this type of conception. I. The 50 acre Hillshe Section is equiraly MHPA in a dedivated eity open space park. This is the only City owned constal bluff open space park and of Torrey Phys.

Tails is the only City owned constal bluff open space park anoth of Torrey Plures. 2. The park is hounded to the west by the Parific Ocean with developed residential bousing separated by a street to the north and a well infigured landsagned college to the

Ť

east and the south boundary is Navy property. 3. To the cost is Sur Diego Bay, thus any castern wind driven fires would not likely cross

this water barrier. 4. Brash menagement in this park would destroy the efforts to re-vegetate with narive coastal cage scrub and fink this vital wildlife area with the 640 plus acres of fiderally protected ecological preserve to the south.

H-3 5. The most visible viddiff hubbat area is the Northwest Canyon which adjoins the FLNU comput. This caryon is so narrow that 35° of Zone 1 type clearing would denude this small but unique island of refuge for wildliff. These are roads and fire hydramts on the PLNU campus dgit on the edge of this lovely canyon. Some discretion much be allowed to retain this habbat.

The Friends of Sunset Cliffs has two main concerns. 1. Can misquate notice be given if furush Management is to be achievaled?

H-A 1. Can adaptate notice be given if Rusah Management is to be scheduled? 2. Can exceptions to Brush Management be made for ateas that have unique potential H-G value to habitat and plant consumities and as in this case, are not likely to be subject to

catastrophic with fires and have adequate fire defenses for the developed areas adjoent?

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this SER. We look forward to your

answers. Sincately , Dedi Ridenour, Eurlmental Chair of Friends of Surect Ciffis Ċ

ļ

!

Comment noted.

H

The City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department is responsible for the brush mussement activities within city owned open space.

> С Н

Brush management activities occur to protect structures for polential wild for hezerds. If there are no structures within an open space park; then no brush management activities would occur. Therefore, open spice parks would not be impacted by the proposed revisions to the brush management regulations.

2

H.4. Refer to comment H-2.

Specific requests should be dealt with through the Fire-Rescue Depertment and the Park and Recreation Department.

ΗS
comment Letter

į

ļ

i

i



SAN DIEGO AUDUBON SOCIETY 4891 Pachic Highway, Suite 112 • San Diego CA 92110 • 619/682-7200

July 8, 2004

Via amoli: DSDEAS@sandago.gov

Ctwis Zihlis, Asalatarit Deputy Director Developanient Services Department City of Sen Diegio 202 C Street

San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Zirkle;

Subject: Comments on SEIR for Bursh Management Revisions to the Land Development Code, Project No. 31245 The San Diego Auctions Society supports the comment letters submitted by the Nathe Plant Society and Certar for Biological Oliversity letters on the subject document. We are concerned that this Subsequent Environmental impact flepont (SEIII) does not adequately describe the protectifiel environmental impacts of the project and does not satisfy the minimum requirements of the Celiform Environmental Quelity Act. We realize that there is a strong need to quickly reduce our vulnerability to widdlifes for this five section. This document was done very quickly with very anallow investigation and analysis to meet a very short dealibre. But this inadequate document is mean to guide truth management over thousands of across for many years. We uge that a temporary ordinance be adopted based on this document for this life season. Then nitkle a better defined and reaccored probability. Is better to this life season. Then nitkle a better defined and controls, and needed misigation, and an adequate SEIR he produced for subsequent years.

THE PROJECT IS NOT CLEARLY DEFINED

On the second page (unnumbered) of the document, it explains that the proposed policy is based on the current Brush Mainagement Regulations of the Land Development Code adopted in 1997, but extends the Zone Two to 55 feet in most celes. Page 5-1 states that under the current regulations, "Brush Maragement Zone Two is sin area of nettye plant material thinned to

50% to reduce fuel load.\*

r.

However, the procedure for clearing appears to be thim init out 50 percent of the plants over 16 brokes in height to a height of 6 brokes, then pruning the remaining plants to sector for a loading. Thus the recturction in vegetation is far more than 50%. The SEIF does not define or limit the amount of the additional potnetion. If these plants are limited up to height for

1-3 practions the function effect), and that diameter reduced by 25% (a very typical pruming to about 26% of practice), the pruming above cruck network the volume of the vegeration remaining to about 26% of the original volume. This, in conjunction with the 50% through well heaving about 20% of the original volume. This, in conjunction with the 50% through well heaving about 26% 20% and the original vector of the vegeration of the set of the vegeration of the set of the original volument interving about 26%. So the mass of the vegeration of the 1997 Zone Two to 85 feet, which has a fuel reduction of 50%. So the mass of the vegeration remaining the tage remaining count is the set of open to 14%, not 34%, not 360%.

Comment poted

Ξ

F-2 Comment noted.

1

The proposed revisions to the Encsh Management Ordinance relates to the widths of Zone One and Zone Two, not to the procedures a perion hench management activities. The revised code section 142.0412 (h)(3) states: "Within Zone Two, 50 percent of the plunts over 18 inches in height shall be reduced to a height of 6 inches." Revised code section 142.0412 (h)(3) states: "Within Zone Two, 30 percent of the plunts over 18 inches in height shall be reduced to a height of 6 inches." Revised code section 142.0412 (h)(4) states: "Within Zone Two, 30 percent for loading in accordance actives: "Within Zone Two, all plants remaining after 50 percent are reduced in height, shall be prumed to reduce fuel loading in accordance with the Landscape Standards in the Land Development Manual." These procedures are not profoused to be changed, however, the language within the code was revised for clarity. The 50% of plants in the 26% coverage within zone two. The bruis mangement procedures may reduce the westerdon areas over 50%, but the plant coverage shall remain at 50% within Zone two.

Ξ

	The SERVEA analyzes impacts accociated with the proposed revisions to the Brush Management Onlinence, not the provisions which are not proposed for change.	Brush Maurgement Zone Two requires 50% of the vegetation to be thinned and is not necessarily performed on an annual basis. New plantings are allowed in order to maintain 50% coverage. This is an existing provision that is not proposed to be chunged with the ray and ordinance. In general, thinning of Zone Two occurs overy two to three	years. However, vagetation types vary and the Fire Manabell has the sufflority to require thinning as needed. Refer to comment E4 and E.S.	Refer to comment 1-5.	Rêler to comment D-36.	The identification of plant types has been added as an alternative to the SFRUMA. Refer to Section VII, under Alternultyres considered but rejected, alternative number three, page 7.	e*	
	Ţ	2	. <b>9</b> 1	۲	۰ ۲	. <u>6</u>		
				• • •				:
impeuks will be dramatically different. The SEIR needs to state what ferred of fuel reduction this project will leave/remove in Zone Two	As such, the document beaves great uncertainty in what will actually be done under the project and it is impossible for a decision maker, the Environmental Analysis Section, or a reviewer to assess the magnitude of the impacts. Clearly this vegue project identification does not eatisfy the jetter or the splitt of CECA.	INPACTS OF SUBSECIUENT MANAGEMENT EVENTS The procedure appears to be based on managing the fuel on a naturally vegetated site. After the first year's brush management, much of the natural some vegetation will necover, but some of it will not, depending on veetber and a variety of chountainces. So, each year the baseline will tend to be less, and the amount remaining after fuel reduction will be leas. If 90% of the vegetation recovers each year, at the and of 10 years the amount of vegetation will be down to 35%. This progressive reduction of somb vegetation is a real impact.	The procedure nears to be revised so that after the vegetation gete down to some defined level, management will be based allowing a fixed level of vegetation (tuei) to remeth, not an ever decretaring one. In that way, the SEIR can actually evaluate the long term impact of the project on biological resources and on water quality. If not, the SEIR needs to be expanded to address the erviconmental impacts of the very fixely iong term progressive loss of native vegetation in Zone Two.	SAME CRITERIA APPLED TO SPARSELY VEGETATED BITES The procedure of thanking to 50% and then pruning to some percent is applicable even if there are only a few pierts and they are a givent distance apart. This does not satisfy the related purpose of the project as there is liftle fitelihood that fire would be exported by the sparse vegelation. Situations like this will have very serious water quality and vedifie movement impacts. As stated in the previous paragraph, there should be come density of native vegetation below which there would not be any blinned or pruned.	DOCUMENT SHOULD INCLUDE A MORE ENVIRONMENTALLY PROTECTIVE ALTERNATIVES The document mendions that the brush management neglered by the previous brush management regulations was ind adequately implemented throughout the City. Those adminings were carefully found to ut to maximize protection and minimize environmental impacts. The EIS should have identified and enalyzed an alternative in which adcadton and enforcement would be adequately appled to fully implement the pravious ordinances viro impacts. The EIS should have identified and enalyzed an alternative in which adcadton and enforcement would be adequately appled to fully implement the pravious ordinances vir investing in better enforcement would be determine whether funceinget, dran hying to implement lenger intrah management areas.	A LESS DAMAGING ALTERNATIVE An alternative that includes a more comprehensive approach to boush management should be identified and evaluated. In the post Development Services has identified many native plants that are reasonably bown that when, it also identified some natives and non-netlyre that wan not. We unge that the SEIR define and analyze an attemative in which thinning and pruning would begin with namoving the most flammable and most invasive species of plante. Next would be the more flammable and most invasive species of plante. Next would be the more flammable and most invasive species of plante. Next would be the more flammable and most invasive species of plante. Next conditions the and and increasenty to get below a defined protective fuel load that considers the ancies distribution.	N	

i

i

I

7

<u>ہ</u>

ዋ

.

<u>^-</u>

**6**:

Ŷ

jemonote beny, euger bush, dudleye, etc. with no annual meeds would probably provide much Conceptually an area that has 60% coverage of vegetation that is more restatant to fire like uture fammeble arrwai weeds. This more descriminatory management would require that the usitiv, and enotion prevention value, and would have a better chance of realsting invasion by more fire production that one covered with acada, anundo, and Parripass grass, that has been cleared to a fevel of 40%. The 60% area would else have a great deal more habitat, weter

£

I

performed in the City, if we are going to do an effective job of providing effective defensive space the people doing it will have to know what they are doing. We strongly urge that a more ocopie deing the clearing would have to know what they are doing. But, as with most tasks disoriminate dearing and Itilming alternative be defined and analyzed.

4,55UMPTION THAT BRUSH MANAGEMENT WILL OCCUR CONSISTENT WITH THE REGULATIONS

The above assumption was mariloned a few times in the SEIR including on page 11-6. It is not a reastanticle assumption. The Impacts of the project should be assessed using a more realistic assumption of some over-Implementation. And the project should include adoquate enforcement to minimize the damage of beppropriate thinking and proving. Ξ

programs reported on the Cournel heavings on this lasue several times. Based on those hearings they repeated that residents are required to "clear" bursh out to at lass; 100 feet and that penalities would be applied if they old not. They also reported that such desarmod any discression of thimming was too nompilorated for a news broadcast. When challenged, liney olgimed that City authorities corroborated their interpretation. Faced with this sort of master missinformation it is very likely that management that is done is very likely not to be consistent was required in a few other stories in subsequent weeks. When contacted they clehned that it should be remembered that at least one of the most popular local television news

172

Also there are many so-called experts hying to sell their tirush clearing services to residents. They band to follow a pattern of searing the potentiel customer by overstaing the risk of the nearby vegetation, doing some cheap and dreconten clearing, explaining frow much "sefer" the customer is after the clearance, and using that customer's perception of safety to get offier with the regulations. Ē

customens

This project needs a major effort at public editration, media aducation, and enforcement to protect the environment and water guality. This should be identified as a required mitigation try to get british management to be done in an appropriate way, to manage fire risks and to

measure, with monitoring of its effectiveness, in the SEIR. Otherwise it should not be assumed that buck measured evaluate that buck measurement will occur consistent with the regulations and the SEIR should evaluate and offer mitigation for the impects will result from the reaconsibly foreseen excesses. ŝ

GOATS FOR CLEARING

that assertion. There are serious deta hunived with thinning using goets. When goats torage in The document asserts that having goats graze in a Zone Two area for two or three days is a weedy area, the seeds of these weeds will be distributed wherever they graze next. This is equivalent to Zone Two thistring. Honever, the document provides no information to support

weeds. Goats also eat arreal animels when they find them. The project does not address what portion of a plant. Reducing fuel toad depends on removing dead wood. Removing the wood would tend to cause healthy troadteaf evergreen shrubs to weak, dying, or dead shrubs which vulnerable to procion. Coats tend to browse en leaves, which are typically the least iferminable are more firs yrone. The reduction in heelthy shrubs is Brely to eccelerate the take-over of Rely to exectable the weed problem. - Goets are reputed to disturb the solt leaving ft sensitive reptiles, redents, insect tarvae, etc. will be devouced by the goats. <u>1</u>2

Refer to comment D-36.

1-10

Refer to commont D-9. Ξ

This comment does not address the relequery of the  $\mathrm{SLIR}/\mathrm{BA}$  . Therefore,

za comment is required.

12

Command noted. 1-13

Refer to comment D-36,

14 [\_14

Whether brash management activities are performed by Juansus or goars, weed investion in thinned zone two britsh menaged areas will add occur.

Ë

We do agree that goets might be quite useful for heiping to maintain areas that are covered with exotic weady annuals and grasses.

problems with the use of goats for a range of vegetation types, slopes, and coll types. We were Curing the scoping phase of this project we were assured by relevant City employees that well morthored tests would be performed to answer any questions about the value, and the

effectiveness of their use. The only result that we could find in the SEIR was that clearance with goets coste about helf what it cost for human workers. We did not find any of the information cold titat, in epite of common perceptions, that the tosts would domonstrate the period and headed to assess the environmental impacts of using goats. 146 14

the actuel environmental impact occurred - what level of weeds result, which species of desirable plants survived welt, which barely survived, which were sliminated by the gosts, what the final and flammability-resulted, and how much stration occurred or obd not occur during the For a text to be condusive. It would have to be run over more than one year to determine ì

Duo to the lack of real information on the environmental impact of pruning and thinning with goals, we urge that it be deleted from the SEIR. If goats are to be used later, a separate CECA review including the results of the needed texts around be provided. The optimistic assertions of aubsequent winter(s).

the current SELH are intally unsupported, and are not acceptable for a CECA document. 9 1

EXPANSION OF WEEDY SPECIES

issue but does not provide any <del>cali</del>mates of the rates of invasion that can be expected and how opputation of mative perancials and enhance invasive annual weads. The SEIR mentions this In several parces, the SEIR menutons that inhuning of native vegetation will result to an increase in non-mative annual weeds. The periodio outling back will terrar to reduce the they would affect the environment and public patety <u>8</u>-1

could probably be done every five or so years. Annual weets can grow within a faw weeks to a clearance five or six times a year - which would be totally unaffordable and even lass likely to be dengerous tevol in come circamatences. So, it may well be that excessive theming and pruning Winite many weeds do not have the high heat of combustion of some of the woody natives, they ignite far more eacily. Native sourb vegetation grows slowly, so that fuel management of native sorub vegetation contribution a menageable problem into one that would require 1-20

One potential measure to mitigate this problem is to inducte a meed correct statment and adequate aniforcement of it in this project. There are a number of possibilities. None are ldemiliad  $\overline{2}$ 

econtrolished then our ristorioal insufficient isnel of weed maintenance.

The SEIH should provide analysis tailing what degree the expansion of weeds in the Zone Two sreas, and beyond, will result from the project. It should be besed on existing models and on local validation of the modeling. Further, it should provide analysis of the potential increase in vultierability to fire thet could result from a poorly menaged thinning and pruning policy. potentiai ipat this policy might result in a higher fire safety risk under some circumstances should be identified, enclyzed, and measures to offset it fully implemented ŝ

ROSON

sites were all oleared by human workers. But, it is not clear when the brush management had erosion impacts and only two showed erosion. While not stated, it sounds as though these On page V.C-18, the SELR states that 25 brush management after were enalyzed for

ì

į

Further studies will be conducted by The City of San Diego to determine the effectiveness of utilizing goats for brush management activities. I-16

Refer to comment Y-16. 1-17

Refer to comment F-16. J-18

Invertive species are analyzed on page V.B-31 of the SEIR/BA.

1.5

This commant addresses the merits of the project, not the accuracy or adraptacy of the SEIR/EA. No response is required.

F20

Refer to comment 1.20. 5

Expansion of weed within Zone Two on a citywide hasis is speculative at best. Refer to Appendix B of the dent SEIR/RA regarding the amount of weeds found within areas that are currently brush managed.

53

Refer to comment 1.3.	Communt noted. Broston gulfies are visible iong after rain events and would have been identified within Appendix B of the draft SEIR/F.A.	Bristing bursh management softwiths have not or stated these types of problems. The proposed project would expand zone one and zone two to total no more than 100 feet. The proposed project would not change any	other practices. Therefore, existing crosion from brush managod areas is considered to accurately reflect future conditions. Refer to commont F.25.	Refer to 142.0412(g)(7) in the draft bruth munagement ordinance. "Structure" is defined by the Land Development Code as "an etilities or building of any kind or any construction built up or composed of parts jorned together in some definite manner including a well, feace, pier, post, sign or shelter".	Refer to comment A-12. A city-wide survey was not conducted. Estimatos were completed using 1995 Multiple Specie: Conservation Plan (MSCP) CES data. Estimates of impacts from future development world be speculative. Staff disagross that more definitive data is required.	Refer to conquent D-4.	Continent noted.	
I-23	1-24	1-23	<b>9</b> 2-1	1:27	1-28	1-29	1:30	
	• .							
hear don's and how much rain had occurred since the brush management. Also the clearing that been done under the current andreanes which required 50% tog reduction. This does not appear to be relevant as a predictor of performance for the new owfinence in that it requires 50% thinning and then considerable pruning which is far more reduction in vegebation, as mentioned many and more reduction in the requires	The worst encesion coaurs when we get a heavy rain event efter the solls are already sounded. Constitution the minimat rain is the last few years, a test depending on redural rainful would not provide any information about whist would occur ween there is a serious rain and a serious rark of enceton. An adequate simulation could probably be made using a carefully designed entitional rain system, but the document does not indicate that the was donce.	There are real public safety risks from arcsion, flooding, and mudsildes. The document needs to seriously evaluate the impacts of this project on these risks as well as the impacts to water quality, waterways, and waitends.	As such, the document does not provide information to support the easenfor that impeads to providen would be less than significant. We unge fract the erosion risk of the proposed policy be more fully evaluated, using more representative rainfall levels, and that measures to mitigate that tick be implemented in the project.	WHAT IS A STEUCTURE? The document discusses clearing a zone around structures. What structures require clearance? "Is the astimute of project impact based on a management zone around occupted homes and businesses? Or is a buffer to be required for patker, gazeboe, sheds, renses, outtuidings, systems are around the to be required for patker, gazeboe, sheds, renses, outtuidings, systems are around the structure the formation of the project be reduced by requiring management doity around the former? The defaultion of the project be context of this project should be included in the SEIR to allow decision makens and reviewers to make this sort of assessment.	IMPACTS TO BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES The document mainfoirs that there will be 199 acress of gnatoxither habitst effected by this project. This is very significant. However it does not quantify the acres of habitet of other speades or the number of itxIMdual plante or enfinedix of each sensitive species that will be falsen by this project. A well supported estimate of each of these numbers must be included in this SER.	MITIGATION DEFICIENCIES The measures currently included in this pholent dearly do not raduce its impart to below a level of significance. This <b>might</b> be done if many of the measures mentioned above were implemented effectively. If not, a large amount of miligation will be required. There would be absolutely no justification for the Giy to attempt to over-hile these impacts.	On the fourth (prinumbered) page of the document it was pointed out that impacts to neeting gradicatichers will occur since there is no simil on the time of year that training may occur. This impact and the impact on other threatened and endangened speeds should be identified and militigatic, but the applicant has not agreed to such mitigation. The document mentions militigation for gnatostichers along would be 198 acrea. We urge that militigation be implemented for the potentiat loss of gnatostichers. We exist and the militigation heatened and the document is impacted by the potentiate along would be 198 acrea. We urge that militigation be implemented for the potentiat loss of gnatostichers. We else urge the militigation heatened and the sensitive appeded to the loss of gnatostichers. We ense the militigation heatened to the potentiate and the sufficient militiation be provided for each.	υ
1-23	I-24	1-25	1-50	1-22	1-28	1-29	30	

:

ļ

:

| | |

:

.

I.

On the same page the document mentions that the project will result in the establishment of investive plant species in bruch management Zone Two and possibly drawn slope and that mitigation should occur. Apparently the applicant did not propose such mitigation. Unless measures are included in the project that will fully offset the invasion of the weedy speckes that will result from the project, we strongly urge that such mitigation be provided.

7

.

For follow-up, the undersigned can be reached at 619-224-4591 or peugh@cox.net.

yama C. Payl Respectingy,

James A. Peugh Conservation Committee Chair

15

...

Comment noted. Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations are proposed to address the significant numitigated turparts associated with investive species in Zone Two.

15-1

I

i

i

7

Ċ

ï

÷

;

:

ļ

ł

. !

¢

Comment Letter J

ł

ļ

۱

i

ļ

:

ć

۱



San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

Environmental Review Committee

10 July 2004

Mr.Chris Zirkle Assistrat Deputy Divertor Development Sarvices Department City of San Diego 1222 First Avrane, Mail Station 501 San Diego, California 92101

Ë

Subject Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Austrament Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Pederal Grant from the Office of Entergency Services (OES), Federal Encagency Management Agentry (FEMA) Project No. 31245

Doar Mr. Zirklet

I lizve reviewed fite subject DSBRAEA on behalf of this committee of the San Diego County Ambusological Society. We pointed out in our letter of 14 March 2004, in response to the Notice of Freparation for this projoct, that brush management activities could damage archarching approximation in the clearing operations is dono mechanically, or outside the brush clearance zong, where vehicles and equipment travel to access the worksite. The DSERMEA fails to address this potential direct implied. Several means of doing so exist, including:

 Periodialiting use of vahioles and mechanical equipment in bush, clearing operations except over existing roads.

Ę

- Sturrey of project areas by a qualified and acclarate prior to clearing operations, with appropriate actions taken in sensitive areas.
  - Monitoring of the operation by a qualified archaeological monitor.
- J-2 Similarly, we noted that indirect impacts to such scalegical sites could result from exposure of sizes to illegal collecting. The DSEIR/BA also fails to address this impact.
- The DSERF/EA, in Section IX, takes the position that since no "grabbing or grading would be required", there would be no potential for impacts to archaeological resources. Archaeological sifes can be fragile and damaged by wheel loadings. Imagine a track wheel going over pieces of

Ţ

The ordinance proposes "thinning" not "clearing" as the comment lefter indicates. In Scotion IX of the SEIR/EA, the proposed hands management activities do not include any surface or subsurface disturbance. Pruning and thinning activities work all take pluce above ground and not morease or grading would be required. The amount of thinning would not increase the visibility of potential surface resonness. Vehicular traffic to perform brush management activities could not occur off of existing roads without a separate permit. Therefore, no proposed project.

J-2 Kefer to comment J-1.

J-3 Ruffer to comment J-J.

P.D. Box 84146 + Sen Diego, CA white-1408 = (658) 536-0135

pottery, för czample. The current document doca not recognize this impact or provide the necessary impact analysis sud appropriate mittgation.

Thank Jun for providing this environmental document to SDCAS for our review and comment.

Vienes W. Royle, Jr., Ch Ī Sincerely, . .

Environmental Review Comm

SDCAS President Filo Ë

\_

...<sup>,</sup>

## t<sup>1</sup>.0. Ebx 81108 ^ San Clegn, CA 22133-1105 = (B5B) 538-0030

ł

ł

Comment Letter K

ì

I I

ί

1

ł

i

# Serra Mesa Planning Group

Post Diffee Box 23315 San Dago, CA 92193

finity 7, 2004

Environaciatel Plautier Alhiton Kanp

City of San Diego Development Sarvices Center

1222 First Avenue, MS #501 Sun Divep. CA 92100

RE: { Main Selesconstruct RA (10: 1193) for Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Vesland Grant from the Office of Renergancy Services (DES). Federal Broargeary Managranish Aganey (FEMA)

Doar Ms, Rasp:

On June 18, 200M the Seare Meas Plenning Group persed a mobion (2-0) to respond to the BBVBA रात्रीय (श्रेस्ड्रे दण्डात्रकारिट

- Items's information in the EIR document that is not factual.
- More scientific restarch in needed.
- Retire public advection is needed.

Ligted below is a more dotailed analysis of the RIR/RÅ and explanation for our comments.

The justification for these regulations is stated as: "Bruch Management Zones were established in the City of San Diego Land Development Code to project Pabrickle structures from potential fra-dangers and provide thianing of native vegetation to reduce the amount of fuel for a potential fra-and allow for access to regetation for fits permonet." (City of San Diego Baush Management Evaluation Nielogical Technical Report)

uppeared to be kery to a house burning. The flatmusbilly of the structure secured to be the with al Asny of the hornes that barried in the catastrophic firms of 2000 sither had shrubbery text to the ovidence is there that this proposal will really produce an "effective fire break", as it esponses? Northers in this BA is there may so is nitibeor and added evidence to support this increase in the wares that did not hum or had areas cleared in excess of these regulations. Neither factor unahigated destruction of our native hebitat, including in the "Reference" section. What ŝ ч Д

element. These dostrotive proposels workd not have made a diffraction. What would have made a diffraction wordd have born attractures that were much less inflammable. Yet the city does not taku that appressit. This could jaad residences into à false sours of security.

The commont addressed the marits of the project, not the automacy or adequacy of the SEIR/BA. No response is required. ž

The comment addressed the merits of the project, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SEIR/EA. No response is required. 실

thinned compared with those that the not would have either proved or discroned the effectiveness of the in general. A simple comparison showing the performance of areas burnt that had recently been brush groposed changes to the ordinance.

Crity a small number of mid-range stower moving fires would receive a positive allect from thinking in Zone 2. We get not conduced that the positive banefits outweigh the negative impacts. However, If the ortinance lifuning. Smail firms are very defensible given the 35° Zone 1 approach and do not require Zone 2 thinning. the fact is that know which then fires are minimally affected by the implementation of truch management is to be implemented. Oven all possible attentistices and impact mitigations must be considered by five EUR.

. ¥

oBregenerit policy that is not dearly defined and ulthout adminic basis will nexult in excessive dearling of are Berly to need more than 30%. We are expectally concerned about the negative publicity that trees native vegetation and theo removels. Some stopes would not require a 90% reduction in fuel while others (ration or non-native) are receiving from the press and ony representatives. This is despite the well-known orincide that effectively pruned trees represent a very low fire hezard. Findo after photo of large trees still The 32<sup>md</sup> Street Compon Task Force is concerned that the concinacis on a "one size Ais all brock

Ż

standing around residences, othen singed to the inside from the pouse fire but unalifected on the other side, were common after the Ceckar fine. It appears that these changes to the bresh management plan are motivitied more by political encodercy and waibility than science or research.

Spring Comments for Alternations in the Charl Universitial Input Report for the referred Back Management Plan

assume that non-aerial spray inigation techniques would be used (buildher, low flore flood and drip). Meisture in the confrontant is a solution to fire spread, not a contributor. The conducions of this irpicture, financia direct eerial spiray of score natives can create problems. Nowever, this alternative should e). An alternative adouting the representant of highly flammation ratives with took flammable natively was croute impacts to histogy, erosion, and water quality is not supportable. An effectively established rative zone of tow Rammable vegetation is the best solution for live management and would result in fewer considered to have significant impacts based on the assumption that supplemental inigation would create st<del>yrtic</del>ailt impacts. This is inconsistant with the language of the bruzh menagement orthanco, which allows tur supplemental tampotary inighilon. To assume that all supplemental inigenion with result in numoff that wit mpade to biology, erosion and weiter grafity. Most rative vegelation is not negetizely allieded by additional startative are not appropriate and should be reconsidered. 9 E 2-2 2

hely property caner that chooses an alternative stels management approach should be allowed to apply for attemative conformance under a ministerial parmet if the application mosts important conditions and indings. Approaches allowed under this alternative conformance should inducts  The phased replacement of highly baranable native regretion with other sustainable native vegetation that has a significantly lower ford index, utiling accepted standards such as the Ramnatifity fist of natives provided by the Caffornia Native Plants Society. ÷

2). For those relating properties (juin to 1989) that do not have a full 35' around the structures because sume or must of this distance is on slopes, the property owner should be allowed to plant and tragate non-malive or matter low-feel species. Invasive species would not be allowed

8-19 19

ŝ

i L

ł

Refer to compout F-2. ł Refer to comment F-3. ţ Refer to comment F-4. ž Refer to comment P-5.

ž

Refer to communit F-6.

ł

Refer to contract  $F^{-7}$ .

ž

ment to radive areas on these shopes, infigation would be rectonumshold to be famponary, but issed under certain conditions, the imigation should be atomed, by permit, to be permanent.

1

3) Abov for the use of imigation systems (temporary or permentary) during Santa Ana conditions on or other official fee lazard warning conditions to help reduce the risk of fra. Rearh-turns on integrition practices and types of infigation would resel to be put in place to discontrape extensions fractions and types of infigation would resel to be put in place to discontrape extensions fractions and the support of neural processions (or the support of neural processing busiles accompany or other and the support of neural processing intervals the use of stocking the use of stocking the order of the support of neural processing the use of stocking the order of the support of the support of the stocking the market to help the use of stocking processing the use of stocking propose infigation systems designed for the protection of the stocking or genuing.

b) The inclusion of a public education program was an alternative considered, but rejected (vill-1), it is stated that these education materials are strendy available. However, many of the materials are contractory and do not provide encode specifics related to the Cby of San Ulego Brash Management (Autheren: Sine the Pre Cite) has the shifty and insponsible to define which properties with have the busic homever, many to define which properties with have the first of the busic homever of the encoder softward in the consideration of the provide and the provide strength of the properties with have the Mil-1(1) busic homever, many of the responsibility to them and the provide the the public feducation as a stated strength to the state able and the first properties with have the first of the provide to the the public feducation as a stated store strength up in this letter should be considered. The base head was not to have public depotion as a stated store strength up in this letter stored be considered.

A public charakten and untubly program is needed as part of this ordinance. This would include definitions of puring, thurding, deading, guidzing, part ramoval without not, council, two fuel management, and other forms that may not be undestood by the general public. Without the countinent of a training program with materials to be given to the public, it is difficult to see from the project could be impact mental. The ordinance should require an exclusion program that would table discover in moment bithing methods. The ordinance project are a counted for the activation process for countactors of proved bithing methods. The ordinance provide an exclusion process for contractors difficult do service. The ordinance should require interactions and allow for the deals of payment for services that do NJ=12 - Prenoval of storatations plants first to count towards developing SCPs covered soil area with lug. Toduction within that remaining vegetation that provides SCPs coverage.

not follow guidefines. Some of this education should include the following concepts:

- Recognition that there are native plants and nationalized plants that are naturally tow-fuel, or that can [N-1 3]
   The scality memoged to be low in fuel and invasive plants that are both high in fuel and damaging to refive indicats.
  - Pluintg should always be denoted the lottum up, removing dead wood with no Teelging" of the PM-1.4 http://www.comescienter.comesciences represent woody franches to the dying effects of the surand increased growth of small changer flush of growth witch increases the plane's userphility to
- ignation. - Removed of anexal plants over 18" high should be done prior to the fire season but alter the rainy stated to avoid erceion and numbli.
- An appropriabily proved since will need to be pruned every four to six years to fractione deadwood that has anomaliated, or to reduce the crown again. Anold annumby sheating off new bud growth that may result in profileration of compatible twips if done in the growth seasor, or may foll the sinch if

three in the dry season

M-9 Refer to comment F-8.

j

.

Refer to comment F-9.

M-10

M-11 Refer to commont F-10.

M-12 Refer to comment F-11. M-13 Refer to comment F-12. M-15 Refer to comment F-14. M-16 Refer to comment F-15.

99 12

- Avoid defailing of iteality pruned broadical exergreen native simulys in Zone 2, which could lead to type conversion to exolic grasses and आत्माप्रबंध, which extend the fire season and Apple native readily then healthy pruned native stantion.

**U-17** 

Specific Connects for Arguet Analysis in the Bart Enstrumental Instact Arguet for the revisal "Arcel Management Par"  The 32x Struct Caryon Task Force recommends a stange to the tifle of ordinance and the text to "Vegetative Fast Managament" to alter the public's paragitor that At Ibrush (vegetation) is dargectorely fammakle. The emphasis should be no managing fuel, not brush, since luck is in all differenti icome of vegetation, whellow matrait or planted interdimel, as well as furtishings and building metafuls. 2) The 32<sup>rd</sup> Street Caryon Task Force befores live the review of potential neighborhood character / accimential statements. The lack of public education and the excessive requirement to remove branches up to three these the height of acjament undersiony, will result in the complete removal of our difference the stark of many trees. Most native brush is other to a parent live in person lise the totak to branch demante, which is more than totak to for the difference of or retifice to informations that and the analytic of next of our retifice to informations.

The 32<sup>rd</sup> Street Caryan Task Force is concerned that without public extraction and darification in the buelt measurement ordinance, trees or large tree-flee stimulas are fleety to be removed, resulting in a significant visual *i* neighborhood *i* assistatic fupant. Marke, naturalized or non-native trees should nat be removed as part of other zone. Phaning of backer fuels used with a notable of the trees should be recorreded. For trees on slopes with understary native regetation, failet branches, leaf thighlorhood is provide a policy and guideflues on tree (to include the anomedian backer branches, the ortheance should provide a policy and guideflues on tree (to include the anomedian back for trees on slopes with understary native regetation, failet branches, leaf thight or buest branches, the ortheance should provide a policy and guideflues on tree (to include the anomedian back theorem and the tree of the trees in the ortheance should provide a policy and guideflues on the formation.

12,12

3). The 32<sup>rd</sup> Street Caryon Task Force is also concerned about tree removals in Zore 1. The orthware states that hows shall be at least 10 first anay from a structure, measured at the drp line based on the mature size of the free. If the free wore brimmed regularly, is work never expand to the mature size of the free. If the free wore brimmed regularly, is built never expand to the mature size of the free. If the free wore brimmed regularly, is built never expand to the mature size of the provides, so this guideline is contraining and ecoessive. It is believe the arching order is built we arching order is built between the stating order is built by the believe the arching order the built provide mature size of the provide. The free code says trees should not horge orat the built by the fact is the from the

M-22

M-17 Refer to comment F-16.

M-18 Refer to continent F-17.

.

Refer to comment F-13.

M-19

M-20 Rofer to comment P-19.

M-21 Refer to comment F-20.

M-22 Refer to comment F-21

or trus campy was within 10°, nor do se know if there were other trees faither away, and if they burned also. In many cases, the tree may have been formed by the house, not vice versa.

tranches are prened to allow for a 10 separation between the sonctone and the free. This separation have striegende or bockyerds extraded of supporting a free al 11s kult matures size drip-free with an additional 10° kuffer. The fractility to stade inhabited structures workd have an energy use impact requirement of 10 feet from the drip line. A more elitative method would be to be sure that the linis requirement also takes away the ability of a homeowner to shade their house. Many homes do not associated with it as veil as related as quality transits. The Gedar Fire does not support the can <del>either</del> be hortzonkul or vertical, thereby allowing for shede on the shucture. Also, certain <del>nees</del> arc could be the first resident, and could actually help to fifter and althouse facturants and region; hear trom lynting adjacent shortures. The shode from trees, whicher over a shorture or other (and)scaped mees, often helps to keep the area from drying out, which is the primery reason for ignition.

principally significant inpacts to sensitive species". These impacts are considered to be reduced to distance from the impact. Attemnitives should be locked at much doser, including methods that allow stationent on page V.B.-30 finit reads: "The proposed brish management revisions would result in Lefore a level of significance through acquiring other fabilal. Impacts resulting then investigation of the investigation of the provided scientific constraints that are summarily dennicated, even though the document has provided scientific However, this plan automatically assumes the best indigation is to oriset the impact with purchased redicti, which results in a net hous of tradition in the region and the millipation is officin at a great for replacement of native vegetation with large atrixuits of fuel with redva or non-rative (rep.) meske)  $\phi_i$ . Under previous easiysts of the existing brush management conherce and as fisted on page Y.B. 27, brusti oranagement in Zono 2 is considered to be "impact neutral". This is contradicied by a occupitotical should grow and alteriting proof that this has occurred in the mojority of areas thinned for brush. Under CEQA requirements and guidelines, avoidance of impacts should always be a priority species that produce less fuel, M-24 M-25

will uncleasional that roots should not be removed and that for impact thinning techniques and invacts are not enticipated (V.C-11). This assumes that all individuals involved in brush justiagement zukimenti are to be used to Enit soil distributes. Vidrout a public eduzation campaign, brochurts or statictions, and distructions is very likely to occur? It would be belier to let the inspect as poteribially 5), impacts associated with hydrology and receips a sectify that since the sold is not being disturbed épuliteant and sborr that it can be unitgated through a public education cannaion. M-26

Under the society on Erosion (V.C-13); data supports the daim that erosion does occar on steep slopes or arctable sole wintre trush respectivit has accured. The MOUS listed in Appendix D, indrates that under Section B, paragraph a, à proparty closer is allowed to do more then thiraling. For example, disting is allowed width express mineral soil to ension. 12-M

the impacts (or lack of impacts) can easily be tead to quantify the local acres of steep stopes and erobable slopes. Again, it would be better in recognize the worst-case asserted that linkth removal, fuinting and the baring of soil will result in erosion. This erodom impact can be reduced to below a located on steep slopes or ecodable soils, even though the same GS tools used to determine many of This study does not attempt to quantify the amount of the city's brush management zones that are cost of significance by public education to prevent full plant removal, tree namenal and the use of sol-JN-28

Refer to common! N-22. 17 S

ì

Ì

į

ļ

.

ļ

i

ļ

I į

ł

i

i ;

ì

N-25

Refer to comment F-23.

M-24

Refer to comment F-24

Refer to comment F-25.

**M-26** 

Rafer to comment F-26. M-27

Refer to comport  $F_27$ . M-28

M~23

damaging equipment and techniques. Also, actions such as requiring chipped vegenulum to be phased over all stopes is effective in reducing erosion and preventing invasion proliferation. Stutkes show that chipped vegenation is much less flammable then standing vegetation, due to the parking of the matter which prevents air (cwygen) from being available for ignition. 6). A determination resets to be made as to the cycle of thirming that may be required as well as advantages to the time of year that this thirming should be done. Fire management data world indicate that many highly flaurmatus materials would grow back in 2-3 years. This is probably unrealistic and may regatherly impact the hardnes. Some guidence is needed, perfects to and may regatherly impact the hardnes. Some guidence is needed, perfects to and indicate may require the removing the needed to understand that the desired. 150%, indice to an administration of 5-year materiance evolves in the removing the removing administration of the testing.

7). Even the realities of higher budgets, areas with steep stores and factory fuel loads adjacent to Intattied structures should receive a higher priority for fuel management compared to areas with lower fuel loads A "one size fits all' neurogeneric zone, with all chy-concel lands build held to the same strandard of conformance, will expose the chy to fability, since it will not he able to give all areas the sume level of conformance, will expose the chy to fability, since it will not he able to give all areas the sume level of care, due to the limitations of maintenance cycles, budgets and differences in growth rates on different size.

However, if the ordinance provides a definition for high priority their areasgement, then Hobilty would be reduced even when all areas are not treated in a given year. Vegetation with high levels of lact should receive different priorities for their misrogement. Areas that contain sures dimension fuel and deadwood should receive a higher priority than areas that are already guide open in chandler, or riperian areas with year-tound succession in all plants. Grasslands that support vigorouts stands of fast-growing annual excelves a higher priority than areas that are already guide a high priority due to high fast fuel for much an another or fermel should be considered as a high priority due to high fast fuel for moment, when year that are base grassbards may pose a way for the fast.

50-92

6) The dity should research and make recommendations for the use of constrained forms or use of goals or either finewhork to reduce lated forms may be risky and browse flakibly. Goals, which night be useful to reduce fact-growing investe annual each royertabun on weedy broks, or after simplex from the set of the reduce fact growing investe annual each royertabun on weedy broks, or after simplex from the set of the used for method rank or eliminating databased in shrub stands, and so should not be used indicating or eliminating databased in shrub stands, and so should not be used indicating or eliminating.

9). Inough the ordinaryse is based on vegetation that management, all information from the City needs to confinue to emphasize the need to modify building order for properties bordening on open space. The next startbor to limiting property damage from fixed is not burst instangement. In Zone 2, this the proper use of life-safe construction materials (including reaching, which as arready softing, decising, additing reaction and fearing), the profilting of small-dimension wood construction (starts arready and fearing), the proving additing access, versit, searce, server, subtroading, additing and fearing), the profilting of small-dimension wood construction (starts arready and fearing), the provide a subtroady france to the decision and the propert gladerics. For the graderest that provides address and defensible builters and the propert gladerics for the abuer of the provide address and the construction fraction, the graderest and defensible builters such as parameter propert gladerics for the abuer of the abuer of the read high-wind widdlifes and the construction fraction fraction of small-dimension wood construction fractions are addressed, and the end of the provide address of an and the open second of the propert gladerics for the provide a decision and the reador is the propert gladeric for the provide a decision and the end of the propert gladeric for the provide a decision and the community layout to reador exposure of homes to they are address and the community layout to reador encodered and homes to stage their attacts.

i

ł

M-29 Refer to comment F-28.

M-30 Refer to continent F-29.

M-31 Refer to comment H-30.

M-32 Refer to comment F-31

M-33 Refer to councent F-32.

.

Refer to comment F-33.

16-34

₩-34

Thenk you for considering our light.

01118 Sincerely ١

jerstika d'Elght Project Natragoz, Tohty-Second Street Canyon Taul Taktytonos: 619/233-6120 Errak: torshieteaulcom

Dhrby-Second Street Canyon Task Force 239-6120 olcom

.

.

**N** 

## **UPTOWN PLANNERS**

1010 University Avente, But (781 - Rep. Crap. Ca. 22,003 Angues, 460 The Uphram Commanity Planning Committee

lune 10, 2014

City of Sen Diago Development Senfoes Center Allicon Rean, Environmentai Manuar 222 First Ane, NS #501

San Diego, CA 82101

Exam EIREA (JC: 1193) for Erven theregoenent Revisions to the Land Development Code Reference

Dear Ma. Raap:

Community Plan Area has significant native and naturational convous that worked ha affected by folis orubance, the board expressed great concern river possible Angeods. The board voted 13 to 9 and/containg the following comments on hainait of the board, taxaed on the lastese and commends dispussed and read into the mentio On June 1, 2004, the Board of the Usytoms Planners (Uptom)) mode a molecu to support comments auflored by Nike Singleton (a maniter of our treat) in rejerts to the sizone referenced project. The Uptarm

Alitaritatives in the Drait Einvirontented Inquest Report

rithmets of Jusio 1, 2004.

L H

would be burn by the property civities and that a review proceeds of come kind is in place to make sure that this lytown world like to make suce first all attendates to the proposed bursh management plan be considered dave the sidily to provide a more sustainated subdun for lang term and management, assuming that costs orior to autorship the preferred option. The effectives standal in realistic opticns. A property conner should राज्यार्थीएक is eminomicitally consider स्वीतिक संविक स्वाप्त कींग्रेज्येन के प्राव्यिक कांग्रेज्येन के संविक्त ž

Ne also feel that a public understant surgrant is addicat in reking also that residents are not oversedore in កតេអូ កេននៅ មានឲ្យនៅនេះនាង កែបូលនាង to ប៊ុន Londogy, ក្លែសាល់ស្ថារ នាជា កេនត្រាវជាកាវ-bood សានារូវនានា៨ ទេយាសាស Olea of the នាំងការដាំមេនា និងនៅនាំង ដឹងទៅ ឯកអះពិ ៣៩៧៥មុនការទាំាក់ កែម្នាប់កោរនាជាដំ កែ នាត់ទាំងីបា កំព ថា pundo នណ៍នាដាំបាន component. The pubBs នៅនេះដីចោព ចល់ពេទ្រភាពការដែលនាំង could be វិវាភ្លាំនាំពាត់អង់គឺ នាភ្លា គោ សំ និង សាសាស នា heir boush memegament selvets. Asliens by the public (Dest may not be twomented) are Braly to herpen which e X

a required militation to utiliset probuibal impentis association with the layer menagement progreen.

liptions is constanted that no attention has been given to bruch management along rewietles in high fre istand areas with high first anovunts. Date arrows that this is where arrows and any dented firs starts convenciv

verionatial parcets. Open sperse, hebital provenses and perficind alroads as consider the prosimity of hels to ten ollen start. This chy's responsibility for grover theil management goes well beyond the 100 zone ground dighty accessibles public rights of way and complete heat nooffications to leasen the encourt of bush when speada burds. There should be a section that dispusses built meansyament in the zone. Fight hads are particularly undientally in these mediciale focalicity. The same diastistion needs to eccar on other simply job where fore ю Z ₹

stitanikon ginen to ficah fucia

Page 1 of 2

i

ł

I

ì

Comprisent noted. ž

The SERVEA Service VIII: addresses a range of alizarohives to the proposeć project

ž

The construct addressed the metho of the purject, not the accuracy or

Rafer to comment D-36.

ż

adaquacy of the SEIR/EA. No response is required.

ŤŻ

ź

Refer to comment N.4.

	<ul> <li>addition of the particular contract product on the optimization of the particular contract of the partic contract of the particular contex contract</li></ul>
--	--

.

•

Comment Letter O.



оспольныцы • 4709 Store Dirty: • • Bar Ditero, CA 95316 • • Prose: 619.521.0303 • • Feiz, 619.521.0333 • • Bardi: 6.1144har(@ahmet

July 4, 2004

Allison Raap

Involutional Planaer

- City of San Diego Development Bervices Conter

1222 First Ave. MB #501 San Diege, CA 92201

•

Reference: Desit RRNKA (BO1233) for Burch Minuspentent Revisions

DertMis, Rasp:' -

-

,

Ar a professional ravagetation design consultant for allower two decades in the San Diogo area and a table of plant landscape lastroctor at three local community colleges over a sovem rac field. I would like to offer soveral comments on the recent proposed conteges to fine Recal Management Provision of O-1 City Code. These comments and quasticate see designed to reinfure up on earlier comments

you rotered from the Compunity Forest Advisory Bosed as well as several after focal group Grameening on the KIR/ES.

Coneral Contraction

Fathere to Previde Adaquate Locification of Need for Changes

This document fails to make a case for fac steed for disarges to the existing trash monagement and amon. The only rationale presented is thet the Fire Marshall recommends them. In fact, several of the desirge do not appear to hive been recommended by the Fire Marshall but instand atfind at the time this document was written (I am thinking particularly of the provision to eliminate all but may landscorping indication from 2,000 2 manupement areas and the use of grests for innehrmangement). In my option it is questionably whether the Fire Marshall would approve of these changes.

It is implied, without evidence, or several points in the dovanced that the impacts of the recard Ceder Plea would have been reduced had these changes been in place. It should be finity may to deterrine whether the Codar Fire get more or less out of control in areas where brach managements had taken place. The City must containly inve records of where vegatation thioning has been conducted as public proparities over the last tan years and fire records of where wegatation thinning has been conducted to public monatines over the last tan years and fire records should be able to show if time subsequently burned and areas. In fact, it secons to be the concours of the expects I have apoleen with since the fire that large wind-tablem fires such as the Cedar Fire are only minimally affected by brush firming. Neither

Pege 1 of 7

the We Presized nor No Action Alternatives present any research to substantistic the accul for charges to

0-i Oommant materi

.

The Size-Rescare D-spartment is the Applicant-firr this project and is requesting its revisions to the brush manegement regulations.

Ï

Q-3 The corritont addressed the reactile of the project, not the asceracy or referency of the SERMAA. No response is required.

	O-17 The command addressed the meatly of the project, not file about any or adexplacy of the SBRR/EA. We needed is radiated	D-18 The continue ad <del>dress</del> ed the marks of the project, not the abourery of edequary of the SERVEA. No response is formred.		С-19 The comment addressed the marin of the project, not the acturacy of a sciency of the BER/EA. No response is required.	O-20 The contrast addressed the marks of the project, not the acourary of a signary of the SERVEA. No response is required.		O.21 Proposed broth management regulations require 50% of orieting plants over 18 inches in beight shall be thinned to a height of bix inches. The running 50% of plants are protest and thinned.	0-22 The comment addressed the metric of the project, not the scenescy or addressed the RERA. No response is required.		C-24 Refer to somment C-16.	O-25 The common addressed file marits of the project, not the acourary of adorpsoy of the SERU/RA. No response is required.
<u>Lard, of Garjër</u> Paga 11: "Zone One shafi contrên no kabîtokilo ntucturo ûtat provides a means fur bantarîtûng fira to the lishitekte atruchmen."	Does this mean all wooden frame holdings with need to be toon how a immediately? What constitutes a flarmosple structure? Does this include plastic factors, flarm retardant treated wood faming, new larminate device and fracing? Am carned dwellers with wood factors annual fracing? Am carned of the to tear sheen down? Zone One to tear sheen down? Fince decids and georders are often used for cardioor living antitizes how doas the private property owner determine when the babitat part of his structures begins?	Page 11-12: "Planta within Zone Goo chall be Joes thus 4 foot high except for thes" 3-18 How are vines to be treated in Zone Ore? Why 4 fast?	Fage 13: "50% of the plants over 18 inches in height shell be fitured to z height of 6 inches"	Does this mean that an think an thinking is required so form as all cristing vegetation is below 13 metron! Does this mean that if I have two similar over 16 inclus in hugh and 500 icor apart of my property that I am required to out one back to 18 inclus? Does this mean that if my 2000 two area is bare with unit three plonds 20 feet apart that I have to prove back 2.5 shoulds to under 18 inclus?	It appears the fattent have to have no ance than 50% of Zone 2 cover by vegetation over 18 bookes in J-20 height, but this is not stated electry.	Page 13: "Within Zone Two, S0 % of the plants over 12 inclose in height chall by thimsel to a height of 6 then a	្លានខ្លា Way does a property creater read to pruce heat. "dimited" plants to 6 inches when 18 inches is the height at which centred is required?	<u>Lack of Clerr Lin</u> lip to Monum and Amerant of Clerrance. C+22 The ordination does not indicate whether sative or non-netive vagetation should be cleared first	The coeffinance does not obligate the private property twarm to any degree of the diffection to familiation of the shift with existing sources of mutangered species present on his property (e.g. simply chalting with the City's GNS mapping of resources).	$\mathbb{G} ext{-}\mathbb{Z}h$ . The ordination does not Earth(d 100% concrutes of vegetation from all fire zeroes,	<b>ి-25</b> The ordinance dues not Surbid leaving chipper multish ar brutch piles in areas of thirming. గ్రామా 4 లో 7

י .

,

I

!

i

:

j

ł

:

ļ

!

. ļ

i I

.

asouno that all vegetañon could de elesred 200n bolt Zone 1 and Zone 2 and make nu analysis of thee impacts.

•

-

The lack of noy phyroned public education program, over as simplo as a small written pampples or notes on a website, suggest that these rules will be mixindzproved and that larger impacts than anticipated by this and year will occur. 0-36

Specific Concession & Recommendations.

Comments

At the very least the following increasions and clarifications about he corrected in the text.

- The document is incompleted in regard to the annages impacted by the proposed changes. In Tables V.A.-1, & A.-2 2380 mares are mentioned as impaots but on page V.C.12 2474 acars are stated as imposts. 0-27
- Page 13: Change the word required to <u>perceited</u> in the line " No bunch management is required in areas contraining wethoods". 0-28
- $\mu$ age 13: (3) should real "Within Zone Two no more than 50% of the area shall have plants over  $18^{4}$  (1 magnes  $24^{\circ}$  to be constant with new leadersys provisions. 62-0

Recontracadations

- recountly approved. It is not wise public policy to turb into the creation of they laws after contentration in the need on the most pretional occurs, pertionation without at least scare restruction to substantiate the need The first recommendation I would make is that this these changes not be put into affact until at least come arbitral restants is done on the effectiveness of the present policy that was only for with changes. • 9 8-0
- out into natural coven space where no degree of regritizion management would have protested them. To addition, neither the City or property owners should be allowed to hadd structures on their properties within require fire attemportured no property net owned by the property order. If such structures are neumitted the code should spell out that the property owner is required to pay codes and planning isympts for new developments to assure they are fire defeasible. Many of the buildings that periated in the Cedar Fire ways allowed to be built on indefendible ridges jutiled The record recordended a faculty make is that the City place a lot more from an building eś 3
  - diamonichility and allows for the possibility of turing on operhead aystrons during a fire if lesieble to further lower the frequential of a horder area. If implemented properly there is no designed to produce as Fidle mucifi as possible <u>and be effecting to a from Zone Twy</u> areas. This fo probably totae trace insperant than vegetation thirring as a mame to resize vegetation The most important recommanistion 3 would make its that permanent reophysecity induced the adjacent property overer for any edificant for thinning required. m 1200

88 0

At a minimum an allownnee should be snade for less than 50% of cover to be below 18 inches in Zone Two when past or all of the cover is high water contact anomiant like cuoter, yncard, end/or aloes. 4 ş

reason to believe inigning vegetation would have a negative impact on biological resources

(e.g. no more than twice a tormiz insignion over the summer meatur without substantial runcfi).

Refer to comment D-36. 65 65

The comment solutested the merite of the project, not the second  $\sigma$ Proposal entimance has been sevised to incorporate this change. ationary of the SER/EA. No response is required. Relet to common! A-65. Comment moted. Comment noted. Comments method. 0<u>5</u>0 80 0 5 87 0 5 0.28

<del>eg</del>ulation is not proposed to be clanged with the purposed reviewner to the Chocat Zoga Two Baush Managament Allows tranporery induct. This លេខាត់ ៣ទារទទ្រពោលជា កក្ខន្ទរទំនាំងដែលន.

2

Comment noted. ž ł

I

Parts of the

680

I

i

Dereice some definite guidelines and a clear set of standards for the limits and methods that can be used in Zone Two must for vegetation management. These at a minimum should huckade: ŵ

matrive alguins anch as leguonadebeary or laurel sumac or chamico should be Non-native vegetation should be cleared first and the wowns of deep-rooted left in place to protect slopes against mudslides, 800

Vegetation litiming for fire management should preferably he done antyfe of the highest fire season months to prevent accidental lentiton by graphine or eleatric payered thiming/panaing equipment. 0.37

Privite property owners should be notified by the City of instances in which sublangened species are shown to occur m their property based m City mighing and/or they should be required to check with the City as to the huing other throung work, and fur codangered bird speakes, doing work existence of these restorces on their properties prior to starting vegetation mangement activities The cardinance should require these species to be outside their nexting season. On the other hand, requiring exponsive biological amyors before bruah management takes place should be ophonal protocted whenever possible by cheming them last, avoiding trampling them except in the area of new developments where suvers are skready required. 0-39 0-38

The ordinance should foshid 100% elearance of vegetation from all fire zoner and disting as a means for vegetation thinning. 9 8

Thinning of vegetation should be to a lunght between 24 indues and 6 indues to be consistent with the planting parts of the code. 9 8

The ordinance should forbid leaving chipper mulch or brash pilles in areas of thinning 50

means of vegetation cleaning. An amuel free public workshop open to should educate private property curners and City crews about the ways and property creaters should be conducted in each neighborhood in the spring just Simple public education programs tarch as a pamphiet or rotes on a webeits prim to fire season. 64-0

Trees in Zone Two should not be required to be prozed up off the ground so long as the 50% thranking requirement is much however, all dead tross and branches should be required to be pruned off and/or menoved ansually. 6

ş

Page 6 of 7

Comment noted.

ð

ļ

Under the Alternatives considered but rejected, a third alternative has been added regarding thinning by plant type when performing zone two brush 200

management activities.

Comment noted. The revised brush management ordinance will problinit brush menegement activities within coastal sage setub during California guatesteher breeding season (March 1 – August 15).

69

Refer to comment 0-37. 200

Commant noted. ñ

line contrast addressed the merits of the poyleot, not the accuracy of adequary of the SEIR/I.A. No response is required. <del>9</del>0

The comment addressed fits mutits of the project, not the incuracy or adoquacy of the SEIR/EA. No response is required. Ī

The comment addressed the media of the project, not the accuracy or adequary of the SFIR/EA. No response is required. j

Refer to comment D-36. 5

Comment noted. ł

0-45 Contract mated.	O-46 Refer to communit F-22.	0-47 The comment affiressed the marins of the project, not the accuracy or adequary of the SHIRALA. No response is required.	O-48 Invailer: plant species are not permitted within brush management zone two	0-49 Comment nuted.			•	
<ul> <li>Gow use should not be insidedful until a boller defendention one be mode of its effects and the situations when it may be appropriate. At the vary least gost use should not be primitted on areas where straingered species are harma to ordeneght to occur.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>The diazzane of treas from Zone One structures rule should be refined thruth.</li> <li>A few highly flammable species of tream such as pines should not be ablowed to to plasted within Zone One accuse et all analyze should be removed if they to concur. The distances of true truntes or branches about the distances of true truntes and there are the order to be the distances of the tructure lambeage treat reach campy sizes which would no under the first from being plasted at all within the 35 front with Zone One if the distances then from being plasted at all within the 35 front with Zone One if the displane are presedent.</li> </ul>	7. Private hume alter, because they are usually the name vulnerable by current building shardness to find, a landed to give a fright relative then either Chy et commercial structures for first inspections & pertaines for new compliance. For similar respons, high field los given hapeeiton galority.	<ul> <li>Certain types of low growing modulent groundonvers like carpehroum its plant (which is invasive and creates enous problane) and invasive cursic species south to plaupes grass should be excluded from Zone Two planting whether they are considered fine resistant or not.</li> </ul>	In conclusion, notifier the proposed onlyness thranges nor the analysis of their potantial impacts uppear to be well thought out and 1 would recommend against approving them at this time. I uppear these currents and reconstructed on the hold in producing a fisiel vertion of any changes which are approved. I also hops you will abore these commends with accurd persons and suff before they make their finel decision on these propressed revisions.	Brad Buckbart, Principal Bodinart Broinconcental Consulting	. ۲ ۲.۱۹۲ ۲.۹۵۳		

Comment Letter P.

i

:

I

į

(2934 TEXANA STREET, SAN DIEGO, CA 921293620 AFEGEROLCOM ANNES, FEGE, PHD, M.B.A.

jizhy 9, 2004

City of San Diego Develophent Services Center 1222 First Ave., MS #501 Ms. Alfison Reap, Earch outletted Planner San Diegn, CA 92101 Raftrense: Draft EIR/EA (30: 1193) for Drush Management Ravisions to the Land Development Code and Faderal Grant from the Office of Buncr Services (OES), Fed Emergency Mgrut. Agency (NEMA)

#### Dear Ms. Ruep:

The catalyliabutest of 100-feet zones of vegetation reduction by both the City and Courty of Son Diego will contribute to greater public understanding and compliance, and that is groutly appreciated by many of us in the continuity. Please consider the following, in devoloping a recommendation to the City Council regarding this ordinance: Extensive public education tempaigns and compliance programs will be necessary for entire community, neighborhoods, and streats to benefit from the defensible space. My house is at nist, if all my neighbors do not reduce their vegetation. Public education programs need to not reduce the reasons for the vegetation.

water-wise, energy-wise, and native plants, inigation systems, maintenance mapix manuts, and timing and reduction; degree of flammability of various plents, the suggested plant lists; trade-offs with fire-wise, extent of pausing and thisning. 2

They are likely to result in some homeowners removing far more than 30% vegetation, and others onusing The directions for percent vegetation reduction are conficing, complex, and may be counter-productive.

- reining the ustural cosparral and costal ango venciation. If trees are properly trimmed and their leaves raked, they are not bighly fisammable, and abould he retained for acathenics, hahitht, and energy reduction. nue-off and erorion on steep singes (peritage to their devenhill neighbord). Grasses and other flattoneble vegetition are likely to invede bare ground, and a higher-risk shustion created for homeowners than сч d
- Implications of additional clearing on preserves and converse, particularly those set-aside under the Multisue jes Embliet Courservation Plan, should be stericd more clearly in this document, result in no hubitat ices: have adequate mitigation; and he adequately familed for maintennee. Goals are unlikely to be က မ
  - Strong builting codes for fite-resistant materials, application to both new and existing structures, and effective except in grassy areas. 1
- onforcement of these codes will save the more structures in the next firestorm than cleared vegetation will. Evidence from the Cedar Fire showed that most homes ignited from fire carried on wooken feaves and deetrs, from ambers lawing on codar roots or wood siding, or from onbers entering the house through anguntected verbitation elements. жү С.

Sincerely,

Ame Jege ANNE 8, FECH. PhD. Y

Botarry Restarch Associate, San Diego Nalmal History Muscum And Retired Forest Supervisor, Cleveland National Forest

**Befar to comment D-36** Ż Refer to comment D-36. 57

Befer to comment A-12. n H

- Gosts are known to graze on other platt types besidds grass and have been effective for thiming activities in other jurisdictions. ጀ
- This comment does not address the adequately of the SERVEA. Therefore, no comment is required. ъ,

COMMENT LEVER U

730 1 STREET -Sam Diggo, GALIFOLMIA (1214) STADL INDHARKS VAIL

SELTZER GAPLAN MEWAHH VITER A LAW CONFORATION

at a la la gage a consecon Berner Care - King

E24 6183.507.610

July 9, 2004

City of San Diego Development (222 First Avenue, MS 501 Environmental Planner Ms. Allison Rang Services Center

San Diego, California 92101

Brush Management Revisions to Land Development Code Project No. 31245, SCH No. 2004031041 i 2 2

Deer Mr. Keepc

Our fam represents Pardee Hones ("Pardoo") in connection with its ownership of several properties located in the City of San Diego. We have reviewed the May 2004 Darft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment ("Draft SER") which has been prepared by the City of San Diego ("City") for the proposed brush management revisions to fue City's Land Development Code. Our client has the following commetis: Page S.2.  $VL_{12}$ . The Draft SEUR only analyzed impacts from the application of the propused brush management revisions to suisting development, with no explauation why impacts from the however, will indisputably occur. To fairly or accurately assess the impact of the proposed brush management revisions, the impacts of the application of the revisions to fature development must applications of the revisions on *future* development are not assessed. Future development be considered.

ċ

SERF explain how the proposed changes in Zone One and Zone Two will he applied to be reviewed. Cartianty the specific location of development projects wither under construction or in the application/planning/permitting/development phase could easily be incorporated into the malysis. Moreover, mither the proposed trush management revisions themselves nor the Draft development projects in the approved but not yet developed or partially developed phase, the plauning phase or the permitting phase. It such ongoing development projects are expected to incomposite the expended buffer contained in the revised Zone One and Zone Two, the physical in addition, the impact of the application of the proposed revisions to orgoing development must

ð

impact of such a requirement on the ongoing development projects should be assessed and

helveded in the SEIR

THOMAS F, STEINKE, KSQ.

VIA HAND DELIVERY

Rnvironmental roview for luture individual projects with cover potential impacts. Future development could not be analyzed at the time this SEIR/EA was written.

5

Comment noted. Projects within the permitting plass may need to revise plane, once ordinance is approved, prior to project approval to most the brush mangement requirements. 3



ı

ì

Ms, Allison Ranp July 9, 2004 Page 2 Finality, Scotion 142.0412(d) of the proposed brash mutagraneat revisions provides that "[a]ll existing and now structures subjust to this division shall comply with all requirements of Chapter 14, Article 5, Division 5 – Additional Building Shandards for Buildings Located Aufarent to Hizzardons Artess of Naturalized Vagetation." As we have detarmined strate dismussions with your office and that of the city dett, a new Division 5 in Chapter 14, Article 5, although considered by the City Council along with other changes to Chapter 14, Article 5, although considered by the City Council along with other changes to Chapter 14, Article 5, although considered by the City Council along with other changes to Chapter 14, Article 5, although considered by the City Council along with other changes to Chapter 14, Article 5, although specen, therefore, that by referring to and incorporating the proposed Division 5, the proposed brush memogeneous revisions similarly intended to exclude property where an owner has acquired wate therefore, that by referring to and incorporating the proposed Division 5, the proposed brush memogeneous revisions similarly intended to exclude property where an owner has acquired vested rights. Consistent with this integretation, rolated anondraneus to Division 2 of Chapter 14, Article 5, white the revisions similarly intended to exclude more the containing a provided in the property arbject to vested reached to exclude more No. 0-1928, anonything property - elected not to alke the property ownera 'vested rights in 14, heat the PA 0.021 to San Diago Mut. Code Species Type Property ownera' vested rights in 5 10, 2020 to San Diago Mut. Code Species Types ownera' vested rights as it responds to the rest for property - elected not to alweight property ownera' vested rights to be a the to be the sector property - elected not to alweight property ownera' vested rights as it responds to the react fre-

ő

If it is intended that this proposed brush management revisions exclude purporty where an owner has acquired weated rights, we recommend making such an acclusion explicit and correcting the reference to Chapter 14, Atthele 5, Division 5, which was never enacted. However, if property subject to vested nights is not intended to be excluded from the purposed revisions, the Drath SRIR abould consider the physical impact such an expansive application of the revisions, would have on projects in which an owner has acquired vested rights.

cutergenoy.

Page 1.3: The Draft SEIR coplains that the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department is responsible for hresh assagement on City property and that the City's compliance with the proposed break management provisions would to partially funded via a Federal Emergency Management & corners (FEMA) count for which the City is cornered a surfacions. With the City has

**Q-5** Management Agravy (FBMA) grant for which the City is currently applying. Will the City have the fluctuation of the first source of purplement to the City is one of the fluctuation of city owned property if this grant is not approved and allocated to the City?

Pages 1.4, III-1 – III.2, PII-6: The Draft SEIR assumes properly owners will thin the conect amount of vegetation in Zone Two even though it consoles that some properly owners are not chrently wredding Zone Two as required. The assumption regarding thimming appears prime in light of the professed neucoompliance with the wredding requirements. As a result, the Draft SEIR abould functionate a discussion of the possibility that the proposal result, the Draft SEIR abound functional a discussion of the possibility that the proposal result.

(1-8) result the Draft SEIR aboutd incorporate a discussion of the possibility that the proposed new straints will be ineffective. In any event, some property events do maintain Zune: Two areas in compliance with the existing requirements, each as in Ocean View Hills, Pacific Highlands Reach, and Cannel Valley.

The commant addresses the merits of the pubject, not the accuracy or adequacy of the SEIR/EA. No response is required.

3

The comment addresses the marks of the project, not the accuracy or adequary of the SERATA. No response is required. Once the regulations are in effect, proparties would be required to compily with the new regulations.

Į,

Q-5 The SERVEA malysic assumes that the City will implement the bresh manageturni regulations on its own property.

Q-6 . The assumptions within the draft SEIR/EA were bused on field observations by City Staff.

8 GLTZER | GAPLAK | M C NAHBB | T ITEK

Ms. Allison Room hily 9, 2004 Page 3

revisions would have no significant land use effect, inducting on the MHPA. We agree and monumend that the Draft SERR clerify that the revisions would be implemented in a manner that ensues that they would have an insignificant land use effect or that any significant effect would <u>Pages V.A.12 - V.A.22</u>: The Draft SERR concludes that the proposed brush management be mitigeted ⊳ C

proposed haush management zones." The Draft SUR fails to explain the basis for its assertion hat no mature trees would be removed and that fact is not apparent from the proposed revisions Austhetica would be insignificent because "[n]o mature trees would be removed with the impacts to Nelghborhood Character/ themselves. The Draft SBIR should provide further discussion on this issue. Page V.D-2: The Draft SEIR concludes that ŝ

It is fair to conclude that the increased depth, of break management laws could have a significant effect upon neighborhood character/assfredox due to the additional depth of the zonts and cloaring requirements. ç Ç

Seeilon 14210412(f): The purposed revisions in this section reluce the extent to which Zone Two width, may be decreased upon an innesses in Zone One width. The Draft SEUR does not address the physical impact such a change would have on the environment. Such a discussion

9-0 0-0

should be broarpurated in the document 9 0

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft SERR and request that you place place my name on your mailing list of persons secking notices for future worklons of the SFR.

Please call me at (619) 635-3038 W you have any questions or concerns regarding the information contained in this letter.

Very truly youth  $\int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2}$ 

Seitzer Caplan McMahon Vitek Thomas F. Steinke, Esq. A Law Corporation

Paodee Homes TFS/lany 5

i

i

5

Refer to comment O-37. All potential significant impacts to isnd use and biological recourses are mitigated to a Jevel below significance Current proposed brush menagement regulations do not require tenaval of mature trees. Proposed brush management reviewes do not affect this [lack of] provision.

ő

Brush menagement zone two revizions require "fhinning" not "clearing" as stated by the suffice of this letter. ŝ

Two width. If this thethold was selected, zone one bruch management could states The Zone Two width may be decreased by I ½ feet for each I foot of increase in Zone One with up to a marimum reduction of 30 feet of Zone not reduce potrarhal impacts based on this option since there is no way to be increased from the proposed 35 feet to 55 feet and zone two would be rednosd by 30 fact. The SERREA utilized a worst-case analyzes and did The proposed revised brush manugement ordinance section 142.0412(f) decreased from the proposed 65 feet to 35 feet, resulting in a total brash zone one would be within the development footprint and would require Appendix II for a discussion on the methodology used for the biological management width of 90 fest instead of the proposed 100 feet. All of appropriate mitigation per the City's Biology Guidelines. Please and impact assessment. Under this option, impacts to 2019 two 74001d be determine how often this option would be implemented.

			The comment addresses the mories of the project, act the accuracy or	Refir to comment R-i.	Refet to comment R1. Refet to comment R-1.	Refer to comment R-1.	· .
ά δ		• • •	L.R.	R-3	₽-₩ ₩	<b>5-X</b>	
KAY S'TEWART Landscape Architect	Alliwun Raup, Envinonmental Planner City a FSan Diego Development Services Center 1322 First Avenue Mis 501 San Diego CA 92101 Eurali: <u>DSDRA</u> @sandigen Re: Project no. 31245, 9CH No. 20040310¢1 Re: Project no. 31245, 9CH No. 20040310¢1	Drar Ms. Raap and City of San Diego. My commants are addreased both in the wording of the proposed revisions to the ordinance and in the context of the Draft Bubsequent FRREA JO:1193.	<ul> <li>A. Contracts on the proposed revisions to Ordinance 142.0412 of Article 2, Division 4, of the City Ordinances (lattar &amp; numbers refer to those semie subsections):</li> <li>(a) As stated, the purpose of the orthogone is missing a word: add [CAPS].</li> </ul>	However, I think this part of the City Ordinances should not be called "Batch Menagement" but should be titled something like "FUBL MANAGEMENT TO REDUCE STRUCTIONE STIL COMBULSTBLIFTY." "Exush" is not, nor should the, the sole factus of a policy intended to reduce fluels and functione, combustion of homes. Using the renn "fursh" is not a defar way to define the needed work, but instead confuses the issue. Purthat, I suggest this whole Ordinance does not behave on thread confuses the issue. Purthat, I suggest this whole Ordinance does not behave the issue. Purthat, I suggest this whole Ordinance does not behave this as well as living elements. I don't know what part of the Ordinances it fits in any more. The fullowing sections could be "vegeration theel or combustion measurement" and others could be "built element fitsh or combustion mensymment".	(b) (1) fieldete (shown as striketout) as follows: "Imperty that necerved" Distance to tree canopies in Zone 1, and heights of tree pruving, is not sensible. Please refar to the letter from the CRAB. I agree with their findings 100%.	(b)(1)(g) I want to fisant the City for this section. How will it he implemented on orising properties, is my quasitor? Further, in the section (f)(2) on Zone 2, I see no transm why structures should be furbidden in Zone 2. Rather, the working should be just transmer why structures also up to materials should be used in zone $d_{\rm c}$ in zone $d_{\rm c}$ is a porson has a lot of as in Zone One, that no combarithic meterials should be used. If a porson has a lot of	רבה אשלו זיב לשווים. י

·*.	spece, they rany want to use it and the City has no right to forbld their ruse of it, but does have the authority to regulare the safe tase of it.				
9 2	(b)(1)(0)(3) The turn "thimuch" is not used correctly in this statement, nor is the intent nor practice clearly described. I greation that 6" is a required (or desirable) iteright. The ERVEA and the files File Code refer to 10" high. I suggest wording as follows: "Within Zone 2, 50% of the scal area shall have plants not over 18" in height related in freight to 18" if viable, or cut off at the ground if not, studing with invasive exotic plants, then not see then species that produce abundant for by annual growth, and list native species that have sucollear leaves and large diameter branches."		१९ २	Refor to comment R-1.	
<b>B-7</b>	(b)(1)(b)(4) See notes above, which upply to this section also.		R-7	Refer to comment R-1.	
8- 14	(b)(1)(l)(5) Strikeout the word " clearing" and substitute the words (caps) " THUNRING AND PRUND(G"	.•	R.8	Refer to composit R-L.	
¢. Ľ	(b)(1)(h)(5)(A) I think the prohibition against partaanent inflation is contarry to good practice and desired outcomes. Confirmed observations on native and non-mative drought tolerant lightly premed glants that wave very lightly triggated with overhead sprays every 7-10 days funct through November dig axi lightly triggated to fire front of the Coders Fire passed over. Therefore, premental all metal interfacion could be a valuable edite after possed over, therefore, premental metal interface that combust the coders from the fire for the fire all and start economics.	· · · ·	ና- ዝ	Refer to comment R-1.	•
R-10	In addition, the prohibition against overthead spinys in particular is contrary to being able to spread clupped outlings between thirmed plants on the soll, and lightly înrigating to spieri up decomposition and compaction (return's ignition greatry) while protecting fine soil from everion and from heating and killing the remaining plants.		R-10	Refer to commant Rt.	
н-н Н-н	I am avvære that afnæsa of irritation systemes reculting in water waste are rampart in arnamental landscapes, including public landsespea However, that must be daalt with wherever it eccure. If Zone 2 was only permitted to be irrigated 3X/month, this might keep, weeke down. To sey this is reloacy, of an nicologn tisk to warnait proxaripations is distingemented. Dare earth (per Holly Cheorgh on thousands of existing "trush management zones" is a far greater source than coassional sprinkber rills.	· . · · ·	R-11	Refer to comment R-1.	
1-12	(b)(1)(E)(5)(F) In developed landscapes, why is the deviced and configuration different from the thinned landscapes? This would mean 50% of the area as $13^{\circ}$ , maximum high, and 50% in pruned shrulss and trees. This pruned integht as stated is scrively flawed: 3 X $18^{\circ-5}4^{\circ}$ , which is rather than many useful shrulss with wide not systems. Even if that is desired, thereby limiting the plant selection significantly, the wording should area (in case) $s^{\circ-5}4^{\circ}$ , writted for graned in the state of a scrive of that is desired, thereby limiting the plant selection significantly, the wording should area (in case) $s^{\circ-5}4^{\circ}$ , writted to grow and the plant selection significantly. The wording should area (in case) $s^{\circ-5}4^{\circ}$ , writted to grow and them be pruned.		R-12	<b>Refer to comment हि. 1.</b>	
R-13	(b)(1)(b)(b) renoval may be comply: productive to recincing fine tisk, because of rapid regrowth of aggressive woods that create masses of normal flagh fucls.		R-13	Refer to continent R-1.	

.

.

.

:

.

.

\* . \*

,     		:		
<b>д-1</b> 4	(b)(1)(1) [ want to thank the City for allowing this beavey. However, i must press: why not copute all new hourse to be built this way? Then there would be a musch greater likelihood of structural aurvival in the text high-wind five. San Diego County just passed ordinaryces requiring all these and more in new structures. The City should follow suit.	." • • • •	R.14	Refer to comment R-1.
R-15	As a small aside, City staff member Keith Griet described "Zone 1" as "inigated turb" in a presentation he gave at the Burn Institute last week. This is highly inaccurate and misleading. Lask that safif people present oly lows much more accurately. J. Comments to Draft Subsequent EDK/EA:	• •	R-15	Par the Loodeope Regulations, Section 142,0412(b)(1), Brush management Zone One is the area adjacent to the structure, shall be least farmeable, and shall consist of parsment and per narently irrigated manental plauting.
9 	Appendix B, the brief survey conducted by Gity employee Hully Chenne observed avisiting "transh maragement zones". This brief starvey confirms just how little native vegetation and how turnsh hare carch is carried under existing grootines, continuty to griddiness that have been in place for smoot 15 years. It illustrates how development of these zones batis to invusion of definited consurvation arcas by non-indue species. This combineed with the fact thit, Codans Fire crossed 100° zones with very little fuel leads mu to veroder about the utility of changing the ordinance and going through all these hoops. It makes me fiel a bit supid to be responding to it. However, if fluck that focusing on this issue ney make us all do the right thing eventually, both for-protecting homes and for protecting natural resources; in test 1 hope so.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	R-16	Comment noted.
<b>R-17</b>	Rer Goatst I didn't see any mention of goats in the revised ordinance, pet the RIR/EA introduces wording to end the prohubition in the CUV ordinances against using goats. I think that careful studies should be parformed to see if normal fleeb fuels can be controlled effectively by goots in already estabilished final management zones. I do not think this EIR/EA has persuaded ure that the impact of goats would be neutral. In petricular, I do not think goats are useful for pressing low fuel zones, for the following petricular.		R-17	Comment noted. Additional Isognage has been added throughout the final SERVLA regarding attitizing goats for zone two brush management.
R-13 R-19	resisons: 1. Goata cat leaves and twigs, not dead wood (which noods to be centowed to <u>meate</u> low- fuel memagement zowes). Their thinking on live shirubs will just creates more deal wood. 2. Their choice of foods may eliminate neight sinfilizing shrubs that could be prevent into "Jiddo trees" and leave other apecies that are simmler domand or peaky invasity, weeds, or "Jiddo trees" and leave other apecies that on diminate domand or peaky invasity, weeds, or the trate or upportunon plant species that onciribute little to fuel logiting.	- · . · ·	R-13 R-19	Refer to comment R-17. Refer to comment R-17.
н-30	It is hard country to track propie to do it right. It would be impossible to train goats.	••••	R-20	Refer to comment R-17.
5 2	Ree Alternatives (self of which were rejected): I think the BIRVEA deprives all of the periple of San Diegn by rejecting an alternative that would use education (5-6-) to improve fuel meansgement. If the City tangent "Thei reduction" contractores how to L(1, despite) are not according to the city tangent of the improve fuel meansgement. If the City tangent "Thei reduction" contractores how to L(1, despite) are not according to the city tangent of the improve fuel meansgement. If the City tangent where exotors and the improve provide are a to reduce also for a fine that may occur more in a lifetime, in the meaning in the incentione the area could work better as a waterfaced, a green Imp for the city, solve wildlife and perhaps even to pretty, meat of which are missing in existing "brush management zones."		: R-21	Alternatives, Section VIII of the Draft SEIR/BA, includes fassible as well as rejected alternatives to the proposed project. Refer to comment D-36.
· .				

• • • •

i

,---| /

Refer to comment A-26. The known species locations are known atings of the species; these locations may be individuals, pairs or neating pairs. The hoestions are not necessarily all known nasting locations.	Refer to comment A-22. The total known locations of California Gradoatcher's within its regional MHPA preserve of the MSCP is approximutely 1,819. As such there are 1,819 or more however individuals	wantur netwar population in the source of the regional population is 0.27% or less of the population. Refer to comment A-12,	The total MI4PA is 56,831 aures, approximately 90 percent (52,012) of which is anticipated to be preserved for biological purposes. This is atarch on user V.4-9 most UV.2 has been connected to reflect this fact.	Comment timelear. The draft SEUR/EA does not have an Executive Summary Findings section.	•	Kee plent is an invesive plant and it is not permuted within breah management zone two.	
<u>17-</u> 18	R-23	R-24	R-25	R-26		R-27	
		· ·	· . · · ·				
Re Significient impacts and Mittigation: Unfortunately, as statict in the stryral scotlons of the ERRAE desing with the conservation of edited halitat for conforgared species, the proposed revisions will aggreate outent patterns of significant losses. Most suffy, L.3% of City of San Diego MiSCP gualentabur next sites will be destroyed. In addition, excito investive specker will invarite more readily into dedicated consurvation hand, and hundreds more acres of MiSCI haid will be "managed as Zone 2" and as Holly Chrong found, that probably means they will be destroyed, conduct consurvation thank, and fous of contangered species. The City "has not agreed to" any of the suggestrat exhibits measures an melodousty termoid the MiSRP. What a shource.	I think the Chruniztive Effects are undetectimated. I woncy that 1.1% loss of graduations is significant when the population is reduced to only 377 known nexting pairs. If the human two were that few, the loss of 6 peirs would be a tragady.	Ree Contradictions. In section V.A-13, Anaiysis of impacts: the proposed regulations say to out plants to $G$ high in the 50% cleared area, while this argument that says there would be little impact on plant species says that 18" high is the objective. Clearly the HR/EA did not apply the proposed standard in associating impact. A 6" high cut on even the most petite plant nucleon entything that mathematic a $g$ , the flowers.		Re: Executive SummAry Franker, it states "the project will not have a significant effect on the any house of "which contradicts attracters within the EIR.55 which conclude there would be significant hand use effects and biological affects. Since the MMRP's were not accorded, the Summary Photings <u>abouild</u> say that the project WILL have a significant effect on the confromment. The summary (which is all most people will reach is (hereford a lie. How can that dend?)	Condensions: The high wheel Orders Fire showed that even 100° plus while fuel mataragement zones (the cast edge of Soripps, pergo of Maternar Air Shalton, and the north edge of Darag Sartes) did not prevertive fuencement losses. Homes with 100° of the set of the s	Vegramon new Introductions and structures in igury-controllors and may user arguity combustible planets and structures right around the hours, meaning the conversion of restly structure to and its planet won't stop structure loss, though it belos for providing a usable spice for fine structuresion divide lower trace at After taking time to zerose this ordinance for fine, pathenes along three I have suggested, as well as tho many other suggrations you may receive, there she places meeted to result to the many other fires by upgrading building standards to rother combustibility, at least as this wond from to of Stan Disco. I serve resultations.	Simeral CUBAR
В-22	П-23	R-24	R-25	R-26		4-27	

Karster at

ł

t Letter S.

:

;

i

:

í ł

i 

### To Whom it Concerns:

M(A) feet of their property if bruth cases an attent of the requestly flue. There is no point to adverting the 100 feet with the building of the property with the building of theorem for a could only contradiate the 100 feet region. Bruing only 20 feet from bruch, even if the bursh answeds with an ensuing only 20 feet from bruch, even if the bursh answeds of provide the some safety lavel. required to perform a 100 food clearmace about their residences. This analors seena if this buildings of residences is not carried out within a theirance of In the Brugt Managentent Ordneess mater consideration, owners shall be

చ

The comment addresses the metrix of the project, not the acorracy or adequacy of the SERVEA. No response is required,

5

Refer to comment S-1,

3

Let as anside the ownex of property that is adjuctnt to property or which build is growing up to the property Bas. That owner should not be promoted, and the culturations should so state, to build within the 100 foot distance from the property like. Otherwise the intent of the entire orthances

je subvertest. Tille some registramene kjoued be impereted en tuflding tredis. Thue a new fact in open terificay or soviti sig open linnd, vicuid bave to have, as a advioration, a 100 first bruck managed root about its edges. 20

ut bruch. Phase für rezidentose, indi ridual en in developmente, ekoude also De revisionent to zeu statettertiger, wordstemp (y. The plane should be stade to As a result of this, the orderres would have direct impact on the planning <u>configets ស្នំព្រំ</u>, the bortsh menagement endpance 80 that consistency of the of all residences, individual or in tract or and, that are adjucted to wear berding pirrows is realized. න ආ

Sincery

Andrew Wilson

13631, Old El Cambro Read

Sen Diego CA 92130

(b)000 km2 6)

Comment noted. າງ 70



Governor's Office of Planning and Research

State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit

Allinon tean City of flan Diogo

Anglet 3, 2004

Астой Війметалицки Сотетис City of San Diogo 1222 First Avenue, MS-501 Seo Diago, CA 92101 Sofject finish Managenset Royalous in its Land Droklyment Outs and Federal Grant from the Office of Finesegnecy Services (OBS), Federal Imgrgwoy Menograment Agentsy (FEMA SCHH: 2004031041

Doar Alfison Rodp.

The State Clauringtonies tukunitied for obere numeri Supplemental BIR to acheched athe agencies for review. On the acodes in Ductation Denila Report phase curs find the Chemphones phase for a space agencies that reviewed your document. This review getood claused on August 2, 2004, and the commanda agencies that reviewed your document. This review getood claused on August 2, 2004, and the commanda for the first effective agency (its) is then been cashe to the first the comment package to not in order, phase muttin for Rate Clausingtones and administrate. Please rate to the project's travelingt State Clausingbouse number in first state coertequeukance so that we rare enter a many list.

Ę

Phases notes that Sections 21 100(c) of the California Perbits Recourses Code states (net

"A cosponisible or other public agrants shall raily mults substantive comments regarding these articitities involved in a project which are within an arcs, of enjoying of the segmety or viaith are required to be rearted ont or approved by the agrants. These comments shall be algorithed by specific eforumentation." Theise comments are furwarded for use in preparing your fanal anwomtenial document. Shonld you need name information of clarification of the coolcused comments, we recommend that you contrast the concessing agreeny directly. This jetter minowineigen fitst yon häve compiled with the State Clearinghouse rendew rentimensatis for draft cavity wateriest documents, paramet to the California Environmental Quality Act. Please compart the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-1613 ff you have any quantificate more than any norman territor process.

20My Sincered

TerryRub

Director, State Clearinghouse

टिवानीलवाक 131: ह्रान्डलवाक्ट Ayeany เล่อย ระสาราห เราหารรรม ระสาราช 2044 รณการเหล่ายนี้ (2.4.1170/871A) ชนี้ (2.3)ปีเส โรมี (3.6)รู้เลื้อสราชเมื่อ 1.424 (2.6)รู้เนื้อจังเป็น ระสาราชาชาติ

I

I

This letter was reveived uther the close of the public review period, but is included in the Final SEIR/BA. No responses are required. Refer to comment Latter A.

Ξ

Lead Agentey Project issued Crost Streets Date Received 08/18/2004 Project Title Lead Agency Contact Proximity to: Project Location Deschadon Partel No. Wedenwayo -Upinervs Township Reviewing Land Vise sdeamey Agentation Senool North Adency Commity 501 Africants Phone 1 Ире Name Ş ġ ą Alison Rasp Emergency Services (CES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA 2004031041 Sen Plago 819 448 5378 BIR Supplemented EIR Bruch Management Row(s) rate to the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from the Office of AssonationVisual; Londuse; Currolistive Effects; Wikilite; Weier Quelity; Vegetation; Sof 1222 First Avenue, MS-501 Brush Menagement Revisions in the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from the Olifze of Sali Dego, City of Citywade Sen Deg San Dieg City of San Digit City of Sen Diago Mult-Hebitat Planning Ares (MHPA). (FEMA). The project is located within the City of San Direct, public and private lands and includes the grant'fank Die Olikee of Einangerzy Services (OES), Federal Einergerzy Manageritett Arginty and 85 of Zone-Two. Project implementation on City property is proposed to be initially funded by a Fire, The project projects a CAY with 100 feet brush microgramant zone consisting of 36' of Zone Circ allow for revisions to the Hunilabel Cade Chapter 12, Attace 2, Division 4 to madily the requirements of Resources Agency, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region & Department of Party and Ension/Companyon/Grants brish reactagement puravant to the reconnected stone of the Fire Citizi 2 + 4 result of the 2013 Ceder Emergency Sarvings (OCS), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Counce Approve to Region 5; Department of World' Resources; Cettornia Coastal Commission; Cellivinia Highway Patrol: Representations: Network Amerikaan Hankage Commissions Integrated Waste Management Board, Office of Enjangency Services; Dependment of Porestry and Fire Protection; Dependent of Fish and Gene, Cabrane, Diatrici 11 eferen Start of Renform 00460/2004 State Clearinghouse Data Base Section Sint CA End of Review 0602/2004 Ð Ş 92101 8696

ļ

; ļ

;

ł

۱ i

: |

I

!

!

I

FIGENMENT RESERVED

FILLER ALL REPORTS -AdoBborations on the jumposed building code revisions for buildings adjacent to high fire hav and or the state of the second second second provide the second second second second second second second second se Dear Ms. Rasp: Harviron Moutel Flancer Ja Raphy Refer To: FWS-8DG-40721 communit letter (April 8, 2004) on the Notice of Preparation (NCP) of this SEIR/PA. reviewed the January 21, 2004, City Manuger,'s Report regarding the proposed revisions, at 1 ine proposed revisions would require approval by the California Coastal Commission for Sau Diego, Califand 192101 Mis. Allison Resp 2004, to itam about he proposed butch management revisions, and the Department wrote a meas. In addition, we met with Ms, Ann Hir, and Mr. Keith Great of the City on Japanery 9, the January 20, 2004 recording of the staff report, public testimony, and City Council the Oily's Pire-Rest; a Department regarding the scope of work for the SER/EA, and listen ed to modifications of the "Hy's Local Coastal Plan necessitated by the revisions". We have also Stipspapert Invison sental Impact Report Environmental Assessment (SERVEA), which fit as off (Department), collou truly the "Wildlife Agencies," have reviewed the above effectioed D: of The U.S. Field and Wildlife Survice (Service) and the California Department of Fish and Ga ne Catylof Sail Diego Development Services Department 1 - The City property it a Land Janakamant Code EIF in 1996 Bee styletons to the Land Development Code সিংগ্ৰিDCC, kickuby the brush perpipipenent regulations, ইয়া ware made in conjuscion with the MSCP. The Department is a Trustee Agency and a Responsible Agency pursuent in the California Hudsneened Species Act and other sections of the Fish and Came Code. The Department a so insidding new, threat med, and endangened plant and animal species, pursuant to the Californic. Environmental Questity Act, Sections 15386 and 15381, respectively. The Department is March 9, 2004, letter from the City of San Diego's (City) Development Service's Department to administent the Next of Community Conservation Phonemic program. The primary others: 863thing is his accervation, motoriton, and management of the state's biological resources. 222 First Avenue, b [3 501 Coffice of Innurgency Services, Federal Emergency Management Agency (SCH# Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Poderal Grant from the 2004031041) Draft Subseq tent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment for For su Cards and Hade and Wildfifth Offlow 7ATC (760) 431-5502 + 9618 6010 Hidden Velley Road Carle and, Carltonnia 92000 U.S. Mah and Wildlife Service CHE 121-54-65 10.0 . F STATE CI EARING HOUSE Ē Ģ 9 X0X Clear 10.2-3 1007 6 6 JUL YAX (858) 467-422) San Diego, Oilform 5:123 CA Dept. of Fish & Upto 4949 Warandar Arr me South Coast Regions O Dee (253) 467-4201

Note: Blanks in data Belte result from Insufficient information provided by lead equality.

Mia. Ram (FWS-SD(A4072.1)

mandale of the Servit is is the protection of public fish and withlife resources and their habit ds The Service has legar responsibility for the weither of migratory birds, anadminuous fish, an endangeood animals 1 mi plants occuring in the United States. The Service is disto responsil to for stifting the Ha hungared Species Act (Act) of 1973, as anomated (16 U.S.C. 1531 et arg).

Eristing Condition.

The current brush us magement regulations were developed in conjunction with the City's Molifule Species Causarvation Program (MSUP). Under current regulations of the MSCP, with magicunent Zone O as is the area asymout to structures and consists of provement and permisphily incigate, achieventia plantings. Brosh management Zone Two is an atta of native plant mitorial thinne to 30 percent plantings. Brosh management Zone Two is an atta of native plant mitorial thinne to 30 percent plantings. And RL Cantino Real, and 30 to 45 feet cast : if this interstel from 20 to 40 heat ways of Intersteis 805 and RL Cantino Real, and 30 to 45 feet cast : if this interstel from 20 to 40 heat was one and Two have a combined range of 40 to 50 feet cast of ft. Fut another way, Zones One and Two have a combined range of 40 to 70 feet west of futerstel 805 and El Camino Real, and 70 to 95 feet cast of the intersection.

Cuirughy heads mar agement in Zone Two cocurs on 3.753 acres within the City. Of that, 1,223 says and for private 1 and, and 531 acres are on public land. Of the 3.753 acres, 526 are with in the City's Multiple-Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Multiple Habitist Press velou Area (MHPA) (pers. cont.a., Ched Rane, City MSCP, June 25, 2004)? The City's Park and Regreation Department (PRD) manages upproximately 22,600 acres of ou en gasee, much of which t is in the MHPA. This open space includes 220 linear unles of urban wildfled functure. The PRD is responsible for conducting brush management in eity-owned. open space steas within the City, including Zane Two.

Proposed Project

The Chy's Fire-Rear as Department is proposing revisions to the brash management regulations in response to the fir set in the City and the Commy of San Diego in Octoher of 2003, and yr. su hut to the recommendations of the Pire Chief. Thefr purpose is to allow for a greater deforabilit space against impeaving fire. The proposed revisions would entril establishing a 100-first with the City. This would, result in 15 - 45 floor avaiations would entril establishing a 100-first with with per the contrast start contribute of 35 floot in Zone Case and 5 feet in Zone Two, depending on the exist with the City. This would, result in 15 - 45 floot expansion of Zone Two, depending on the exist with the City. The would, result in 15 - 45 floot expansion of Zone Two, depending on the exist with the City. The would, result in 15 - 45 floot expansion of Zone Two, depending on the exist with the City the variation of zone Cone and 65 feet. Relishing requirements allow for the event point by visited zone One falls short of 35 feet. Relishing requirements allow for the would like this to a maximum reduction of 30 feet of Zone Two. Brush narasgement activities would like City would it ally costs revealed to frace there. The Clarks purder of the MSCP\* Meters approximatoly 50,834 acres and hodington represimately 47.810 a mass within the Clarks purder of the clarks, and officients (throwned prime). Approximately 40 percent (52.012 acres) MHPA lange within to Clyrb a materials in the ander to the preserved for the docided supersion. And and 77 price of the case buildilet resources and 77 percent of the hodingts through a purposet.

Mit. Ramp (FWS-SDG-4072.1)

Troject Objectives

The fires objectives of the proposed fevisions, as provided in the SERVEA are to:

a. complete in a timely and comprehensive manner the revisions to correct bensit management regulations;  Identify and Implement officient, effective, and savingmentally acceptive means to accomplish the revised baugh management Zones One and Two; and  hidvide for c. Textive and environmentally senatave long tarm maintenance of brush, management analysin open space, private lands, and other environmentally senative.

Alternatives

**Jand** 

It indicates to the properties action and the nu-project athemstice, the SERR/FA described the fullowing sitemative at (s) the so action alternative which assumes that thate would be no if dural functions are strained to be City for bruch managements within the open space it manages, then by radiating available to be City for bruch management within the open space it manages, then by radiating available to be City for bruch management within the open space it manages, then by radiating the amount of bruch management the City would be shift to be city the degree of the available of the dispute the tradiation of the manages and the state of the state of the dispute of the available of the dispute the tradiation of the management in the fully would be shift to be dispute the state of the source of the state of the dispute 
trimeets / Mitheatles

The REIR/EA indicates that the proposed trush management revisions would result in an additional Chy-wide impact of approximately 2,880 succes within Zone Two. Of this total, in equipation over the current social on-within the MEIP A, which represents an aspectimately 136 parce solution the MEIP A, which represents an aspectimately 136 parce solution the MEIP A, which represents an aspectimately 136 parce of the provision over the current social coverage of Zone Two within the MEIP A. The 71.5 acres of inside the function of the functio

The SERVEA indice less that the impacts analysis in the M/SCP EUR/Eur/informental Impact Stateminerk/EuS) that nody seconded for any potential project-related impacts on press ve configuration, struct and diversity, and habitat (adothness of the MHPA. The SEIR/HA combines that conservation of covered species would be mainterned and there would not be a significent: increase in the likali wood that an wincoverch species will meet the criteria for likating under : [the the foldered or strue Endangered-Species Act." Elowever, the SEIR/EA consider that the foldered or strue Endangered-Species Act." Elowever, the SEIR/EA concludes that the foldered or strue Endangered-Species Act." Elowever, the SEIR/EA concludes that the foldered or strue Endangered-Species Act." Elowever, the SEIR/EA concludes that

87/189/ 24444, 1457/78

I

!

Ma. Raup (FW3-SD(1-4072.1)

n. biological resputees

 graduation, which file for shine memory activities are conducted within the MRP duing file gravatcher breeding sweece;

الله المالية ال من المالية الم

A Something approximation

h

In addition, enumleri re fungeous related to biological restances are considered to be signifier at and unmittigated. Th mgh the SBRAIA identifies measures to mitigate for some of theso significant impacts, the City does not propose to implement any of the mitigation measures. -Recense the SERVEA coolded the first file propaged action would result in againment beinginimizedual effect, the Federal Emergency Manageneent Agency (FEMA) should propage a beinginimized by the National Rawinsumental Policy Act. In addition, the action is propose in may affect listed spo see. Therefore, FRMA, should initiate section 7 consultation to fulfill is obligations under the ESA. Of particular content to the WIGHUS Agencies are the effects of the proposed bruch manage or an gravitations of the MISUP and MEPA. The proposed revisions conflict with specific requirer sets (N.S., Magnichus clear and during the aviant meeding season and long of halifust within the MIPA. The field of the MISUP and MEPA. The proposed revisions conflict with specific requirer sets (N.S., Magnichus clear and during the aviant meeding season and long of halifust within the MIPA is the Gity's take peamit for the MISUP. Further exaspecating this conflict is the lack of midigation for these impacts. While we recognize the methane of methats with the City's perint agase against impacts. While we recognize the need to provide an adoquate defends e agase against impacts. While we recognize the methanet of the MIPA should be be agase against impacts. While we recognize the methanet of the MIPA is a midigation for these impacts. While we recognize the methanet of the MIPA is a field in a condition 3 of the promit, and any unsucidable lose of habitat in the MIPA atomit he MIP is and condition 3 of the promit, and any unsucidable lose of habitat in the MIPA atomit he is in the MISOF. Because the promit, and any unsucidable lose of the implementation in the roticulated at Mrs. MISOF. Because the needing the project-claterial impacts and the difficulty of millighting atomic models, we should the invalue how are address and the difficulty of millighting atomic models, we should be the City to consider atomic models with the first of the model for promit further management.

We study a their CEC A allows CEQA lead agencies to make statements of overniding torgédit idious that a trens environmental effects may be considered "acceptable" in situation winds the appoint or commic, legal, social, technological, or other henefts of a proposed project outweight the marrowit fable actress anyionmental effoots (CEQA Catchelines, sociant 15097(s)). The City may dowed p a statement of overdiffug considerations for this SETIC/SA that satisfies (CEQA. However, for the transmost of environmental effoots (CEQA Catchelines, sociant 15097(s)); the City may dowed p a statement of overdiffug considerations for this SETIC/SA that satisfies (CEQA. However, for the reasons for an above, it would be difficult to provide adoptate glastradistion for an A a statement of components that the project-related impost on the MS(F) and SULPA. For verify the "eccoptable." Furthermore, it would be impropriated for the City to us a statisfical for considerations to justify hock of adoptate editor the City to us a statisfical for consideration to justify hock of adoptate editorement of the cristification of the City to us at a statisfical for the City to us a

Mag Raap (FWS-SDG-4 )72.1)

brush, rektyagament etem lations, particularly vektout trying first to techolish a tellithe source of funditifico anderwrite it a cours of entrecement, fa addition, given our concerns regarding the project-related putantis, nægative isological impeats, wo question how the shove project objectives "it" and "o" 'yould be realized.

<sup>11</sup> Our dorated comparely on the proposed brack numeracurrent revisions are strathed. The Whilish A gradies spinetistic the upportunity to comment on this SERVEA. The Department finds that A gradies spinetistic the upportunity to comment on this SERVEA. The Department finds that a fight polyhypertrent of the prevised hush meansgrandent regulations would not be do minimit in a strathypertrent transformed that the prevised hush meansgrandent regulations would not be do minimit in a strathypertrent finds that the prevised hush meansgrandent of the prevised field of the Califordia Silah and Game Code. Hease evolution is the prevised field of the Califordia Silah and Game Code. Hease evolution is the prevised of the Department at (858) 467-4230 or Bam Server it is Sarvice at (760) 4331,9440, or if you have a fuel by the statement at commence and entry of the location of the section set of the commence of the section set (760) 4331,9440, or if you have a fuel by the set of the commence of the section set (760) 4331,9440, or if you have a set of the department at (358) 467-4230 or Bam Server in the Sarvice at (760) 4331,9440, or if you have a fuel previous of the section set of the commence of the section set of

.

Sheeniy, S. Fish and Wildit's Ser nor fism

eientin Amer No. Potend Emergency Management Agenov, Office of Russin

[3] Keith, Chy't San Ditego Dovelopenent Services Dependent Keith Under, Chy of San Diego Planuing Dependent Dependent Ann Hix, Chy of San Diego Park and Recordent Dependent San Onte, Chy of San Diego Hire-Resone Department

Steerlyn Sach, Chiflentis Coestal Commis Name Clearingincost

Ma. Ram (FWS-SD()-4072.1)

' Enclosar ≻1

Vis.Rago (FW3-3D) -4072.X)

A LUANT AND A LUANT AND A

Baclonit -

. Whill lee agreecy Connorts and Heconhmendations on the SEIR/EA FOR BRUSH MARKENERT REVENONS TO THE LAND DEVELOFMENT CODS

1. The SERVEA Shimld Be Resimulated

ò

Several of our or muchts identify where the SSTS/EA lacks information which we helin ve is necessary to determine whether the proposed broad management revietions would affor (a: the systemptions that were made (drink the broad management revietions would affor (a: the systemptions that were made (drink the broad management revietions to a spatial to the by the MSCP. Absent this additional information, it is infeasible for us to make these determinations and the SERREA is fractional information, it is infeasible for us to make these determinations and the SERREA is fractional concluency raidifier to impact on which are the determinations and the SERREA is fractional status of any of the species covered with a block of the miltight (GDA Section 15088.5(a)(d)). In addition, we ho leve the there are fest this milightion measures, would enably different from the others provide the the SPRARA [CliQA Section 15088.5(a)(fraction the others provide the determination to a dopt these measures would also warrant the readmatten of the SPRARA [CliQA Section 15088.5(a)(fraction of a dopt section to dopt these measures would also warrant the readmatten of the SPRARA [CliQA Section 15088.5(a)(fraction to dopt the section to a dopt these measures would also warrant the readmatten of the SPRARA [CliQA Section 15088.5(a)(fraction to dopt the section dopt the se The Department's NOP letter amphasized that the SERR/EA must cosure and varity that all requirements and conditions of the MSCP Schures Plan and associated Implementing Agreement you! I he tust if the proposed bruth management revisions were approved , id implemented. The NCP letter the indicated that the disension in the NERNEA about the projeck-related is as of habitat within the MEPA should (a) throughly address the assomptions failed at were made regarding the protection of MSCP contered species, (b) incure indicated is a set habitat within the MEPA should (a) throughly address the assomptions failed by revision of impacts from truck management affinded by revisir at to the building code, and (a) deactive how for City would locar passes for the loss of sensifiers in graved on a mode regarding the protection of MEPA level states for the loss of calculation is the protection of MEPA level and the protection in the MEPA, the net locard that within the MEPA, and the protection impact on MSCF covered-species. The SBRPEA level adequate information regarding ratio showe identified isons, information that is moded in defauntitie the validity of several cf. (to conclusions teges ying biological impacts in the SERPEA. We appreciate the efforts of Gify shaff in proparing the SERR/BA under the pressure of cranegoury conditions. However, because the Uniform Fire Code gives the Fire Marsh II the suffortly to implement the recommended changes administratively, there is no emerger cy relative to a new to adopt the proposed revisions or some version thereof. Rather, the suffortly to implement to adopt the propert rimplementation of the existing brind. undergenent req thements by the City owned upon space) and the proving private partlet, and (a) the recent brindling code revisions (e.g., requirement of Chen 'A' nonling assemblic', fourthfilm on a varie to reveal the first of the prevention of the state of the privational private partlet, ind The complexisting the care not adopted with the standard are that (a) the conservation of coverse species is 10 for main patient. (b) that free would not be a significant increase in the Realincod fort on uncoverse appeals a) result for singles to find the free ground on this find the result of the provide and the of Ma MPPA, would ret up to the standard. (b) these product results potentials from the branch to configure there share diversely within the MMPPA, and (s) this product results to potential from the free configure of the share diversely within the MMPPA, and (s) the free free from the potential from the free from the off the share diversely within the MMPPA, and (s) the free free free potential from the APPA would be areflecity to affit of the share diversely within the MMPPA.

Report regarding the proposed brinds management revisions documents the serious staf. In: deputibil the FRU- has to most its only galous for truck monagement. We note that the Jamary 21, 2004, City Manager is Report regreting the proposed revit at a states, "the State and Federal Wildlife Agenetes appear amonable to the changes in the latch management in preliminary 2, 2004, the method of a states, "the State and Federal Wildlife Agenetes appear amonable to the changes in the latch management in preliminary discussions," At the meeting on larmary 9, 2004, the importance too states the states of the proposed revisions would affect the assemptions regarding the Labler inducts to be compared more a covisions would affect the assemptions regarding the Labler inducts to be compared more at an operating with a state of the potential impacts on the potential impacts on the state of the potential impacts of the SUR (RA, we are concerned about the doption of the proposed width for Zones C is and Two without effectuate malysis of the thick the proposed implications and without indications.

Reputition dation:

"The Widtlife Ag males recommand that the City revise this SERPAR, to provide the information acta ested in our commants below, and recirculate it firt additional in formation. The additional in formation, though the included in a revismalisted SERPAR, (CEQA Sect. m. 15088.5) or in the recirculated and/or final SERPAR that is made aveilable for review ... inc public and comments public and the proving the provident of the sector and the sector of 30 days. The provident of the sector and the sector of 30 days. The sector advection of 30 days are available for review ... inc public and commenting agrandees proving the provided the provided to the sector and sector advection of 30 days.

"2. Eropersof Widdle, for Zoney One and Two Require Justification.

The Wildlife Ag matter achrowledge the need in provide an adequate definabilite agaze reprint imprating fire, 1 ad that fae proposed 100 foot wide brush management mea is consisted with the Mannon ndum of Understanding, dated February 26, 1997, among fae Wildlife Association, the Chiftenia Department of Faveshy, the Sam Diego County Fire Chief's Association, and the Fire District's Association of Sam Diego County. However, it is not Association, and the Pine District's Association of Sam Diego County. However, it is not clear frow the proposed within of Zones Outs and Two were determined. Exectionally, in: massociation the proposed within of Zones Outs and Two were determined. Exectionally, in: the two matter why Zone One, which is outside of the MilPA, its proposed to be more ver of the two matter.

Reconservations

ŝ

a. We recommind first the recirculated and/or fixed SEIR/2A explain the resouring be third the proposed zone whiches

્રેટરેલેક છે. હે. 2950 વસ્તાએ સંસ્થાર (વૃષ્ણ, પિત દેવાઈ ઊપલ ગ્રા કારણાવ્યું તેથે ક્લાંક દ્વાં પ્રસ્થાર The કલીπનાંગ્ય ગ્રાપ્કલક મહત્વાં કણ . - વિવસે Matagement કો પેલ હાજ્યનું આવેલ્યને (ત્રાહ્યવ્યન સંસ્થાર વ્યવ્સ વ્યવ્સ વિવસ 1, 730 વ્રાવ્યન
bla: Raup (FWS-SD> 3-4072.1)

THE REPORT OF THE PARTY OF

Enclose: >

MEPPA; and . 0) there is reem for more than 35 free in Zense One. This should be applied increase in  $\ddot{Z}$  no One. The proposed revisions woold limit that to a maximum radii lier. whent parcels most all of the following three parameters: (a) Zone One would be extra by outside the M.R.P.A. as is comently required; (b) Zone Two does would encouch into (i.e. going ontwo ment, and the on-going costs assorabed with brush monagement City- with Zerre One for as wide as a possible (i.e., not be limited to a 20 frot increase ... - 30 + .....)  $\frac{1}{2}$   $\frac{1}$ üüptede (e.g. edge afferde aud distarbance of avian breeding sochriv), die nood for 1 aissitutional development alko. This spreach would reduce the City-wide need for song to the second state of the second structure of the second state of the second state of the second second s b. Endsting requirements allow for the docrease of Zone Jwo by 134 feet per 1 floot of both retroact vely and to future development, and to residential, buildness, and

fiftil for four mains Zone R. We are iconcerned about the related potential truption in The proposet, revisions tequire that Zopo Yer, would be sepanded by 1 foot for every terrarso sibuation described in the preceding comment, the noriging to not establish a for the MER. A, and recommund that the revisions to modified to establish a timit fair foot by which I Zone Case fails short. However, unlike the proposed revisions for the Zone Two at yas within the MHPA. Ficase set connent 8 for additional suggested modifications to the proposed revial an

4

hadelessy for Analyzing Inpacts on Hahitat and MSCP-Conster and Non-Covered itve Speele ( is Insdemate

Martinetton

tio known lotations of this species are within the proposed intuch management area.  $^{6}~{
m Im}$ Singles in het fitt and that might exwer within the expended Zune Two areas, inducte O. sy cortecption of the gatebratchur. For aroundle, regarding manyw contentio plant species the becomes these species are gainedly less than eighteen inches in height and would not be baccharts (B $\iota$  scrittrir varience), which has an average height of aighty thehas; how ver  ${f B}^{
m sec}$  on the SERVEA, it seems that very little consideration was given to the pote that h(Operate party ter. serpenting). In addition, willowy monochills (<math>MOnordello line de ssubject to thi ming par the broth management regulations. The exception is Eachilue adulition to E wintus becolume, when namew chilemic species that grow to speed. S <sup>(t</sup>hiphen (Det torties conjugens), dudleys ep. (j.n., their flown stalte), and make the Ju ssy. Hadried, a state and federally listed MSCP covered appealed (hough not a name w project-related impacts on MSCP-covered or non-covered schedbyr species, with it.) SURVEA stars only, "no impacts to narrow endenric species are expected to occur endentio spicials, grows to exceed 18 inches in height and might occur within the a járush menagen nok sepádatána meluka tant, within Zona Tao, od plouts namebáng oftas 60 percenti Jr-ho 1919 péser 16 thatle 5 in foddinij ara hikovat abul ba pranad to polos útél kosting in a constance vyhi ké Médérege Steoden la in iko Land Denelopment bitenara "Şooribn 142.041 30(1)(3), -julasou" ia the propos pá

Mat Raup (FWS-SUN)-4072.1)

Baclogness

corporated Zo to Two west. As to minute, contrib capits wren is just one of several, goodes that 1 across theore theore give statiyes from was apparently conducted. Hare 49 of M.S.T. Subarts Plan states, Zone Two "my" he located in the MHPA ..." may Edwever, the SERV/EA does not provide any analysis of whether, or where, the provened disonzeton at out wildlike comiders, the SERVEA starts, where corridors are nearen ar <u>i</u> surficitions would onpend existing Zone Two arees, or loosta inture Zone Two areas . n etteody terror as, special manegrated measures are construct, including implementing where arrow with the considers require it to be located outside of the MHPA."  $\Pi_{\rm eff}$ measures to ( ordeol runoff, noise, lighting, otofic predictors and invasive plants." is in the world of some within the MRRA and how this would be addressed.

:

indussement areas, the estimates in the SERVBA of the actial ortent of the impacts 30 not We believe that the project-related manuary on the MEPA and the apealer it approx ince bolar-estima  $\mu d.~The$  inpact analysis conducted for the SER/RA, cheengrased ext $_{
m eff}$ lands for which the CMy has issued grating permits (pers. comm., Jeanna Kursich, City reliest the full project related impacts on habitath within the MHPA and the species if buish meneg street zones for already developed juroperites, lands that are graded, an J MSCP, June 24, 2004). Because this soulysis did not include future projects' brogh supports (c.g., gustratcher). ×,

.

Recommendations

-a.<sup>3</sup>. The reductic het and/or final SBRR/BA should idonizify the MSCP-covered species 4,14 mcovered sere five species that are likely to occur within the expended Zone Two are, and is.' proverted a thic rough analysis of the potential project-related impacts on frees species:

We assume that implementation of the proposed revisions would continue to restrict Zone --- One to areas putnide of the MEPA to be consistent with fae MSCP Suburce Plan (r. 120-49 of the Suberts Plant. The restructated and/or final SERP/EA should dentify whether this is the case, and if it is not, the inpact analysis should be revised to include the impact from Zone One careraching into the MHPA. 2 d

The redevels hed and/or firmal SERVBA thould provide an analysis of locations when a (no Preferably, if a proposed reviewer should be modified to reflect that Zone Two area inc and to occur: within neurow withlife contribute and the recirculated and/or tipul SERB  ${f E}_{1,1}$ ttrat, in near yo wildlife contidues within the MikiP A and how this would be address ed.. proposed rev sions would acoust at lating Zone Two grees, or locate future Zone T vo gbould evaluate this restriction. o.

recirculated survior final SERVBA should discuss the fact that the project-telated in: paste potsable, pro ride an estimate of the additional coreage and species that would bo di, e. try We approxime that it is judissible to quantify potential fitture impacts. However, it, , effected. This discussion should include the protected expected of investive special would extrant beyond the expansion of the extant broch management anale, and, tf ocytand the proposed tyrush management footprint (command 6). Preferably, brush

14

147-11/11

Mg, Raap (PWS-SID 3-4072.1)

Steeloatt >

management zones should be inicarporated into the footprint of all future projects. The receired and for final SBR/EA should evaluate this radii concut.

within the M MAA by I that for overy I knot by which Zono Che falls short, as prop. and inpart areas within the MRPA that would wise from the expansion of Zone Two at m The rectords tad molicit final SERR/EA should also discuss the potential for additional . A rate, we ur desseared that this impost cannot be quantified, but it should at least be ounHadvely identified.

jotcathal thur acts from the construction of staging sicar, and access roads or patha. [483, rectional ated ) publics final SRR/EA though else address this and my origoing mainten and The redrouts had anivor fixed SERR/EA, should clarify whether the tatimetes include the  $\dot{t}_{
m eff}$  might be necessary to reach the expanded areas of Zone Two. If they do not, i is

of the reade/ titles that would be necessary.

intracts fluct the content SERVIA has not addressed, we recommend that the recirc is ed window that \$JIR/RA propose mitigation to bring the impacts to a level less than If the additional analyses recommended in the foregoing comments reveal significant -- algoritheant

Project Related morets on the MEPA and the Species it Scenaric Would Price ho Bigmittogat

jimited to areas toutated the cote blobgical areas and would not upplet major highlar hi larges  $v_{i,j}$ , there would not us a significant furnesss in the likelyhood that an autovared spectos will meat igenting the project-related impacts on the MEPA and the species it supports, the SE R-EA or within cominence therefore the consurvation of covered metrics would be maintained and steines. "Since putontial impacts would be within the 200 food buffin makyzed in the M MP diversity and hal due htterfaces of the MHPA would occur. Impacts would generally b: BIR/EIS for edg! «Everts, no additional impacts to the preserve configuration, structurel the cuteria for listing under other the federal or state Endangered Species Act."

ļ

perground

Ċ,

÷

section prior (City of San Diego 1990). The REATIR for the MSCP includes the following MfIPA preserve growning accumation would result in adequate the data which for the furposed of a preserve area inductor. J the second in the first of 200 foot along the inductor of a preserve was one of the first of Sun Diserve Trans. The preserve was one of the preserve was one of the first one of the preserve was one of the preserve was one of the first one of the preserve was one of the pres perturent statem mts. " indicest imp ands to covered spectics would result from edge effects within and adje but to the pressive  $\operatorname{rad}$  increased development pressure outside the pressive. Assuming  $\mathfrak{e}\,200$ -ಹ

stonertra N.C.P. isticar stated to queried find fina impact analysis include the impectations exceed to 54,

aires) of the MHPA area could be subject to edge effects depending on how well the local -first wide sin p of preserve boundery, it is estimated that approximately 20%6 (34,00) hurjaat is reg nded at alguifteant" (City of San Diego, 1996), page 4.3.151 -- the an Nyila trois. Bozante these edge effects could adversely impact covered species, this indic so ytisäiskious implemont tiekt putestva management guidelinen and land use planafa f of eignitions is for the MHPA scenario (1.a., the proposed peoport for the MSCP **ELIS/ELIRY**)

drammities habitate would result from permitted trees within the preserve, edge of tells prisserve. These impacts are considered algulficant" (City of San Diego, 1996; phys from uses ad scent to the preserve, and increased development pressure origido the 4,3.159 - - the tandysis of significance for the MHPA scontin, in the section for th listimoti impracts to covered specifie, transvered species, and southive vegetation City's MBCS Subárea Plra).

Resource Presention Ordinancel to a tevel below significant" (City of San Diogo, 235; pages 4.3.153 -- the discussion of mitigation for the MHPA meaning, in the accitent or hese implayed would be milligated firrough implementation of the guidelines and certiniances is entified in the City of San Diego Subarra Phan and the City's RPO the City's MICP Subares Plan).

Tae MSCP KIR/IIS then erter the RPO and identified sections in the City's Subsets Firm contraining relevant requirements, two of which address brush management and invasive ca - - Sections 1.4.3 and 1.5.2 (City of San Diego, 1996; page 4.3.193 and 194).

i. Wikhish Agontha ballove that the 200-foot builts for edge effects that was seemed it. It. MHPA at the reference within and interface at the Grave the ERVEIS for the MSCP was proven ref. -maintenance for (communit). This would significantly expand the mean both directly  $\mathrm{mi}^4$ The 200-foot bu the for edge effects was hased on the understanding of the impacts on 'bi historia of Zone Two within the MHPA at the urbar-wildland interface, plue the acter p subarable area, when as what was contamplated during the provaration of the MSCP. inigigatentation M the proposed revisions would result in an approximately 136 peacer. indirectly (i.e., e ige effects) affected by brouh menagement in this already hiclogically  $\delta t t t \ell A_{s}$  and that the constant through the contact multiplies are therefore not analyses for the [3]R/EIS for the MECP is missipplied in the impact analysis for this gupported by ant stantial evidence in the record.

foot wide strip a centric the pressarys houndary was intraded for analyses of edge effects on y,  $\sim$  Breid on the interstatements in the KRABS for the MSCP, it is shidont flat (a) the 2.10. and (b) adequate unitigation for the impacts within the buffer is to be achieved by implementation of the mandatory requirements thed in the MSCP ERVERS.

We consider the impacts resulting from activities associated with breed manageous t turce/loss of àilitin Zone [wo as diract impeats because they result in direct distant H.

Ma Ramp (FWS-SD) 7-4072.1)	D. We do not express with the City's correluzions that the project-related potential impacts would be unifacity to affect the structural diversity within the MEPA, and that the hubbat, interfaces of the MITPA would remain uniffected. The reductiveleted and/or final St. R. RA should bether substantiate fleese conclusions, considering that beth the structural diverthy and the habitar interfaces within the area of direct and indirect project-related fullue us. would experisive site significant negative integrate.	c. The rectricult led and/or final SERP/EA, should alaborate on the condition of the 135 wores within T(arT/) habited. If they are considered distructed, the SERP/EA should distruct the '' jett-nula lean see of fluer distructed condition, particularly for those That IV stress with set '' jett-nula from invasive species whose catabilishment was caused or facilitated it. I' bruck the function of the set of t	d., Based on the monumendations above (a, b, c), we recommund studence measure (b) MSCP covered species, and mitigation for the identified impacts to the MHPA fure exit preservation of additional in-bind habitatin a meaner that maintains the design and structure in sprity of the preserve. If un-mitigated, the loss of inhibitat within the M H A would signific cantly degrade the preserve, and may variant reconcileration of the City a coverage for some species under the MSCP. We recommend that the to-circulated autorial	nter SELVEN, or early explain, what multiplean measures with 09 area.	According to the SERF/EA, fundiamention of the proposed revelours would affect 1911 exits of guaranteher habitat, and 5 out of 377 occurrences of guaranteher in the MHFA within. If a City. <sup>1</sup> Howver, the SERF/EA else Indicates that the dashbase land to estimate the fundu on on the guaranteh a contrarest down not contain a compactmentive aurysy of all lands in the City of Star Diego, tind occupation of hebitat varies compactmentive, and that the funds in the individual binds removation of hebitat varies compactmentive, and that the fund inpacts o individual binds removated.	The SERREAR in license that bruch management in Zono Two is outwardy allowed ymme to and within the MHRA. <sup>1</sup> However, private proporties within the MHPA are normally required to restrict bruch the associant artivities within Zone Two to outside the breeding assoon fir itse gradienthers. The SERVEA states, "If the bruck management activities [within the MHIA] carnot be compilered significant." Moventalese, the Chyproposes to allow bruck management with in the MHPA during the twoeding season.	7 The 377 occurrences of anstantable, see the Cityra shale of the total 1.016 brown is certains (its 1647) of the distributions that are be unisolved by the MiSCP. "Occurrence" is synonymous with "worken" (serie. Its 17, 2004). "Adjunt - binawn, Lity 7, 2004). "The MiSCP." "Occurrence" is synonymous with "worken" (serie. Its 17, 2004). "It is a series of the product of the product of the series of the MiSCP." The Misc - binawn, Lity 7, 2004). "Adjunt - binawn, Lity 7, 2004). "The Misc - binawn, Lity 7, 2004). "The Misc - binawn, Lither - binawn, Li
			- -				
	:			·. · _	N.	•	
. Mai. Ramp (FWS-SID-J-4072.1)	A tablet within the brush management frought and the access route to the free, and fit work of a state of a within the brush management frought the 200-front wide buffer used by the second of the free and fit work of a state of a state of the free and fit of the second of the free and fit of the second of the free and fit of the second of the seco	(1) A provide the unplication of the 200-fool wide buffer was accordable in this context, it is in the second provided in the second provided in the second provided in the put is according to the put form of the context. The providence within the buffer are intervalence of invasive exotic itent in the providence within the unblack of the context. The providence of invasive exotic itent is people at the unblack within the formation of the context are the characteristic intervalence of invasive exotic itent is people at the unblack within the formation interface function the City, including forming managements are within the MIRPA, continues lack of conformance of with the City's reminement.	including the brush management regulations (comment 6), by hold, fao City on public conformants if the class with flores conformants due to the conformant of the class with flores conformants does not be class one class cannot domonstrate that the catent monoid within the class with flores and periods and the class does not class the class of the class o	Brush management in Zone Two is correctly considered input neutral for the purpose. of determining halo fat mitigation needed for projects for which the Chystennes discretions! y determinists. However, just as with the 200-floot buffer for edge effects, the impact neutral stains (for Zone Two we based on the understanding of the related impacts on the MHPA at the buffer is well properted on the understanding of the related impacts on the MHPA at the buffer in post of the related impacts on the MHPA at the buffer in well at the WHP in the the MHPA at the buffer in well at the impact of the related in properted in the state of the related in post of the related in post of the related in the two at the integration of a society of the number of attress. In addition, the	impsot-neutral a stud carrot be supplied to bruch management areas in or selfercent to gratestocher habit at within the MEFA if the broch management occurs during the grates inter- preceding seasor, nor can it applied to areas that do not undergo weed control as require ( by "Weight broke areas area transforme. One biologically deficeable approach to allow a "Weight broke of the impact neutral status would be to, minimally, (f) demonstrate that the "Merice" and (it) prometions the weed control within Zone Two areas and prohibition required into the MSCP, and (it) prometing the weed control within Zone Two areas area for an within Zone Two areas and the MSCP, and (it) prometing the weed control within Zone Two areas area for the area in	Conclusions and Recommendations Market The BERVES, contently lacks sufficient information for the Wildlife Agencies to contri- Market's with the Gry's conclusions that (a) the conservation of conversed species would be the instantatients (b) store would not be a significant increase in the fikelihood that an the introvered a exist will most the contracts for listing under either the footer of state induspered i posses Act; and (c) the configuration of the MHTA would tranth	untification and the implementation of the function of the proposed revise is world significantly increase Zone Two within the MHPA at the unteriverial interface, which would result in a rast loss of habitat within the MHPA. We therefore records at the sector stated and/or final SERVIEA substanties these conclusions.

ŝ,

2

;

i

:

i

į

ļ

ì

•

.

;

Mar Rasp (FWS SD 3-4072.1)

Constraint

Enclosure, I

MS. Raap (FWB-SD 3-4072.1)

Endorum III

Ernath manageon at activities would likely occurs every one to three years and last for or a to two days. Hand tools and small thechanical tools, and as weed whatkens would be ut, is: Al (1995) sprinciple on communication manageoment during the aviam breeding colscoin is for east strong horized action relating break manageoment during the aviam breeding colscoin is for east (in gradient) and the adomnent for periods hous compared to effect eggs or young through the avia production, we share through the SERNEA does not address the address the atternation of master and atters. 'The to the short through the solution and position to strong the avial production, we share after through the solution and activity improves and the struction of master and atters' 'The to the short through the state and position at private associated with the full management zon e two, it is not antiformed that a significant prime imputed with the full management zon e two, it is not antiformed that a significant prime imputed with the full management zon e two, it is not antiformed that a significant prime through occur.' The SERVEN it with a the following measures to mittgate the potentially algulicent y up attrained imparts to the generologies.

artistikalisa is aiso avaltable he ike form of requiring a qualified blokogut prior to

มุณะเรลดเดม 10 ตามของ ตามหลาย แหล่ง มาการ ๆ กลุปตามาตรี ส อุนตาทนะ ตามหลาย คา - อองการสาวการ มีการที่ง ชนานสระทรษณ์ สะนักได้เรา โด กู่หางคุง ก็คะ ทุกญ่ยะนี้ ราโตร for สาวตามกับค่ะค่า และประ However, fire Clay does not propose to carry our faces, nor any ofter measures, to miltipate for some project related impacts on the gradestelor, not does face SERNEA provide an Weighten set why, other than that the applicant, the Fire Rescue Department, has at a subject to anoth in interval.

Discussibu

In addition to the mean and of the project related impacts on gradestcher reflected by he as SERV/24, and it is already discussed problems with the methodology used to estimate the ass second if it impears that the estimate of impacts on guntoabelies occurrences does in the "account for the y otential loss of or effects on gustestchars in habitst adjacent to Zone T no during the breach is subject to regative indirect effects of break measured during the breach general.

Regarding brief measure within the MEPA during the gratestoter breeding arsen, it is the proper proper to much measurement axivities not to comply with the requirements with the requirements and the projects must comply. The MSCP states, "no clearing of occupied set within all other projects must comply. The MSCP states, "no clearing of occupied set within the clike MBCA and within the clike," MHRAs and within the Commy's Biological Ret. wree set of Forms Arma may occur between March 1 and August 15" (entry for the gosteatcher in 7 th a 3-5 of the MBCG Plen).

Regarding distarbance from noise and visual imparts (fite latter is not addressed by the Second subsection of with brush management scriptible during the gratember breading Second subsection in that the description in SBFR/EA of brush management practices ref are

the City's procedures. This does not necessarily reflect the risebods used by offices Whole conditions break numericant. They may take longer and gamesis lander noise them doet the provide they may not know their work area so localized as does the City. The SERVE: A nonsecond strategate the soft nees and provides insufficient information to surport the condition that i adirect affects from conducting bruch management would not use affect practations thread from conducting bruch management would not use affect practations thread from conducting bruch management would not use intervalent at vities. Therefore, we do not agree with the conclusion in the SERVEL about potential 5 idirect inpacts on the gradations through the freeding season.

รู้ชื่ออยู่หน้าสำนักประเท

1

In comment of we recommend multigration for any identified impacts to fale MHPA. Arrough preservation of solutional in-limit habitat in a manner flast mainitude the deuly a and structural integrity of the preserve. Therefore, we concur with the conclusion it. If a STRRPAA that the impacts on 198 acress of guateentier habitat would be agaifficent such about the would be well free impacts on 198 acress of guateentier habitat would be agaifficent such about the state of the impacts of the sectors of guateentier habitat would be agaifficent such about the sector. The restantic to it and/or final SERN/BA should prohibit brosh management within 41: for the famire grass proceeding season (again, see Table 3-5 of the MSUP Plan), and shar it montry the g uposed rovisions to reflect this prohibition (i.e., assume booupsney by gatheratine). The recirculated and/or final SERVEA should only she how the CRFN III infinite mean left of the public who conduct hund non-PRD staff contractors of the h MBPA (i.e., vibether W e within their Zone Two), and how PRD staff contractors w to d due to be so in bruned about the fands they been transgement of the locations of the h shared for the random their Zone Two), and how PRD staff contractors w to d The entry for the grantenther in Table 3-5 of the MSCP Plan, states, "Arres specifilo (stategradent directives [ASMDs] must multido measures to reduce effects and initiative dis undenno during the nosting period, fire projection measures to reduce the potential for maintent degradation, and management measures to mutotalu or improve fishirst quality is holtoding vegetation structure." The final SERE/EA should address it at requirement in it relates to the areas that the proposed revisions would address it at 'requirement in it relates to the areas that the proposed revisions would address it at 'requirement's around it be reviewed by the Wildlich Agencies prior to implication, the first symbolic structure proto that the proposed revisions would afford (e.g., itsu-'requirement's and should be reviewed by the Wildlich Agencies prior to implication, the development atould be complete prior to the date that the proposed a whole a brane infractive, sure that the simplement of measures the first the proposed aread they the infractive, sure that the implemented commutently with the activities they are intravised to a futures.

Invarive Frotic Unit Section / Lack of Advances Enforcement

a. Previous comments have alluded to the indirect impusts from foreb management. To reards of the CRV's Bruch Management Bushustion (City's Evaluation) conducted is a fit SERR/BA in interfect and edgit of the 25 sizes observed had 50 percent or more cover : f excite plant provise (Bruah Management Evaluation / Biological Technical Report excite plant provise (Bruah Management Evaluation / Biological Technical Report -Appendix B). This hears out the common hunwledge that fatult managed areas un highly susceptible to being invaded by profits plant species, even if the surrounding

PREFERENCE OF ST SERVICE

-----

Ms. Rasp (FWS-SD 3-4072,I)

Enclosure 1

i

:

hukitat is solvily or predominently occapied by native species. Blased on the City's Evaluation, sinff correlated that hyvasion of exorts species into brush namagement iters appears to be the greatest impact associated with biological resources and brush management. We classify the invasion of evole plant species are the most biological th demagnaging iterlinest impact of brush managements, for brush management iter, threet impurts on scoritive babitate and species.

tybuidization with netwo plutts, and supporting non-native animals, fung, and min when uidéi Zous'. No mea mei ruromidrig fuhituta. This would affectively increase the elge invasion into adjacent native habilats, and an increase in the guaritability of gropage, ea to affect of brue is management avoidings and the affected area within the MHPA, shows the the state's repeats the species are experiments from invasive weeds (Bosterd et al. 2000). Estat lishment of invanive spector also ingromes for potential for progression of ayoles, hydrelogy, and wildfire frequency, outcompeting and architegion of netifie plant; instaticts. For ensurple, the California Natural Diversity Database indicates that [8] of biological priblams. These include: alternion of ecceptura functions such as mite, ar Rate modes seem to be particularly vulnerable to the charges wrought by non-native increase in it o Zone Two width would expand invasive exetic species both within 7.10 (l.o., habitat yps charge) and animats, which realits in reduced biological diversity travel stud to not shiftsh in more distant habitatis. We are concarned that the proposed The previence of investve exotic species in bruth managod aross possensation · ; . correct estimates which now include only direct funacts.

b. Many stronic species that settlabils in the inneh management arear, including govert. Hose physically staff, are as or mun flaumable that the nahyo species they displa to physical by "lity staff, are as or mun flaumable that the nahyo species they displa to "City of Lagran Hills). Fire-prone excess plant species include panyes grass (Corri divided plant), start this le (Canaover malkents), castor bean (Notau connumus), black mui trad (Broxsica nayra), Russian thistle (Salaoia rogne), the trabbaco (Nicotan z glanen), ut did onts (Ar as investigation and the carbonated matternt), castor bean (Notau connumus), black mui trad (Broxsica nayra), Russian thistle (Salaoia rogne), the trabbaco (Nicotan z glanen), ut a wild onts (Ar as investigation thistle, castor bean observed during the City's evaluation. Pampas gras, star thistle, castor bean, and black musicad are also as the carbonated, wild onts (Ar as investigation), wild onts (Ar as investigation), all of which were observed during the City's evaluation. Pampas gras, star thistle, castor bean, and black musicad are also concert, and the carbonated are able to the carbonated wild carbonated are interested are also the same there are also the same and the carbonated are also investive approximation. Pampas gras, star thistle, castor bean, and black musicad are also investive approximation. California E to the prosence of fire-prone carbonated are carbonated are also an analyzed are also at the prosence of the same and the carbonated are also at the productive to brue in management efforts.

•c. A report by in: San Diege County Wildland File Task Force states, "mifortunstely, may journerwnen ignore the need for defensible space, because they misurativitymed the four normers ignore the need for defensible space, because they misurative states, "mifortuned" to make the land area the inequal of any vegation on the land area their lownes. Other homeowaters for normal to touch any notive vegation for the land area the need the normal constraints. Other homeowaters for not want to touch any notive vegation for environmental or another homeowaters for not want to touch any notive vegation for environmental or another homeowaters for not want to touch any notive vegation for environmental or another homeowaters for not want to touch any notive the land area the interval of any notive vegation, which could involve catly treated of the target" (San Diego County, 2003). The City's Evaluation autostandate this statement.

In the discus stop of the rejected education/usinfing alternative, the STREATA plates. 'A is assumed that not everycore who requires brackinitetesymmet... would conduct intuit minibalizament per the required procedures in the regulations or as required in development formit conditions''. The SERUPA goes on to state, "bused on the essumption...; the to

Me. Rasp (FWS-SD 3-4072.1)

Haolostur. 1.1

i.

would be a a prificant impact to sensitive bloiogical resources as a mark of the establishment of non-mative plant species in zone two and downllope of 2006 two. 5.4.

ğişişed çin these ohkervations and the Chy's Evelvation, it is apparent that, for the mist jeat, betish at anagement is currently not conducted or not conducted properly. Thin thee, it is difficult by analytistand how mendating a willet breat munagement area in Zohis Two will achieve to introded puryets of providing more defensible space, without adequary City-wide on forcoment.

(1) Ope of the stamptions used in the preparation of the SEIP/EA was that weading, as (s) spinned by the City's quarant break immagement regulations, does not occur.<sup>3</sup> This (s) submitted of the City's quarant break immagement regulations, does not occur.<sup>3</sup> This (s) submitted of the City's quarant break immagement regulations. However, break as (s) submitted of the City's quarant the standard occur.<sup>4</sup> This is a future of yoftenence for evaluating in protect frequence project.

regularitons despite the intentions in 1997 (BIA. 2004); Accurding to the SEIR/EA. when An editional need for entimenters of the brish management rogulations is eviden: ed by modification I was to make the regulations more catorceable. At appears that earlor: at an opposition to, a requirement that was proposed in the building code revisions'<sup>16</sup> - - firit all yrakitikut.com statibile construction that provides a xuoang for transmitting fite in 580. table structures, an d state, "structures such as fraces, wells, and nonhebitable gazeboe that are the City modified the broad management regulations in 1997, one of the purposes of the Höured in Z.ine Two. That even the Building Industry Asseolation (which was un un (Charden 14, Article 2, Division 4, page 24 of the Municipal Code). No structures are periousitide. ; The City's current bruch management regulations for Zone One strenky ocated within bresh manegement Zone One shall be of morembushile construction these opposed to this proposed revision) apparently did not know shout the oxisting containing a sligh fire hyzard area or anywhere within 300 feet of each a lot, be nore ा requirement, heads underscores the lack of enforcement of the linusly management.  $\tilde{u}$ chestory sir notices ( $v_{\mathcal{K}}$ , funces, perios, play structures), on a lot adjustent to or g)unsoly (ac.dog. The SERVER's indicates that the project includes a proposed code armaniment to all w Zone Tye it indicates that the project includes a mayals includes impacts attribution to Zone Tye it includes the state and that the impacts analysis includes impacts attribute to goods. They appeal at avisions do not mention the use of goods. To si if apparent th at the impact analysis in the SERVILA includes impacts from the use of goods. Potomtial impacts from the use of grasts for bench measurement include, but are not limited to, overgasping which in turn would likely result in an increase in investive plant species and The City's treamth until menagrement representions require their Zaho Two The merkethed on a regular bat is no potenties and thermark parks, controlling response and end-shallong any temporary informal general Scotter COSTORING), and realis anticol. In addition: Costdame 14.3 and 14.3 and 14.2 other MSCP subers Plan profile this Planotodos of three las excite data species in the MHPA, and smare subscott for MHPA, and calle to introduction of three las excite data species in the MHPA, and smare subscott for the MSPA, and calle to brouched and inner real of invasive earlier plant species within the MHPA, and anner subscott for the sector data to brouched and inner real of invasive earlier plant species within the MHPA, and anner subscotter of other assets

ł

ji d. Tido vystickai of the proporand revictions to the building code for high site herawid annual allo GDV Council \* " " konzelested adaption at the revisions on January 20, 2004.

Ma. Ram (PWS-SDF) 4072.1)	c. The final RIG/RA should addreas the fact that meny crotic species that establish in 1 to burdt manug singet areas are as or more flarmouble than the native species they didg. at ≞	d. The proposed activities include the fallowing (artificently are proposed deletions and indicatined try is proposed additions): "2 me Two shall be mai memed on a regular sade by proving aid thinking placits, controlling words, and maintaining any summung interiments afor gatabilishment."	Wo recommend that (i) this revision to worded in such a way that it is clear that the wood control ametics en-giving and eact only "until plantings are established," and (ii) the priorizations bester inflettion requirements in Societors 1.4.3 and 1.5.2 of the MSCF B) seca "Plan requiring forwards spaced.	a. The rethreadshed and/or final SERR/FA shared include proper soft language for the cut- mensioner it exterined to the use of goats for brand management, and goeify the set of of the municipal code to be anended. The recorrelated and/or final SERF.FA size of provide a diagrammin of the impose from using goats for the hard size of it goets, would be allowed for use within or adjacent to the MER.FA size with by it goets, would be allowed for use within or adjacent to the MER.FA allow if with specifically a diagrammin of the reserved to an another the MER.FA.	<ul> <li>don't flow heyond the required 50 percent of vegatistion, per the code;</li> <li>iii. issirtlet their grazing to plants over [3 indues to height, per the code;</li> <li>don't damage namow anderede species; and</li> <li>w. ' don't spurad invasive species from one site to office sites.</li> <li>Alternatives An Itrait</li> </ul>	a. The SEIR/Ex. indicates that the alternative involving clearing and, to planting Zonte Fwo with fow height path appears the alternative model not roughly in significant biological impacts. However, it is los Mealifies potential significant impacts on individual complete from Zara Tree from the plantaneous integration of the straight from the temperary impacts on individual type channely of hadden the species and algorithm to the temperary individual type channely of hadden to be been to be been the straight of the straight of the lost of the vector and platted and the final SEIR/EA should be a significant to permease the lost of the vector and platted and the tender that the permease the lost of the lost of the lost of the vector and the lost of the lost of the lost of the vector and the lost of the lost of the vector and the lost of the lost of the lost of the vector and the lost of the vector and the lost of the vector and the vector and the lost of the vector and the lost of the vec	poleatial loss of sensitive plunt species, both of which would nequire mittgation. b. Regarding the alternative involving strongthening the building code regulations as "review prefain to first induce the near areas, the SERR/EA indicates flat such prefain the Degration in thigh file heard areas, the SERR/EA indicates flat such with the Degratinets that heard to an instagement source. Contain university as a support this alternative, particularly for structure with the Degratinets that heard, we support this alternative, particularly for structure that would be a sequence to a support this alternative, particularly for structure that would be the management structure is a support that structural such management. That is, introduced for the internative that management. That is, introduce the need for housh management. That is, introduced for alternative the number of the internation of the management. That is, introduced for internation the number of the internation of the internation of the number of the internation of the number of the number of the internation of the number of the internation of the number of the internation.	
ו'ז-אוואסוממי איז לאנאיזיפוע	ប្តូលនាប់ស្ទ័រ សុល(សា, sprand (e.g., by cont, fraca) of inviousive plant propagoles from one brush អានានន្តជាថាជា សាល់ទោះមាន ប៉ង់ន ពនាជ (and, នាក់នង batween), ប៉ុន្មានជំដាំក្នុង of winds quality, ព័ន្ធភា hundsda huffs cash frices, and rimedue on namow endernic plant anionies.	g. The SERVEM proposes no mitigation for imposts from hynekye species, stating, "F of dut to miligate algoificant impacts to biological resonances as a roadit of the establishment if a number in the interface of the stabilishment is a biological resonances as a roadit of the establishment if a number in the interface of the interface of the interface of the stabilishment is a number of the interface of the stabilishment is a number of the interface of the stabilishment is a number of the interface of the stabilishment is a number of the interface of the interface of the interface of the stabilishment is a number of the interface of the interval is a number interval is a number of the interval	City of Start Heige Philology Chuidelines. This mithgation however, its not proposed." We City of Start Heige Philology Chuidelines. This mithgation however, its not proposed." We agree with this mitigation measure, even though bruch musegraneht in Zone Two is controledly confident in proposed in the purpose of the control of the philot mitigation uncelled. The purpose of the control of the philot mitigation where the philot philot philot philot mitigation where the philot phil	Recommendations សម្តែកស្រុកសំណាក់ពេជា ដែលដែល come into compliance with its regulations regarding hunst សម្តែកស្តីសំ Nie ក្នុងសំណាក់ពីបុរ come into compliance with its regulations regarding hunst សំណើងនេសដ្ឋាភិភី, ជាជា អូវបាក់ដែច សំ ទូ០ខ្សែ City-voide enforcement (10.01050 តំាសាននៅ។ ទំព័ន៌ដែន Atti D. and អូវបាក់ដែច សំ ទូ០ខ្សែ City-voide enforcement (10.01050 តំាសាននៅ។ ទំព័ន៌ដែន Atti D. and អូវបាក់ដែច សំ ខេត្តទំណែន City-voide enforcement (10.01050 តំាសាននៅ។	Introduction is not to be considered as miligration because weed control within Zone (No is an estimate bounding on the MSCP. However, not only would it provide a significant in the interior determinant everal for the MSCP. However, not only would it provide a significant in the interior determinant everal for the MSCP. However, not only would it provide a significant of the interior of the MSCP. However, not only would it provide a significant of the interior of the MSCP. However, not only would find the provide a significant of the provide an effective dates will be provide as for fitteding the provide an effective dates will be provided as the provide an effective dates will be been according in the test of the City has sufficient the fourth of a sufficient of the fourth of the fourth of the molecular interior of fitteding in the City has endined for enfortment with it. MSCP the source of fitteding in the City has enforced the fourth of the molecular of the fourth of the fourth of the molecular of the fourth of the fourth of the molecular of the fourth of the molecular of the fourth of the fourth of the fourth of the molecular of the fourth	dominton up on the proposed fruit management reviews until there is adequate finding to dominons on the proposed regulations, and until there has been further onforce for claring and proposed regulations, and until there has been further consideration, of the building code revisions for high fire herard meas (commont 7).	11. The CD/A departed if and has supported the intractional agregation (1982, but clearly dones to a provide the intractional agregation) is a sufficient of the construction intractionary. The CD/A depart for (2014) factor and the provided the intraction intraction (1982, but clearly dones to a provide the interfactor of the construction intractionary. The construction intraction of the provided for any clearly of the construction intraction of the provided for any clearly of the provided for the construction interfactor of the construction interfactor of the provided for the construction interfactor of the construction interfactor of the provided for the construction interfactor of the provided for the construction interfactor of the construction intervactor interfactor of the constr	

Ma.Ramp (FW)

Ms. Reap (FWS-8D) >-4072.1)

material after natives should be recented, and not considered optional. As to existing estructures, the building code should be revised to next the revised building codes. We get the urbashieldismi interface to upgreded to meet the revision building codes. We taygland the dipy Countril for stording building code revisions that require Class "A" footing asset hilds and prohibit the use of wood ablets and wood ablenders. We must be City Council to further, stringthen the building code. Flowers, they council to further, such the understand the to further, stringthen the building code. However, they could greatly of annothers in high heared fire useds. We understand that in many cases, such revisit would not eliminate eithert having the project impacts as account of greatly minimized the need far, and the sciture building redes. However, they could greatly minimize the provident having the proposed supperstands as account of string anangement provides, and the sciture that the proposed widening of Zones Ouc and Two

An discriment preventionally, the serious lasts of enforcement of the hruth monoperiment regulations polyters to the meet for action that would reduce the meet for that enforced at at a grant space of a provisions in the building code and the further attractibuting a. The fulliding code a would reduce the City's hrund management operational costs in Zou. Two, The reduce the STARPEA About theoremethy address the issue of concurrent to it commensation to evels of effort to zerose the orders through the provement of the actions of effort to zerose the City's bruth minagement concurrent to it commensation to a confere protection from the orders wildland free functions and building code to achieve protection from the at the orders wildland fibration.

# 8. Surrested Modüğentions to Proceed Bruth Management Revisions

. We and the following megneted medifications of the proposed mvisions to three already. Strongended. fuggested deletions are struck out, and argented additions are underlibed.

a. Othe of the st furnitions used fit the preparation of the SERVEA is that un impaots the wetlands abould occar. The proposed raviations state, "No humb menegement is rot, in all in groups combine welland versions. This language is made: the society and the proposed raviations." This language is made: the society and the proposed raviation. This language is made: the society and the proposed raviation. This language is made: the society and the proposed instands the society of the society to the proposed that the revision provide a byte of the proposed in the society of the society of the society of the proposed that the revision provide a byte of the provide a byte of the proposed of the provide a byte of the provide a byte of the proposed of the provide a byte of the

2. Section 142, 1912(i) allows the Phe Chief to modify the bonki management required to the fourth optimity conjetitions which are identified. The language should be modified to the fourth of the fourth optime of the modified to the fourth of the fourth optime of the section allows, for the widening of Zomes One and Two beyond the Carles which are identified to the SEIR/EA strates, "the LDC [Levid Development Cade] allows for alternative complicates to brush management in the form of activitients of fects. In addition, the SEIR/EA strates, "the LDC [Levid Development Cade] allows for alternative complicates to brush management in the form of activitients of fects. In addition the SEIR/EA strates, "the LDC [Levid Development Cade] allows for alternative complicates to brush management in the form of activitients of fects. In addition the SEIR/EA strates, "the LDC [Levid Development Cade] allows for alternative complicates to brush management in the form of activitient of fects. In addition to complete the present of the the large provision of activitient (C, the large provision the modified to make it management. LDC, the large provision the modified to make it management.

# 

<sup>1</sup> Ruchandte 1<sup>1</sup>

d

Enclosum 16

To be constraint with the City's MSCP Subarro. Plan, the proposed newisposs should by, modified to clarify that Zono Orromant be oldside of the MEPA. <sup>4</sup>The City of I actual Hills fortures property owners to remove all deed, overgrown, :r. "Hild out vegetation, plaints, and noes within 100 fees of any structure including word: "Encode (City of Lagune Hills). The San Diegn County Wildland Frie. Tack Perron... Teotonimum's that ordinances include language that "declarat dead or antispartially" Count. recommands that ordinances include language that "declarat dead or antispartially". We recommand that for City's landscope/bursh memograment regulation for annihold. We recommand in the City's landscope/bursh memograment regulation for annihold. We recommand in the City's landscope/bursh memograment regulation for annihold to finglude simil a requirements, while neutiling consistent with the prohibition on giftinguable in theorem with Zone One and a maximum combined width of 100 feet for Eddes, One kiel, Twu. Section 1421 402, Table 142-044, new #9. "All existing or proposed lote where at y open space, y spir area, and undeveloped public or pervise londs containing native or naturalized regention, and/or areas containing antiroxymentally acasitive lands are sub in 100 feet of a articulture or proposed flammable almoture."

7

8 Section 142.4 412(0). This section states, 'Both Zono One and Zono Two shall be proveded on (1.4.1.4)2(0). This section states a recorded essement is granted by an adjace it property under a subject property under a subject property and maintain the maintain the monogener context of the autoperty in property is granted by an animal the maintain the maintain the maintain the management context of the autoperty in property is granted by an animal the maintain the ma

Secton 142.( 412(0). "All existing and now structures subject to this division shall obthiv with rule angipmicans of Chepter 14, Article 5, Division 3 - Additional Built hus Risarlanis for Building Located Adjacent to Hazardone Arcas of Natires or Natural: m Vegothion." While the City Council adopted regulations requiring for an aver secondice, in the prohibiting wood shakes and wood adingtes, they are not yet adopt so additional buckfing standards for buildings jocated adjacent to hazardone arcs of na ive different buckfing standards for buildings jocated adjacent to hazardone arcs of na ive or maturalized vegetation. As proviously stated, we support the adoption of such building standards.

Section 342.6 41 2005. "Where Zone One width is required adjacent to the MIFFA or "E. Section 342.6 41 2005." "Where Zone One width is required adjacent to the MIFFA or within the Coastal Overlay Zone, any of the following modifications to development. regulations of the Land Development Code or standards in the Lend Dovelopment. Mercal are premitted to accommodate the increase in width <u>35 feet (or prefiler 1f th</u>, Z.Re One width is: packing up for a electronic in Zone Twol?"

¢	•
Ľ,	•
Ч	
Ŗ	
Ŕ	
É	
Į.	•

.

Biolosunt J

Ma. Rasp (FWS-SD) 3-4072.[]

Enclosure 13

Services Department, Baylroom so al

Dreft Joint ERRY 13 leavence of Take Authorizations for Threatened and Bullangared S. ex les

Due to Uthen Gr. web Witting the MSCF Planing Area. LDR, No. 93-0287, SCH No.

93121073. And ft-

County Wildami Fire Task Forto Emstings and Recommendations. Report to the Boars. of

Supervisoja, Angrost 13, 2003

San Diego County. 1003. Mitigation Strategies for Reducing Wildland Fire Rintz. San Di 29.

Analysis Section Public Projects and United Shrice Fish, and Wildlife Service. Receivit at A

City of Sart Diego, 2196. City of San Diego, Development

The trifurences to the MHTA should be spelled out, and a footmote added that briefly explains to the reader the purpose of the MHPA and whom to control to find out wi et wa there had is within an adjucent to it. t. أنت عطلة ومن أن المنافع الم المنافع 
. proposed but dong couls revisions, we recommend that the faster cite and reque corrubtance with the figurate.

Disconsics Tigt Require Reconsidiation

Please reconcile he following apparent distrepancies in the SERVEA.

a. Please clarify located the extension on page IV-2, scotion D. Our understanding is it, it correctify but it management in Zone Two occurs on 3,753 series withink the Gity. Of the 3,753 series. 256 within the Gity's Multiple Spectres Conservation Program (MSCP) Multiple Habits: Associated to the States area. 256 series comm., Chad Kana, Gity MSCP, June 25, 2004).

 Page V.C-12 Indicates that currently found management affects 3,815 acres of voget at so, with no distriction between Zones One and Two, where is one understanting is that it current bursh intergement in Zone Two alians occurs on 3,753 acres within the City (pass, comm., Chad Kany, City MSCR, June 25, 2004). c. Page V.C.1.2 rulizates that the proposed revisions would affect an additional 2,474 scres, whereas Tabl : V.A.1 on page V.A.13, indicates that additional score would be 2,680.

2

The January 11, 2004, City Manager's Report indicates that the City hopes to fain the entire attas within Zone Two on an average of every two years, whereas the SEIR/IS', indicates that hush management activities would likely occur every and three years.

References

[BIA, 2004. Letter fit in Building Industry Association to Mayor Dick Murphy regreting the proposed building and free code changes. January 20, 2004.

Bossard, Carle C., Jo m. M. Rendell, and Marc C. Hoshowsky (eds). 2000. Trivasive Plants : f Cationna's Wildlands. City of Laguas IIIIs. City of Laguna IIIIs Weed Abatanan Enpolance tal Childelbres & fact sheed antided Phys.Prove Phant Specks.

sames course Levier room room operates. http://www.cf.htg.ggg\_dpille.cg.we/news//Weey\_Ahubeneen\_Childelines.pdf

# DRAFT <u>FINAL</u> SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

# BRUSH MANAGEMENT REVISIONS TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AND FEDERAL GRANT FROM THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES (OES), FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANGEMENT AGENCY (FEMA)

# PROJECT No. 31245 SCH # 2004031041

#### Prepared for:

City of San Diego, Fire-Rescue Department Executive Complex, 1010 Second Avenue, M.S. 603 San Diego, CA 92101 Contact: Samuel Oates, Fire Marshal 619-533-4406

Prepared by:

City of San Diego, Development Services Department Development Services Center, 1222 First Avenue, M.S. 501 San Diego, CA 92101 Contact: Allison Raap, Senior Planner 619-446-5379

May September 2004

. . . . . ÷

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page			
EXECUTI	VE SUN	MMARY			
	Back	ground and Description of the Revised Brush Management Revisions S-1			
	Елуі	Environmental Analysis			
	Alter	matives Analysis Summary			
	Alte	matives Considered but Rejected			
		ulative Impacts			
	Grov	wth Inducement			
Ι	INT	RODUCTION			
	А.	CEQA Requirements			
	B.	Purpose and Use of this SEIR/EA I-5			
п	ENV	TRONMENTAL SETTING			
	A.	Location			
	В.	Physical Characteristics			
	Ċ.	Applicable Land Use Plans			
ш	BAC	KGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION			
	A.	Background of Brush ManagementIli-1			
	В.	Project Description			
	C.	Objectives of Brush Management Revisions			
	D.	Discretionary Actions			
	E.	History of Project Changes			
	F.	Project Assumptions			
IV	AFF	ECTED ENVIRONMENT			
	А,	Location			
	В.	Background			
	Ċ.	Surrounding Community Uses			
	D,	Environmental Setting			
	E.	Population, Social and Economic Characteristics			
v	ENV	TRONMENTAL ANALYSIS			
	А.	Land UseV.A-1			

	Biological Resources
	C. Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion
	D. Neighborhood Character/AestheticsV.D-1
VI	GROWTH INDUCEMENT
VΠ	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS
VШ	ALTERNATIVES
IX	EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT IX-1
x	SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES THAT WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTION, SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED
XI	SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS XI-1
XЦ	REFERENCES
XIII	NDIVIDUALS AND AGENCIES CONSULTEDXIII-1

# APPENDICES

- A Notice of Preparation (NOP) and Response to Comments
- B Biological Resources Report
- C Draft ordinance amending the Brush Management Regulations
- D MOU between USFWS, CDFG, CDF, SD County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of SD County
- E Methodology for Biological Impact Assessment
- F Draft Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program
- G Draft goat amendments to Municipal Code

# LIST OF TABLES

# <u>Table</u>

#### Page

<u>V.A-1</u>	Biological characteristics of City of San Diego MSCP narrow endemics V.A-7
V.A- <u>+2</u>	Habitat Impacts from Proposed Brush Management Regulations V.A-1314
V.A-23	Impacts from Proposed Revisions to Brush Management Regulations V.A-1719
V.B-1	Habitat Types within the City of San Diego
V.B-2	Local Special Status Plant Species Potential Presence and Status V.A-1618
V.B-3	Local Special Status Animal Species Potential Presence and Status V.A-1921
V.B-4	Potential Impacts to California Gnatcatcher

# LIST OF FIGURES

.

# <u>Figure</u>

i

İ

ļ

# Follows Page

1	Regional Location Map	<u>I</u> -1
2	City of San Diego Brush Management Regions	
3	Before Brush Management	Ш-2
4	After Pruning and Thinning	
5	City limits and Coastal Zone Boundary	
6	MSCP Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA)	
7	MSCP Biological Core and Linkage Areas	V.A. <u>-9 10</u>

# LIST OF ACRONYMS

The following list of acronyms used within this SEIR/EA is provided for the reader's reference,

APE	Area of Potential Effect
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CDP	Coastal Development Permit
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
DSD	City of San Diego Development Services Department
EAS	Environmental Analysis Section
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
ESL	Environmentally Sensitive Lands
GIS	Geographic Information System
LCP	Local Coastal Program
LDC	Land Development Code
LDR	Land Development Review
LUP	Land Use Plan
MSCP	Multiple Species Conservation Program
MHPA	Multi-Habitat Planning Area

MMRP	Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program
NOP	Notice of Preparation
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SDP	Site Development Permit
SFE	Strategic Framework Element
SUSMP	Standard Urban Stormwater Management Plan
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	California State Water Resources Control Board
URMP	Urban Runoff Management Program (and Plan)
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

.

ł

1

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### A. BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The current brush management regulations in the Land Development Code (LDC) were developed in conjunction with the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The regulations were approved by City Council in November 1997 and by the California Coastal Commission in November of 1999. They were made effective with the entire Land Development Code Update on January 3, 2000.

Currently, Brush Management Zone One is the area adjacent to structures and consists of pavement and permanently irrigated ornamental plantings. Brush Management Zone Two is an area of native <u>or naturalized</u> plant material thinned to 50% to reduce fuel load. The width of Zone One currently varies from 20 feet to 40 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and 30 feet to 45 feet east. Zone Two currently varies from 20 feet to 30 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and El Camino Real, and 40 feet to 50 feet further east. Under the current Land Development Code Section 142.0412(h)(6), property owners are responsible for maintaining brush management zones to include weeding within brush management zone two.

Since the adoption of the MSCP in 1997, brush management zone one associated with new development has been located within the development footprint and is not allowed within the MHPA. With the proposed revisions to the LDC, zone one would be increased to thirty-five feet. For some existing structures, zone one may not be able to expand to thirty-five feet without impacting native habitat. In lieu of expanding zone one into native habitat, the proposed code amendments would increase the width zone two one foot for every one foot of zone one that could not be provided, unless the Fire Chief approved a modification on a case-by-case basis.

The proposed activities would be accomplished in accordance with the San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 4 and also proposed revisions to Chapter 4, Article 4, <u>Division 3, Section 44.0307, et seq</u>. These revisions to the regulations are proposed to address ministerial actions. Brush management thinning activities in zone two Could be done by

#### Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code SEIR/EA

livestock (goats). This would involve using goats as a supplement to existing crews to carry out brush management zone two thinning. Thinning of vegetation would include fencing the area to be thinned, bringing in a herd of goats, which would then feed on the vegetation, thereby reducing the fuel load and creating the defensible space for fire protection. The goat herd would remain in the fenced area for two to three days then be moved to another area. This rotational grazing is referred to as controlled grazing, compared to continuous grazing which allows grazing to occur over the same plot of land without rotation. Thinning would occur as the goats feed on the vegetation. Goats do not have a specific diet and will feed on most any type of shrubbery or vegetation. Studies have shown that they will eat plants almost to ground level but leave the roots and graze on the lower branches of large trees and shrubs.

The SEIR/EA is for public (including Right-Of-Entry Pennits) and private activities on already developed properties; not for future brush management to facilitate future development. Zone two brush management would continue to be exempt from ESL; therefore, private brush management activities do not normally require a permit.

It is currently prohibited to use goats to thin vegetation in Brush Management Zone 2. However, the "project" for purposes of this SEIR/EA includes a proposed code amendment to allow Zone 2 thinning with goats; therefore, the impacts analysis includes impacts attributable to using goats.

# B. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in significant impacts to the following issue areas:

- Land Use
- Biological Resources

#### Land Use

The proposed revisions to the brush management regulations would be consistent with all of the applieable planning documents, land use plans and regulations with the exception of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands regulations of the Land Development Code. As discussed in

<u>П</u>ланайн Summary

ł

Section V.B. Biological Resources, the proposed revisions could result in impacts to the California gnateatcher breeding season. This would not be consistent with the ESL regulations, therefore resulting in a significant land use impact. Measures are available to mitigate these impacts, however the applicant has not agreed to them. Therefore, significant impacts associated with land use would remain unmitigated.

#### **Biological Resources**

The proposed project would impact biological resources as a result of the establishment of invasive plant types once brush management activities have been conducted. Thinning in zone two would allow for the invasive plants to establish in zone two. City staff conducted site visits on a number of parcels and concluded that routine weeding as required by the code is not being implemented. The introduction of invasive plants in zone two would result in a significant impact to native habitat and sensitive biological resources. Invasive plant types would be introduced into zone two as a result of the thinning, creating a significant impact. Further, as goats digest certain plant types containing seeds, the goat feces could also spread invasive plants within zone two as the seeds could take hold in the soil and sprout. Measures are available to mitigate impacts to native habitat, however the applicant has not agreed to them.

The EIR/EIS for the MSCP concluded that impacts to covered species and their habitats from brush management were significant but mitigated to below a level of significance with the implementation of preserve management and planning guidelines identified in each City's MSCP Subarea Plan and associated implementing regulations. As documented in this SEIR/EA, impacts to biological resources that could result from implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would be significant in that the project would expand the area within which invasive weeds establish. In that the increase impacts would occur within the 200-foot edge affected area located within the MHPA. This SEIR/EA concludes, like the EIR for the Land Development Code, that the impacts are rendered less than significant by implementation of the MSCP except for impacts occurring outside the MHPA for significant impacts to non-covered species. Therefore, significant impacts associated with biological resources would remain significant and unmitigated.

5-3

The proposed project would also result in significant impacts to sensitive species, specifically the California gnateatcher. Bruch management thinning in zone two could impact the gnateatchers due to incidental impacts to nesting birds and reduction of auitable habitat by bruch thinning within the breeding season on lands within the MHPA. Mitigation in the form of acquiring approximately 198 acres of equal value gnateatcher habitat would mitigate impacts to the gnateatcher to below a level of significance; however the applicant has not agreed to it. Impacts to sensitive vegetation associated with the goat grazing would be significant as identified in the proposed project. This would also be significant as identified in the proposed project. This would also be significant as identified in the proposed project. The California gnateatcher would also be impacted by vegetation thinning by goats or humans that could physically impact a nest. The Mitigation outlined in Section V.B. would reduce impacts to biological resources to below a level of significance; however the applicant has not agreed to it. Impacts associated with the establishment of invesive plants would remain significant and unmitigated. Impacts to non-covered species outside the MHPA would remain significant and unmitigated.

#### Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion

Implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would not change the course of surface water flow or result in the long-term change to hydrology/water quality. The minimal erosion and sedimentation associated with surface disturbance would not be significant. Further, any <u>hand held</u> landscaping equipment (i.e. weed whacker) that would operate within open space, private lands or other environmentally sensitive lands could release fluid or other substances. Due to the limited quantities of substances and typical distances for water quality, no impacts to water quality are anticipated.

According to the Biological resources report prepared for the project, two out of 25 sites that were observed show evidence of crossion. The erossion within the brush management areas can be attributed to the sandy soils on the slope and, in one case, the way the slope was constructed. In both cases, there is not clear association between brush management and the erossion on the site. Based on the nature of the proposed brush management revisions, impacts to erosion are not expected to occur.

 $S \rightarrow$ 

#### Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics

Implementation of the proposed Brush Management revisions would serve to improve the amount of defensible space from structures to vegetation. The brush management revisions would help avoid large brush fires, like the recent Cedar Fire of October 2003, thereby avoiding impacts to neighborhood character/aesthetics.

There is the potential that private land owners could impact mature trees with the proposed brush management revisions. However, the current brush management regulations require that trees be thinned, not removed from brush management zones one and two. Therefore, the proposed brush management revisions would not result in a significant impact to neighborhood character/aesthetics.

#### C. ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Based on the results of the environmental analysis contained in Section V, implementation of the proposed project would have significant impacts related to <del>land use and</del> biological resources. The discussion of alternatives is intended to "substantially reduce significant impacts."

#### No Project Alternative

ļ

Under the No Project Alternative, the existing brush management zones would remain in effect. Current brush management regulation state that the width of zone one varies from twenty feet to thirty-five feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and thirty feet to forty-five feet on the cast. Zone two currently varies for twenty feet to thirty feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and forty feet to fifty feet on the east.

In the absence of implementing any of the activities associated with the proposed brush management revisions, none of the environmental impacts described in Section V would directly occur. However, the Fire Marshall could still require thinning beyond the present Zone Two.

# No Action Alternative

NEPA requires that the No Action Alternative be described. The No Action Alternative assumes that there would be no federal funding available for the implementation of the brush management revisions within City owned open space areas and as a result, no federal action to approve. The proposed brush management revisions could still be implemented by the City; however, funding would need to be acquired from different sources. This alternative would not achieve the objectives of the project of providing additional defensible space from structures to vegetation because the City does not have alternative sources of funding for the project.

# Increasing Building Regulations

Under this alternative, proposed changes to the building regulations would occur thereby reducing the need for increased brush management zones. Revisions to the building regulations could include fire walls which would be constructed at the boundary between zone two and open space. Additional building regulations could include alternative architectural features for structures where brush management would normally be required. This revision to the Land Development Code regulations is included in the proposed ordinance which is attached to this SEIR/EA as Appendix C.

While the proposed project allows development features as an alternative to or in addition to reduced brush management zones, under this alternative there would be no impacts to biological resources or sensitive species because brush management would not occur. The building regulations would reduce the fire hazard to structures and the habitat on site would remain undisturbed.

No impacts associated with hydrology/water quality/erosion, land use or neighborhood character/aesthetics would occur with this alternative.

Т

# D. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

#### Education/Training Alternative

The Education/training alternative would rely on existing or expanded information which is available to the public for the purposes of brush management and creating defensible space around structures. Much of this educational information is readily available to the public via the City of San Diego website, brochures and flyers which are available through the Fire-Rescue and Park and Recreation Departments. There has been a substantial amount of public outreach on the subject of brush management. This alternative is unreasonable due to the fact it is assumed that not everyone who requires brush management on their site would necessarily partake in any of the educational materials and/or conduct brush management per the required procedures in the regulations or as required in any development permit conditions.

Under this alternative, based on the assumptions mentioned above, there would be a significant impact to <u>non-covered species located outside the MHPA</u> sensitive biological resources as a result of the establishment of non-native plant species in zone two and down slope of zone two. In addition, impacts to the California gnateatcher-would occur as the assumption is that brush management could likely occur during the breeding season. Impacts associated with invasive plant species would remain significant and unmitigated: therefore, this alternative is rejected.

#### Prescribed Burn Alternative

Under this alternative, prescribed burning of vegetation would be allowed within or beyond brush management zone two to allow fuel load reduction. Prescribed burns can be used to create a mosaic of age-classes of shrublands; reducing fuel load adjacent to structures; protecting oak and conifer woodlands through understory burning; and removal of unwanted or exotic species. The effectiveness of prescribed burns is questionable. Research indicates that this type of fuel management may be effective at controlling fires that burn under moderate weather conditions, but ineffective at controlling fires that ignite under severe weather conditions (i.e., Santa Ana). It has been suggested that multiple prescribed burns to create a mosaic of fuel loads in the shrublands is not practical and focus should be on the interface between developments and native habitat areas.

5-7

<u>Prescribed burns creates a significant liability issue, and can only be conducted at certain times of</u> the year based on humidity, wind, fuel load and availability of response crews to suppress unwanted burns. An incomplete assessment of any factor for a prescribed burn can lead to loss of property and life with serious liability questions to both the landowner and the one responsible for the burn. This alternative is rejected because it is not supported by the City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department.

# Clear and Re-plant Zone Two

<u>Under this alternative complete clearing would occur in zone two and would be re-planted with</u> <u>low height native plant types. Proper planting protocol would be to lightly scarify the soil surface</u> <u>before planting for better seed/soil contact.</u> Temporary irrigation would be installed for a period of up to two years for plant establishment. The assumptions associated with this alternative are that the irrigation would not be installed or monitored properly thereby allowing runoff to occur down slope of zone two. This can be substantiated by evidence that irrigation runoff is the primary source of water in our drainages within the City during the summer. The newly planted vegetation would be successful in reducing impacts to weed invasion. This alternative would have a significant impact on sensitive habitats; therefore, this alternative is rejected.</u>

#### Thinning by Plant Type

Under this alternative, thinning of vegetation would occur based on the plant types located within brush management zone two for fuel load reduction. The first plant types to be thinned would be the most flammable and the most invasive within the specific brush management zone two area. Next, the more flammable native or naturalized plants would be thinned. Finally, the least flammable and more sensitive native or naturalized plants would be thinned for a total reduction in ground cover to 50%. The effectiveness of thinning by plant type is questionable. Thinning the most flammable and the most invasive plant types first would address the most harmful plant types, but these plant types could establish themselves rather quickly after the initial brush management occurs. This alternative is rejected because it is not potentially feasible to assume that everyone who requires brush management on their property would be able to identify all

plant types located in zone two brush managed areas.

#### E. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

#### Land Use

As discussed in Section V.A, implementation of the proposed brush management revisions is not expected to result in land use impacts, with the exception of consistency with the Environmentally Sensitive Lands regulations as it relates to the gnateatcher breeding season. These impacts when considered with other reasonably foreseeable projects are not considered to be cumulatively considerable.

#### Biological Resources

Weed invasion in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects is together considered to be cumulatively significant and the contribution of the revised brush management regulations is considerable and therefore significant. Since the project is mitigated by the implementation of the MSCP, there are no cumulative impacts to biological resources with the proposed project.

#### Hydrology/Water Quality

As discussed in Section V.C, implementation of the proposed brush management revisions is not expected to require any groundwater dewatering. Based on the nature of the proposed brush management revisions, impacts to groundwater quality are not expected to occur. Based on the nature of the proposed brush management revisions, impacts to erosion are not expected to occur. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed brush management revisions would not contribute to the cumulatively significant hydrology/water quality/erosion impacts.

Econation Summary

# Neighborhood Character/Acsthetics

As discussed in Section V.D, implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would serve to minimize any potential impacts to mature trees, and any individual thinning projects on private lands, open space or other environmentally sensitive lands are not anticipated to result in changes to neighborhood characteristics or aesthetics during thinning activities. No mature trees will be removed with the proposed brush management zones. As such, the proposed brush management revisions would not contribute to any cumulatively significant neighborhood characterizes.

# F. GROWTH INDUCEMENT

The proposed brush management revisions involves ongoing thinning activities located on private lands, open space and other environmentally sensitive lands that would serve to maintain the proposed 100 foot wide defensible space between structures and vegetation. The proposed brush management revisions would not have the potential to directly or indirectly induce growth or otherwise foster the potential for growth. Further, this SEIR/EA does not address brush management impacts that might result from future development. Therefore, no growth inducing impacts, direct or indirect, are anticipated to occur as a result of the implementation of the revised brush management regulations.

# SECTION I INTRODUCTION

#### Subsequent EIR/EA

This document is a Joint Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (SEIR/EA) for Brush Management Revisions to the City of San Diego Land Development Code. The SEIR/EA must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C., §4325 et seq.) and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended (Public Resources Code, §21000, et seq.) and tiers off of the *San Diego Municipal Code Land Development/Zone Code Update, LDR No. 96-0333, SCH No. 96081056*. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, the NEPA format is used in preference to the City of San Diego CEQA Guidelines and City of San Diego Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (Revised September 2002). However, all mandatory CEQA sections are included and, where in addition to NEPA sections, follow the City of San Diego preferred format. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, a Subsequent EIR may be prepared when substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

The advantages of a Subsequent EIR for this project include, but are not limited to, consideration of cumulative impacts that may not have been considered in the previous EIR; reduction in paperwork; avoidance of duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations; and use of the subsequent and proviously approved EIR documents in evaluating subsequent activities.

The proposed project involves increasing the width of the current Brush Management Zones. Current Brush Management Zone One is the area adjacent to structures and consists of pavement and permanently irrigated ornamental plantings. The width of Zone One currently varies from 20 feet to 40 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and 30 feet to 45 feet east of I-805 and El Camino Real. Brush Management Zone Two is an area of native <u>or naturalized</u> plant material

1-1

Introduction

thinned to 50% to reduce fuel load. Zone Two currently varies from 20 feet to 30 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and 40 feet to 50 feet further east.

In light of the size and severity of the Cedar fire, and other wildfires in October of 2003, the Fire Chief is recommending a City wide 100 foot brush management area consisting of 35 feet of Zone One and 65 feet of Zone Two. In addition, it is proposed that Zone Two would be expanded accordingly to achieve 100 feet of brush management where Zone One is less than 35 feet from existing structures. A standard 100 foot brush management zone would allow for a greater defensible space against impending fire. The project is located within the limits of City of San Diego, and includes the City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), City of San Diego Open Space Lands, private property, and lands within the California Coastal Commission jurisdiction.

Since the adoption of the MSCP in 1997, brush management zone one associated with new development has been located within the development footprint and is not allowed within the MHPA. With the proposed revisions to the LDC, zone one would be increased to thirty-five feet. For some existing structures, zone one may not be able to expand to thirty-five feet without impacting native habitat. In lieu of expanding zone one into native habitat, the proposed code amendments would increase the width zone two one foot for every one foot of zone one that could not be provided, unless the Fire Chief approved a modification on a case-by-case basis.

The City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department is currently responsible for maintaining brush management in city-owned open space areas within the City of San Diego. Project implementation on City property would initially be partially funded by the Office of Emergency Services (OES), via a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) grant that is currently being applied for by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department, which is the basis for including NEPA analysis in this SEIR/EA.

Based on a review of the proposed project by the Lead Agency [City of San Diego Development Services Department (DSD)], and pursuant to CEQA Sections 15063(a) and 15081, as amended,

Introduction

Т

l-2

I

ł

ļ

i

it has been determined that the proposed revisions to brush management zones may have a significant effect on the environment. The preparation of a draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR)/Environmental Assessment (EA), therefore, are required.

# A. <u>CEQA REQUIREMENTS</u>

This SEIR/EA has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of CEQA (California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines, as amended March 29, 1999 (California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.), City of San Diego Land Development Code (Sections 69.0201 – 69.0218) and the City of San Diego EIR Guidelines (Revised September 2002).

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA, the City of San Diego DSD has circulated a Notice of Preparation (NOP), dated March 9, 2004, to all interested agencies, groups, and individuals. All comments received were considered during preparation of this SEIR/EA. The NOP and comments received are attached in Appendix A to this SEIR/EA. Through the SEIR/EA scoping process, four environmental issue areas were identified and are addressed in this SEIR/EA. They include: (1) land use; (2) biological resources; (3) hydrology/water quality; and (4) neighborhood character/aesthetics. Other CEQA-required sections, such as Summary; Environmental Setting; Background and Description of Programs; Growth Inducement; Cumulative Impacts; Alternatives; Effects Found Not to be Significant; Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes That Would be Involved in the Proposed Action, Should it be Implemented; Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts; and Individuals and Agencies Consulted, are also included.

Issues that were determined not to be significant and reasons for the non-significance conclusions are identified in Section VIII of this SEIR/EA and include: Agriculture Resources/Natural Resources/Mineral Resources, Air Quality, Energy, Historical Resources (Archaeology), Human Health/Public Safety, Light/Glare/Shading, Noise, Odor/Nuisance, Recreational Resources,

Introduction

Paleontology, Population and Housing, Public Services and Utilities, Transportation/Circulation, and Water Conservation.

# Subsequent EIR Assessment Method

The proposed revisions to Brush Management Zones that are addressed in this SEIR/EA were identified through the application of a Geographic Information System (GIS) by overlaying a data layer that specified structures within the City of San Diego with a data layer that delineated areas adjacent to but outside of existing urban development (i.e., areas outside of development that would be open space, MHPA and other environmentally sensitive areas). Aerial photographs (digital orthophotos) were then carefully reviewed to confirm or refine the GIS mapping. All structures within the City of San Diego were reviewed to determine an average amount of defensible space for properties within the City of San Diego. Due to the nature of the data used to identify the average width of defensible space between structures and vegetation, the potential exists for structures to have more or less defensible space than of those identified in this SEIR/EA to be identified within environmentally sensitive lands.

Given the large number of open space, private lands, and other environmentally sensitive lands, impact analysis in the Subsequent EIR/EA is based on existing data such as Geographic Information System (GIS) data developed in 1995 for the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and GIS data developed by the City of San Diego relative to land use plans.

For the review and analysis of the SEIR/EA an assumption has been made regarding future implementation of the proposed brush management revisions. City staff has assumed that all property owners who will perform brush management on their property will perform the correct amount of thinning, but it is not likely that the timing of the brush management will be in accordance with the breeding season of the California gnateatcher and that brush management activities will be performed outside of the California gnateatcher breeding season (March 1 – August 15) as outlined in the proposed revised ordinance.

ì.

14

Brush Management Resitions is the Land Development Code  $S\mathrm{EJR}/\mathrm{EA}$ 

# C. <u>APPLICABLE LAND USE PLANS</u>

The following planning documents are applicable to the proposed Brush Management revisions:

City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan

Community, Park/Preserve, and Other City Area Plans (See Section IV.A Land Use for complete fist)

City of San Diego Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan

City of San Diego Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations

City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan

# SECTION III BACKGROUND AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

# A. <u>BACKGROUND OF BRUSH MANAGEMENT</u>

#### Historical Development of Brush Management

The current brosh management regulations in the Land Development Code (LDC) were developed in conjunction with the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The regulations were approved by City Council in November 1997 and by the California Coastal Commission in November of 1999. They were made effective with the entire Land Development Code Update on January 3, 2000.

The primary focus of the 1997 changes was to simplify regulations, to improve predictability, to make them more enforceable, and to coordinate brush management requirements with the City's goal to preserve environmentally sensitive habitat. Changes to the regulations included replacement of the complex three zone system of brush management of varying widths (50° to 110°) based upon classifications of fire severity with a two zone system based upon the location of the property's location west or east of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real (Figure 2). The dividing line of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real was selected based upon analysis of historical fire data in and outside areas of climatic coastal influence. The recent Cedar Fire has protupted the Fire-Rescue Department to re-evaluate the current distinction and propose a single citywide brush management system.

Currently, Brush Management Zone One is the area adjacent to structures and consists of pavement and permanently irrigated ornamental plantings. Brush Management Zone Two is an area of native <u>or naturalized</u> plant material thinned to 50% to reduce fuel load. The width of Zone One currently varies from 20 feet to 40 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and 30 feet to 45 fect east. Zone Two currently varies from 20 feet to 30 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and El Camino Real, and 40 feet to 50 feet further east. Under the current Land Development Code Section 142.0412(h)(6), property owners are responsible for maintaining brush management zones to include weeding within brush management zone two. Site visits



performed by City Staff indicate that this current regulation has not been adhered to and that invasive plant species are able to grow within thinning brush management zone two areas. Additionally, the LDC allows for alternative compliance to brush management in the form of architectural features which can be included as permit conditions for projects requiring a development permit.

# Development of the Brush Management revisions

In light of the size and severity of the Cedar fire, and other wildfires in October of 2003, the Fire Chief is recommending a City wide 100 foot brush management area consisting of 35 feet of Zone One and 65 feet of Zone Two. In addition, it is proposed that Zone Two would be expanded accordingly to achieve 100 feet of brush management where Zone One is less than 35 feet from existing structures. A standard 100 foot brush management zone would allow for a greater defensible space against impending fire (Figures 3 and 4).

Under the existing Municipal Code § 142.0412(i), the Fire Chief has the ability to enforce modification to the brush management regulations for purposes of fire protection on a case-bycase basis. As a result of the Cedar Fire, the Fire Chief is recommending implementation of the 100 foot citywide brush management regulations on a volunteer basis, until the proposed revisions to the brush management regulations can be considered for adoption by City Council. In the Coastal Zone, final adoption of the proposed revisions would require approval by the California Coastal Commission to modify the City's Local Coastal Program.

# B. <u>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</u>

# Brush Management Revisions

Brush Management Revisions consist of a City wide 100 foot brush management area consisting of 35 feet of Zone One and 65 feet of Zone Two. In addition, it is proposed that Zone Two would be expanded accordingly to achieve 100 feet of brush management where Zone One is less than 35 feet from existing structures. Brush management activities would occur outside of the California gnatcatcher breeding season (March 1 - August 15). The proposed activities would be accomplished in accordance with the San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 14, Article 2, Division





Before Brush Management <u>Environmental Analysis Section - Project No. 31245</u> CITY OF SAN DIEGO - DEVELOPMENT SERVICES Figure 3



#### Brash Management Revisions to the Land Development Code (BIR/HA

ì

i

1

4. These revisions to the regulations are proposed to address ministerial actions. The issuance of a Right-of-Entry permit by the Park and Recreation Department would be required for property owners to perform brush management in accordance with the regulations on City property. Since the adoption of the MSCP in 1997, brush management zone one associated with new development has been located within the development footprint and is not allowed within the MHPA. With the proposed revisions to the LDC, zone one would be increased to thirty-five feet. For some existing structures, zone one may not be able to expand to thirty-five feet without impacting native habitat. In lieu of expanding zone one into native habitat, the proposed code amendments would increase the width zone two one foot for every one foot of zone one that could not be provided, unless the Fire Chief approved a modification on a case-by-case basis. Per the revised brush management ordinance, the Fire Marshall could expand the total width of brush management zone one and two to exceed 100 feet. However, the SEIR/EA assumes a 100 foot average impact.

For any new discretionary projects, impacts will be assessed and mitigation required in accordance with the City of San Diego Biological resources guidelines.

#### **Procedures**

For any of the brush management methods described above, there are a number of steps that occur before, during, and after brush management activity. The following describes the typical sequence of steps in the implementing the proposed brush management revisions. Variations to these steps may sometimes occur based on site-specific characteristics. Further, the regulations are silent on methods for pruning and thinning. Pruning and thinning can be done by using hand held power tools, basic non-powered garden tools or goats.

**Preliminary Site Evaluation:** Before beginning brush management, verify where the property boundaries are to insure that the improvements you make are on the property. If brush management recommendations cannot be accomplished completely on the property and the adjacent property is City-owned open space or park land, contact the Park and Recreation Department Brush Management Section to review options to accomplish brush management requirements.

Brush Management Implementation: Based on the information collected through the preliminary site evaluation, a brush management plan is prepared. The plan identifies: locations of zone one and zone two; the thinning/pruning method(s) to be used; equipment type; proposed measures to avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive resources; and clearances and approvals required.

**Permits and Clearances:** Based on the nature, location, and extent of activities in open space and other environmentally sensitive lands that need to be completed, the necessary permits and clearances are obtained, including those from any appropriate regulatory agencies (specifically the Park and Recreation Department Right of Entry permit). A Right of Entry Permit from the Park and Recreation Department is required for any work taking place on Park and Recreation Department property.

# Controlled Grazing

Brush management pruning and thinning activities in zone two could be done by goats. This would involve using goats as a supplement to existing crews to carry out brush management zone two thinning. Thinning of vegetation would include fencing the area to be thinned, bringing in a herd of goats, which would then feed on the vegetation, thereby reducing the fuel load and creating the defensible space for fire protection. The goat herd would remain in the fenced area for two to three days then be moved to another area. This rotational grazing is referred to as controlled grazing, compared to continuous grazing which allows grazing to occur over the same plot of land without rotation <u>as referenced in Appendix G.</u>

It is currently prohibited to use goats to thin vegetation in Brush Management Zone 2. However, the "project" for purposes of this SEIR/EA includes a proposed code amendment (Appendix G) to allow Zone 2 thinning with goats; therefore, the impacts analysis includes impacts attributable to using goats.

A pilot project within the City of San Diego has recently occurred on a site near the
Brush Manazement Richtons to the Land Development Code SEIR/EA

Mission Trails Regional Park, which includes approximately 40 goats on one- third of an acre of land. Two additional sites have been added to the pilot program. It has been estimated that the goats can clear as much land as a human crew at less than half the cost. There have been cases in California, in Alameda and Contra Costa counties that have been effectively using goats as a tool for fire prevention since 1983. Additional cities in California which use this methodology include Laguna Beach, Malibu and Glendale.

<u>Goats brought in temporarily for brush management purposes will be regulated through</u> the San Diego Municipal Code, Chapter 4, Article 4, Division 3, Section 44.0307. et seq, which addresses the use of livestock within the City of San Diego. This section is in the process of being amended to permit the use of goats for brush management in nonagricultural areas, if certain very specific criteria are met.

Goats will be permitted to browse during the day, and will be moved along as the amount of vegetation thitmed reaches the 50% level. They will be fenced with electric fencing, and will be at a density of no more than 75 goats per acre. At night, goats will be penned in a small staging area, which is required to be cleaned daily, and the goats droppings disposed of properly. Goats many not be used in coastal sage scrub habitat during gnateatcher nesting season, between March 1 and August 15.

#### C. <u>OBJECTIVES OF BRUSH MANAGEMENT REVISIONS</u>

I

The objectives of the brush management revisions can be summarized as follows:

- To complete in a timely and comprehensive manner the revisions to current brush management regulations.
- To identify and implement efficient, effective, and environmentally sensitive means to accomplish the revised brush management zones one and two.

- To provide for effective and environmentally sensitive long-term maintenance of brush management zones in open space, private lands and other environmentally sensitive lands.
- To refine the regulations that provides an acceptable risk to structures and fire personnel from wildfires.

# D. <u>DISCRETIONARY ACTIONS</u>

## City Permits

City Council approval of the proposed brush management revisions to the City's Land Development Code is required to implement the proposed brush management revisions city wide. Other applicable regulations of the City's Land Development Code include Best Management Practices (Sections 142.0101 & 142.0201) and erosion control in the Landscape Regulations. With approval of the proposed revisions and certification of this SEIR, an amendment to Chapter 14, Article 2, Division 4, of the San Diego Municipal Code by amending section 142.0402; 142.0403; and 142.0412 would be implemented <u>and also amendments to Chapter 4, Article 4, Division 3, sections 44,0307.1, 44.0307.2 and 44.0307.3 and 44.0307.4</u>. The SEIR/EA is for public (including Right-Of-Entry Permits) and private activities on already developed properties; not for future brush management to facilitate future development. Zone two brush management would continue to be exempt from ESL; therefore, private brush management activities do not normally require a permit.

# E. <u>HISTORY OF PROJECT CHANGES</u>

<u>Since the ordinance was originally drafted by City Staff, the SEIR/EA has been modified as</u> <u>follows: There have been project changes for the proposed brush management revisions.</u> <u>1.</u>) Added to this Draft SEIR/EA the project was the assumption that no impacts to wetlands would occur. <u>2.</u>) Deleted from this Draft SEIR/EA the project is the ability of the Fire Marshall to expand the width of zone two brush management. <u>3.</u>) The text of the proposed revisions was Bruch Management Revisions to the Land Development Code SEIR/EA -

changed to delete the word "cleared" and replaced with "thinned". <u>4.) Time of year restrictions</u> are included in the revised ordinance which prohibits brush management activities within coastal sage scrub during California gnateatcher breeding season (March 1 – August 15).

### F. <u>PROJECT ASSUMPTIONS</u>

For purposes of this SEIR/EA the following assumptions have been made with respect to the proposed revisions to the brush management regulations:

- Brush management will be conducted any time of the year. This is based on the fact that
   Park and Recreation Department-needs to conduct brash management any time of the
   year. Additionally, as temperatures get warmer people tend to think about the threat of
   fire-and-conduct brush management.
- The site visits conducted by City staff revealed that weeding consistent with the regulations is not occurring in brush management zone two.
- Brush management will occur consistent with the regulations in terms of thinning and time of year restrictions within coastal sage scrub habitat.

# SECTION IV AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

This section includes the NEPA-required brief description of the affected environment, including the population, social, and economic characteristics providing enough detail to understand the effects of the Proposed Action and other alternatives. The location and environmental setting for the proposed action is required by CEQA is also provided.

## A. <u>LOCATION</u>

The San Diego region covers over 4,200 square miles in the southwest corner of the continental United States, bordered by Mexico and the Pacific Ocean. The region includes 18 incorporated cities and many unincorporated communities. The 18 cities and over 90 percent of the population are located in the western half of the region. The City of San Diego covers nearly 330 square miles and is located in the southwestern corner of California.

## B. <u>BACKGROUND</u>

The current brush management regulations in the Land Development Code (LDC) were developed in conjunction with the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The regulations were approved by City Council in November 1997 and by the California Coastal Commission in November of 1999. They were made effective with the entire Land Development Code Update on January 3, 2000.

The primary focus of the 1997 changes was to simplify regulations, to improve predictability, to make them more enforceable, and to coordinate brush management requirements with the City's goal to preserve environmentally sensitive habitat. Changes to the regulations included replacement of the complex three zone system of brush management of varying widths (50' to 110') based upon classifications of fire severity with a two zone system based upon the location of the property's location west or east of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real. The dividing line of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real was selected based upon analysis of historical fire data in and outside areas of climatic coastal influence.

# SECTION V ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This section of the SEIR/EA provides a detailed discussion of subject areas that would be significantly impacted by the proposed action as well as a description of the proposed mitigation measures. This includes information developed during the Initial Study process and the response period for the Notice of Preparation. It includes a discussion of impacts as they relate to all Specific Impact Categories as a requirement of NEPA and discussion of any additional considerations necessary to satisfy CEQA guidelines.

## A. LAND USE

#### EXISTING CONDITIONS

### Existing Land Use Setting

The San Diego region has one of the most biologically diverse environments in the continental United States, supporting a variety of species and habitat types. This is partially due to the region's varied topography, climate, and soils. The region supports many types of environmental areas such as deserts, coasts, mountains, and maritime communities. The various topography affects all types of development on canyon rims and adjacent to other natural open spaces. Older developments have lots that run to the bottom of the adjacent canyons. More recent developments require easements in the canyons. For the most part, larger canyon areas found throughout the City are city owned. Each of these areas supports a unique assemblage of plant and animal species. There are approximately 1,700 species of plants, 80 of mammals, over 400 of birds, 75 of reptiles and amphibians, 125 of butterflies, and over 10,000 terrestrial and aquatic invertebrates known to occur within the region.

## Relevant Planning Documents

## City of San Diego General, Community, Park/Preserve and Other Plans

Land use regulations are guided by the City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan (City of San Diego 1979). The Progress Guide and General Plan provide overall land use goals, objectives, and recommendations for the entire City.

On October 22, 2002, the City Council adopted the City of Villages – Strategic Framework Element (SFE), a new long-term growth strategy that would replace the existing chapter "Guidelines for Future Development" within the City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan. The SFE provides policies to direct future growth as San Diego shifts from an era of building upon abundant open land to one of reinvesting in existing communities.

In addition to the Progress Guide and General Plan, there are 38 community plans in San Diego, as well as a number of adopted area planning documents for parks, special resource areas, and specific plan areas.

#### Community and Other City Area Plans

Carnel Valley (North City West) Community Plan Clairemont Mesa Community Plan Del Mar Mesa Specific Plan East Mesa Precise Plan, Balboa Park Elliot Community Plan Fairbanks Ranch Country Club Specific Plan Golden Hill Community Plan Greater North Park Community Plan Kearuy Mesa Community Plan La Jolla Community Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan (Draft) Linda Vista Community Plan and LCP Land Use Plan Mid-City Communities Plan Mid-City Design Plan Midway Pacific Highway Corridor Community Plan Mira Mesa Community Plan Miramar Ranch North Community Plan Mission Valley Community Plan Navajo Community Plan Ocean Beach Precise Plan and LCP Addendum

Old Town San Diego Community Plan Otay Mesa Community Plan Otay Mesa-Nestor Community Plan Pacific Beach Community Plan and LCP Land Use Plan Pacific Highlands Ranch Subarea Plan Peninsula Community Plan and LCP Land Use Plan Rancho Bernardo Community Plan Rancho Penasquitos Community Plan Sabre Springs Community Plan San Pasqual Valley Plan San Ysidro Community Plan Scripps Miramar Ranch Community Plan Serra Mesa Community Plan Skyline-Paradise Hills Community Plan Southeastern San Diego Community Plan Tierrasanta Community Plan Tijuana River Valley LCP Land Use Plan Torrey Highlands Subarea Plan Torrey Pines Community Plan University Community Plan Uptown Community Plan Via de la Valle Specific Plan

#### Park/Preserve and Other Plans

1.

Balboa Park Master Plan Balboa Park Master Plan Amendment Chollas Creek Enhancement Program Famosa Slough Enhancement Plan First San Diego River Improvement Project Natural Resource Management Plan (Draft) Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Master Plan Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Natural Resource Management Plan Marian Bear Memorial Park Natural Resource Management Plan Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update Mission Bay Park Natural Resource Management Plan Otay Valley Regional Park Master Development Plan San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan Tecolote Canyon Natural Park Master Plan Western Otay Valley Regional Park Master Plan Western Otay Valley Regional Park Natural Resource Management Plan (Draft)

## City of San Diego Local Coastal Program

The City's Local Coastal Program (LCP) governs the decisions that determine the short- and long-term conservation and use of the City's coastal resources. The LCP consists of two components: the land use plan (LUP) and the implementing ordinances found in the zoning and land development sections of the Land Development Code. The City of San Diego has elected to divide their coastal zone jurisdictions into twelve segments. Thus, there are twelve LUPs that make up the City's overall LUP. Policies and recommendations that make up the various LUPs are included and incorporated into the community plans and/or other planning documents for the segment areas. The following LUPs and associated community and other planning documents may be affected by, or relevant to, the implementation of the Brush Management Revisions:

- North City LUP (Carmel Valley (North City West) Community Plan, Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Natural Resource Management Plan, Mira Mesa Community Plan, Pacific Highlands Ranch Subarea Plan, Torrey Pines Community Plan, University Community Plan and Via de la Valle Specific Plan)
- La Jolla/La Jolla Shores LUP (La Jolla Community Plan and LCP Land Use Plan)
- Pacific Beach LUP (Pacific Beach Community Plan and LCP Land Use Plan)
- Mission Bay LUP (Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update and Linda Vista Community Plan and LCP Land Use Plan)
- Peninsula LUP (Peninsula Community Plan and LCP Land Use Plan)
- Otay Mesa/Nestor LUP (Otay Mesa/Nestor Community Plan)
- Tijuana River Valley LCP Land Use Plan

All twelve of the City's LUPs have been certified by the California Coastal Commission; thus, the City is the governing agency for issuance of Coastal Development Permits. However, there are some "areas of suspended certification" within various coastal zone segments that await resolution by the Commission. Within these suspended certification areas, the California Coastal Commission is the governing agency for the issuance of Coastal Development Permits.

ł

4

#### City of San Diego Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations

The purpose of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations (San Diego Land Development Code, Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 1) is to protect, preserve, and, where damaged, restore the environmentally sensitive lands of San Diego and the viability of the species supported by those lands. The ESL regulations serve to implement the MSCP by placing priority on the preservation of biological resources within the MHPA.

ESL regulations apply to all proposed development when any of the following environmentally sensitive lands are present on the project area: sensitive biological resources; steep hillsides (defined generally as all lands that have a slope with a natural gradient of 25 percent or greater); coastal beaches; sensitive coastal bluffs; and 100-year floodplains.

All proposed developments that encroach into environmentally sensitive lands must obtain either a Neighborhood Development Permit or a Site Development Permit. If development is proposed in the Coastal Overlay Zone, a Coastal Development Permit is also required. Limited exceptions to ESL regulations, including Zone Two brush management, apply in certain circumstances.

The ESL regulations contain development regulations for each type of sensitive land (sensitive biological resources, steep hillsides, coastal beaches etc.). Within the Coastal Overlay Zone (Figure 5), the ELS regulations generally establish a 25 percent allowable development area in steep hillside areas, although development of up to 40 percent is permitted under certain circumstances for certain types of development, including public utility systems. Additionally, the ESL regulations for projects occurring within the Coastal Overlay Zone require a 100-foot buffer to be maintained around all wetlands, as appropriate, to protect the functions and values of the wetland. A lesser or greater buffer may be warranted based on consultation with the resources agencies (i.e., USACE, USFWS, and CDFG).

effective on July 16, 1997, and allows the City to issue Incidental Take Authorizations for listed species under the provisions of the MSCP without having to obtain separate permits from the state or federal governments. Applicable state and federal permits are still required for wetlands and listed species that are not covered by the MSCP.

The MSCP also provides protection for narrow endemic species. Narrow endemics are species with restricted geographic distribution, soil affinities, and/or habitats and are considered sensitive biological resources. Narrow endemic plant species have been identified in the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan (p.106) and include Acanthomintha ilicifolia (San Diego thornmint), Agave shawii (Shaw's agave), Ambrosia pumila (San Diego ambrosia), Aphanisma blitoides (aphanisma), Astragalus tener var, titi (coastal dunes milk vetch), Deinandra conjugens (Otay tarplant), Dudleya blochmaniae ssp. brevifolia (short-leaved dudleva). Dudleya variegata (variegated dudleva). Navarretia fossalis (prostrate navarretia), Opuntia parryi var. serpentine (snake cholla), Orcuttia californica (California orcutt grass). Pogogyne abramsii (San Diego mesa mint), Pogogyne nudiuscula (Otay mesa mint), Baccharis vanessae (Encinitas baccharis) and Eryngium aristulatum var. parishii (San Diego button celery).

The latter two species were added during the final MSCP plan (p. 3-27) or identified in Table 3-5 of the City of San Diego's MSCP Subarea Plan. Table V.A-1 provides information on the various narrow endemics, their lifeforms, flowering periods, and habitat associations.

Species	<u>Lifeform</u>	<u>Flowering</u> <u>Period</u>	<u>Habitat</u>
Aphanisma	Annual herb	Apr-May	Southern foredunes
<u>San Diego</u> <u>thornmint</u>	Annual herb	Apr-May	<u>CSS, Chaparral. Native</u> grassland
<u>San Diego</u> ambrosia	Perennial herb	May-Oct	<u>CSS</u>
Shaw's agave	Leaf succulent	Sep-May	Southern Maritime, CSS
Coastal dunes milk vetch	<u>Annual herb</u>	<u>Mar-May</u>	Southern foredunes

Table V.A-1 Biological characteristics of City of San Diego MSCP narrow endemics.

3

Brush Management Retrinous to the Land Development Code SEIR/EA

Species	<u>Lifeform</u>	<u>Flowering</u> <u>Period</u>	Habitat
Encinitas baccharis	Deciduous shrub	Sep-Nov	Chaparral
<u>Short-leaved</u> <u>dudleya</u>	Perennial herb	Apr-Jun	Open areas within chaparral
Variegated dudleya	Perennial herb	May-Jun	Open areas within chaparral or CSS
Otay taplant	<u>Annual herb</u>	May-Jun	CSS, Grassland
Prostrate navarretia	Annual herb	Apr-Jun	Vernal Pools
<u>California orcutt</u> grass	Annual herb	May-Jui	Vernal Pools
Snake cholla	Stem succulent	Apr-May	Chaparral, CSS
<u>San Diego mesa</u> <u>mint</u>	<u>Annual herb</u>	Apr-Jun	Vernal Pools
<u>Otay mesa mint</u>	Annual herb	May-Jun	Vernal Pools
<u>San Diego button</u> <u>celery</u>	Annua]/perennial herb	Mar-July	Vernal Pools, Grassland

CSS - Coastal Sage Scrub

I

i

1

i

Sources Reauchann, 1986; California Native Plant Society, 2004.

Inside the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the MSCP, narrow endemic species require avoidance; outside the MHPA they must be avoided, managed, enhanced, or transplanted as appropriate (p. 105 of City of San Diego Subarea Plan).

The subregional MSCP Plan (August 1998) specifically addresses fire management (section 6.3.4) and acknowledges that brush management is necessary for human safety, protection of property, and hazard reduction. The Subregional MSCP Plan allows the fuel management zone between development and the preserve to vary in width and to be within the preserve. Fire management for human safety was to be implemented in a manner that is compatible with the conservation of biological resources. To accomplish this objective, a Wildland/Urban Interface Task Force was assembled to draft countywide planning and construction standards and fuel modification standards. The Task Force consisted of the San Diego County Fire Chiefs' Association, USFWS, CDFG, California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), U.S. Forest Services, and staff from various jurisdictions. The City of San Diego is a member of the San Diego County Fire Chiefs' Association. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among

these parties was developed with the purpose to manage fire hazards in concert with habitat protection. The MOU was signed by all parties in February 1997.

The purpose of the MOU was to establish guidelines so that CDF, Fire Chiefs and the Districts could continue to protect lives and property from the threat of fire through the abatement of flammable vegetation pursuant to State Law, County and District ordinances and Cities' municipal codes. Also, it was to establish a cooperative mechanism whereby the USFS and CDFG could assess, minimize, and help account for potential adverse impacts to sensitive species and habitats resulting from vegetation abatement activities. Through the MOU, the USFWS (under Chapter 1.5 Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code) authorized take of species listed as threatened or endangered, or candidate species (under Chapter 1.5 of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code) for management purposes necessitated by or incidental to those measures necessary to implement minimum fire safety standards related to defensible space.

The MOU allows property owners, their lessees, CDF, fire districts, and cities to thin all flammable vegetation within a one hundred (100) foot radius of all structures using methods, such as mowing and trimming that would leave the plant root structure intact to stabilize the soil. The MOU requires that the fire agencies develop guidelines for the public which include directions as to the limits for brush management and acceptable thinning methods. Additionally, the MOU states that wetlands should be avoided, unless vegetation abatement is deemed necessary by the Fire Chief. If deemed necessary, then consultation with the USFWS and CDFG shall be required ten days prior to any wetland abatement activities. No wetlands impacts are anticipated to occur with implementation of the proposed changes to the LDC, brush management regulations.

On June 6, 1997 the USFWS issued a Biological and Conference Opinion (Biological Opinion) on Issuance of an Incidental Take Permit to the City of San Diego pursuant to the MSCP (1-6-97-FW-47). The Biological Opinion anticipated that impacts from development could include direct take such as killing or injuring individuals, or damaging plants, harm resulting from habitat loss, and/or harassment due to edge effects. The Biological Opinion determined that the biological integrity of habitats adjoining development could be diminished by adverse edge



within the MHPA. The Subarea Plan, section 1.4.3, addresses the adjacency of existing and planned land uses to the MHPA. The Land Use Adjacency Guidelines include drainage, toxics, lighting, noise, barriers, invasives, brush management, and grading/land development. The adjacency guidelines are addressed during the approval process for proposed public and private projects.

In accordance with the City's current regulations and policies brush management zone two is allowed year-round within the MHPA and elsewhere and is considered impact neutral (not considered an impact and not considered acceptable as a mitigation area). Per Section 143.0110 of the Land Development Code (LDC), a Neighborhood Development Permit or Site Development Permit is not required for Zone Two brush management activities if the brush management complies with Section 142.0412 of the Land Development Code (Brush Management) and the City of San Diego, Biology Guidelines. The following are the current requirements for brush management zone two; the only revision proposed to these requirements in changing the word "cleared" to "thinned":

- 50 percent of the plants over 18 inches in height shall be cut and cleared to a height of 6 inches
- all plants remaining after 50 percent are cut and cleared shall be pruned to reduce fuel loading
- no non-native plant material may be planted inside the MHPA or adjacent to areas containing sensitive biological resources
- no permanent irrigation is allowed
- Zone Two shall be maintained on a regular basis by pruning and thinning plants, controlling weeds, and maintaining any temporary irrigation system

A three zone system of brush management, consistent with Uniform Fire Code Appendix IIA, with widths varying from fifty to one hundred and ten feet was in effect when the MSCP was adopted in 1997. The current brush management regulations (Land Development Code, Section 142.0412) were developed in conjunction the MSCP. The regulations were approved by City Council in November 1997 and by the California Coastal Commission in November of 1999. The current code is a two zone system based upon the property's location west or east of

Interstate 805 and El Camino Real. The width of Zone One currently varies from twenty feet to thirty-five feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and thirty feet to forty-five feet on the east. Zone two currently varies for twenty feet to thirty feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and forty feet to fifty feet on the cast. Under the current LDC regulations, there are no restrictions on the timing of brush management activities and no changes are proposed with this project and the proposed brush management revisions do not allow brush management activities to occur during California gnateatcher breeding scason (March 1 – August 15).

As a result of the Cedar Fire and other wildfires in October of 2003, the Fire Chief is proposing a city-wide one hundred foot brush management area consisting of a thirty-five foot brush management zone one and a sixty-five foot brush management zone two.

## Water Quality Regulatory Framework

The regulatory framework for water quality includes the 1972 Clean Water Act, which established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program to regulate the discharge of pollutants from industrial, commercial, and institutional processes, and point sources to waters of the United States, and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 which require that Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) be prepared for the nine state-designated hydrologic basins in California, including the San Diego Region basin. The water quality regulatory framework is more fully described in Section V.E, Hydrology and Water Quality. As Indicated in Section V.E, the City of San Diego has prepared an Urban Runoff Management Plan (URMP- adopted by the City Council on January 28, 2002) as part of the City of San Diego's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP – completed by the San Diego co-permittees on February 7, 2002), in accordance with requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board NPDES permit procedure. These documents address the process that the City will undertake to improve water quality. In addition to the URMP and SUSMP, protection of surface water quality is also provided through the NPDES General Construction Permit for the State of California.

## ISSUE STATEMENTS

- Would the project result in a conflict with the purpose and intent of any current planning process or adopted environmental plans or policies in the City of San Diego, including lands within the California Coastal Commission jurisdiction?
- 2. Would the proposed project result in a conflict with the purpose and intent of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) regulations of the Land Development Code (LDC)?
- 3. How is the project consistent with the region's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the City of San Diego - MSCP Subarea Plan?

## ІМРАСТ

## Criteria for Significance Determination

The following criteria were used to assist in making determinations of significant land use impacts (City of San Diego, 2001).

- Inconsistency/conflict with the environmental goals, objectives, or guidelines of a community or general plan.
- Inconsistency/conflict with an adopted land use designation or intensity and indirect or secondary environmental impacts occur (for example, development of a designated school or park site with a more intensive land use could result in traffic impacts).
- Substantial or extreme use incompatibility, for example, a rock crusher in a residential area; Conditional Use Permits sometimes create impacts because conflicting uses are proposed.
- 4. Development or conversion of general plan or community plan designated open space to a more intensive land use.
- 5. Inconsistency/conflict with adopted environmental plans for an area. For example, development of a non-designated use within the boundaries of a park master plan would fall into this category.

#### Analysis of Impacts

The proposed revisions to the Land Development Code related to brush management, zone two would result in an estimated City-wide impact of 2,880 acres. Of this total, 715 acres would be within the MiIPA, of which 242 acres would be within the core biological areas and habitat linkages. The MHPA will preserve 52,012 acres, which includes 35,648 acres within the core biological and habitat linkages areas. Therefore, impacts from the thinning and pruning activities associated with zone two brush management would potentially impact 1.4 percent of the MHPA and 0.7 percent of the core/linkages areas. The following Table V.A.- $\pm 2$  further identifies the anticipated impacts that would occur habitats by Tier (see Biological Resources Section V.B. for a full discussion of biological impacts). No impacts to wetlands are expected to occur with implementation of the proposed LDC code revisions, because no brush management is required within wetland areas.

Table	V.	A-	$^{+2}$

Habitat Impacts from Proposed Revisions to Brush Management Regulations			
Habitat Type	Citywide Impacts	MHPA impacts	Core/Linkage Impacts
1	75	46	30
n	708	312	81
π	465	222	81
ſV	1632	135	50
Totals	2880	715	242

A majority of the impacts from the proposed revisions to brush management zone two would occur within smaller urban canyons and would not be part of the larger core biological areas and linkages. Impacts to the core biological and linkages areas would be limited to 0.7 percent (242 acres). Additionally, all impacts would be within the 200-foot buffer identified in the MSCP EIR/EIS for edge effects. No impacts to narrow endemic species are expected to occur because these species are generally less than eighteen inches in height and would not be subject to

thinning per the brush management regulations. The exception would be Encinitas baccharis, which has an average height of eighty inches; however no known locations of this species are within the proposed brush management zone two areas. Where brush management conducted by humans could avoid impacts to narrow endemics, it is conceivable that goats could indiscriminately graze on narrow endemics.

The areas identified for expanded brush management activities are not located within any of the narrow endemic species' major population areas discussed in the MSCP Plan Table 3.5 'details for the rationale for identifying species as covered.' Additionally, the MSCP database identifies no narrow endemic species locations within the areas identified for expanded brush management. As discussed above, impacts to narrow endemics within the MHPA must be avoided, and outside the MHPA they must be avoided, managed, enhanced, or transplanted as appropriate.

As proposed, brush management would be prohibited from (March 1 – August 15) in gnatcatcher habitat (i.c., coastal sage scrub and southern maritime scrub). This period coincides with the flowering periods of many narrow endemic species. The prohibition on brush management activities during the gnatcatcher breeding season would eliminate impacts on narrow endemics in coastal sage scrub and southern maritime scrub during this time.

Vernal pools were extensively mapped by the City in 2002-2003; no vernal pools are located in the proposed brush management area. As such, no impacts on vernal pool narrow endemic species would result from the proposed project. Potential impacts on narrow endemics from the proposed project would be less than significant.

Since potential project impacts would be within the 200-foot buffer analyzed in the MSCP EIR/EIS for edge effects, no additional impacts to the preserve configuration, structural diversity and habitat interfaces of the MHPA would occur. Impacts would generally be limited to areas outside the core biological areas and would not impact major habitat linkages or wildlife corridors, therefore, the conservation of covered species would be maintained and there would not be a significant increase in the likelihood that an uncovered species will meet the criteria for listing under either the federal or state Endangered Species Act. The proposed 100-foot brush

ì

V.A-15

management zones would be consistent with the MOU between the USFWS, CDFG, and various Fire agencies as well as the MSCP Subregional Plan and MSCP Subarea Plan.

The MSCP Subarea Plan (Table 3-5) and City of San Diego Biology Guidelines places restrictions on grading, thinning, and grubbing during the breeding season of seven sensitive species. Six of these species would not be affected by the proposed change to the brush management regulations because either they occur outside of the areas proposed for brush management (e.g. beach areas) or the habitats they occur in will not be impacted (e.g. wetlands). These species include western snowy plover, southwestern flycatcher, least tern, cactus wren, least bell's vireo, and the tricolored black bird. For the remaining species, the California gnateatcher, no timing restrictions apply outside the MHPA. Within the MHPA, restrictions on grading, thinning, and grubbing activities apply during the breeding season (March 1 – August 15).

Under the current LDC regulations, there are no restrictions on the timing of brush management activities, and no changes are proposed with this project however, this project proposes to restrict brush management activities during the California gnateatcher breeding season (March 1 – August 15). The MOU (page 2) between the USFWS, CDFG, and various Fire agencies allows for take of species (under Chapter 1.5 of Division 3 of Fish and Game Code) listed as threatened or endangered, or candidate species for management purposes necessitated by or incidental to fire protection measures, including fire safety standards related to defensible space and does not limit the timing of the brush management activities. The MOU is referenced in the subregional MSCP Plan (section 6.3.4) and Biological Opinion (page 68) for the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. Additionally, as addressed above in the MSCP land use adjacency guidelines discussion, potential noise impacts from the additional brush management activities would be less than significant.

#### Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses

Land uses within the City of San Diego are currently guided by the individual community plans; the plans for areas along the coast also serve as local coastal plans. The Strategic Framework Element (SFE) of the City's General Plan and Progress Guide, a new city wide growth/development strategy, was adopted by the City Council on October 22, 2002. The SFE also known as the City of Villages, is a vision for the continuing growth in the City through urban infill and redevelopment, and it attempts to focus future mixed use development along established, major transit corridors and combines intensified urban land uses with walkability, public open spaces, and enhanced urban design. The adoption of the SFE and its accompanying Action Plan also starts the process of updating the various elements of the City's General Plan and Progress Guide. As part of this elements update process in addition to the community-specific land use policies and designations in the individual community plans, a new Land Use Element will be written. This proposed Land Use Element would provide city wide guidance for the implementation of the City of Villages strategy.

## Consistency with City Planning Documents

The following discussion includes proposed revisions consistency with relevant planning documents.

The consistency of the proposed city wide, expanded brush management zones to city wide land use policies/regulations was analyzed with a survey of the adopted, individual community plans and a few appropriate precise or specific plans for planning areas either containing or adjoining large naturally-vegetated open space areas. These areas include slopes of the San Dieguito River, Gonzales Canyon, Torrey Pines Preserve, Mission Trails Regional Park, Black Mountain Park, eastern MCAS Miramar, southern slopes and side canyons of Mission Valley, Chollas Creek drainages, Tecolote Canyon, San Clemente Canyon, Penasquitos Canyon, Deer Canyon, Rose Canyon, Beeler Canyon, Murphy Canyon, Dennery Canyon, Spring Canyon, Crest Canyon, Switzer Canyon, Kate Sessions Park, canyons of Mt. Soledad, Otay River, canyons of Balboa Park, slopes along Martin Luther King Freeway (SR 94), and the watersheds of Chollas Lake, Lake Murray, and Miramar Lake. i

#### City of San Diego Local Coastal Program

1

As indicated previously, the policies and recommendations that make up the various LUPs of the City's overall LCP are included and incorporated into the goals, objectives, and recommendations of the community plans and/or other area planning documents.

#### City of San Diego Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations

Although the proposed revisions to brush management zones would be designed to avoid or minimize impacts to environmental sensitive lands, some brush management zones are expected to encroach upon sensitive lands, including those that contain sensitive biological resources, steep hillsides, and 100-year floodplains (please refer to Section V.B, Biological Resources, for a discussion of potential impacts to sensitive biological resources). Some of the brush management zones may also encroach onto coastal beaches and/or sensitive coastal bluffs. As discussed in Section V.B. Biological Resources, the proposed revisions could result in impacts to the California Gnateatcher during the breeding season. This would not be consistent with the ESL regulations. Additionally, there is the potential that some individual projects within the City of San Diego would not be consistent with the allowed encroachment percentages into steep hillside if brush management zone one would be located within open space or other sensitive lands described in the ESL regulations.

#### City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan

The proposed project would be located within the limits of the City of San Diego, and would include locations within the MHPA, City of San Diego Open Space Lands, private property, and lands within the Coastal Commission jurisdiction. Current brush management regulations in the Land Development Code (LDC) were developed in conjunction with the MSCP. Since the adoption of the MSCP in 1997, brush management zone one associated with new development has been located within the development footprint and is not allowed within the MHPA. With the proposed revisions to the LDC, zone one would be increased to thirty-five feet. <u>However</u>.

Ffor some existing structures, zone one may not be able to expand to thirty-five feet without impacting native habitat. In lieu of expanding zone one into native habitat, the proposed code amendments would increase the width zone two one foot for every one foot of zone one that could not be provided, unless the Fire Chief approved a modification on a case-by-case basis.

According to the Subregional MSCP Plan, Section 6.3.4 and the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines, brush management zone two is allowed within the MHPA and is considered impact neutral. The current regulations were approved by the City Council in November 1997 and by the California Coastal Commission in November of 1999. They were made effective with the entire LDC on January 3, 2000. The Table V. A-23 below depicts impacts from the proposed additional brush management zone two requirements. The proposed project would increase brush management requirements zone two within the MHPA by 715 acres. Of that acreage, impacts to core habitat and linkage areas would be limited to 242 acres.

TABLE V.	A- <u>23</u>
----------	--------------

Impacts from Proposed Revisions to Brush Management Regulations			
Region	Citywide Impacts	MHPA Impacts	Core/Linkage Impacts
Coastal Zone	413 acres	102 acres	70 acres
West of I-805 (outside of Coastal zone)	1148 acres	223 acres	50 acres
East of I-805	1319 acres	390 acres	122 acres
Tutals	2880 acres	715 acres	242 acres

In the EIR/EIS, a number of assumptions were used to evaluate whether the proposed MHPA preserve would result in adequate coverage of species and habitats. The assumptions included factors such as proposed habitat conservation (amount and spatial configuration) management actions, and existing, local, state, and federal regulations and policies that would continue to be applied both within and outside the preserve. A minimum edge effect of 200 feet along the

Bruch Management Resistons to the Land Development Code SETE/EA

inside boundary of the preserve was assumed for indirect impacts. The EIR/EIS evaluated indirect impacts that could potentially occur within and adjacent to the preserve. Indirect impacts could include, but are not limited to, human intrusion, toxic chemicals (fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and other hazardous materials,), noise dust, lighting, soil erosion, exotic plants and animals, fire management, and hydrologic and drainage changes. The EIR/EIS assumed a 200-foot wide strip along the inside edge of the regional preserve boundary, as much as 20% (34,000 acres) or greater, could be subject to existing or future edge effects. The 200-foot buffer area for the City of San Diego MHPA would total 17,634 acres.

The EIR/EIS determined that indirect impacts to covered species, uncovered species, and sensitive vegetation communities/habitats would result from permitted uses within the preserve, edge effects from uses adjacent to the preserve, and increased development pressure outside the preserve. These impacts were considered significant. The City's MSCP covers eighty-five targeted animal and plant species and their habitat including fifteen narrow endemic species. The EIR/EIS determined indirect impacts to covered species and uncovered non-wetland sensitive species/habitats would be mitigated to below a level of significance with implementation of preserve management/planning guidelines identified in the MSCP Subarea Plan and the City's associated ordinances (i.e. Resource Protection Ordinance, Environmental Sensitive Lands). The MSCP Subarea Plan specifically addresses brush management in soction 1.4.3, Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.

The City Council directives related to brush management were incorporated into the MSCP Subarea Plan, Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (section 1.4.3). A three zone system of brush management with total widths varying from fifty to one hundred and ten feet was in effect when the MSCP was adopted in 1997. The Policy direction regarding brush management was incorporated into the Land Development Code under section 142.0412 brush management regulations and became effective on January 1, 2000. Other issues addressed in the MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines are addressed below:

Drainage: The current regulations state no permanent irrigation is allowed within zone two. If new plantings occur within zone two, the plantings shall be temporarily irrigated until

i (. **A 2**0

established. The overspray and runoff from the irrigation shall not drift or flow into adjacent areas of native or unturalized vegetation. There are no changes proposed to these requirements, therefore no impacts due to drainage would occur from the project proposal.

Toxics: Brush management zone two involves the thinning and pruning of vegetation and would not introduce toxics into the MHPA.

Lighting: All work would occur within daylight hours; therefore no impacts related to lighting would occur.

Noise: The proposal would include an incremental increase in zone two brush management activities. The increased width in zone two would range from twenty-five to forty-five feet within or adjacent the MHPA. Currently, there are no timing restrictions on brush management activities and no changes are proposed with this project. Brush management, zone two would involve thinning and pruning of vegetation. Hand tools and small mechanical tools, such as weed whackers or goats would be utilized. Brush management activities would likely occur every one to three years and last for one to two days. The principal concern relating to indirect noise and activity impacts is the potential for disturbance of nesting that would result in nest site abandonment for periods long enough to effect eggs or young through chilling, predation, or starvation. Due to the short duration of the work and localized activities associated with brush management zone two, it is not anticipated that a significant noise impact would occur during the breeding season of sensitive species.

Barriers: The adjacency guidelines require that all new development provide barriers along the MHPA boundaries to direct public access to appropriate locations and reduce domestic animal predation. Implementation of zone two brush management activities would not conflict with these requirements or provide additional public access to the MHPA.

Invasives: Current regulations require that no non-native plant material may be planted in zone two either inside the MHPA or adjacent to areas containing sensitive biological resources. The current regulations are consistent with the MSCP adjacency guidelines and there are no changes Bruth Management Retaining to the Land Development Code VSIR/EA

proposed to these requirements. Furthermore, the proposed city-wide one hundred foot brush management area would be well within the two hundred foot buffer identified in the MSCP EIR/EIS for edge effects. Edge effects include indirect impacts from thinning and pruning activities associated with fire management activities.

Grading/Land Development: No grading would occur with the implementation of the additional zone two brush management activities.

#### Water Quality Regulatory Framework

i

As discussed in Section V.C, Hydrology/Water Quality, implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would not result in the potential for significant impacts to erosion in open space, private lands and other environmentally sensitive lands. The proposed revisions would support the intent, goals, objectives, and policies of the San Diego Basin Plan, as well as the URMP and SUSMP, in protecting surface water quality within the region.

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

The surveyed plans showed that while all plans called for preservation of naturally vegetated, open spaces within their planning area, there is a wide range of treatment of brush management; it varies from tacit reference to the City's Land Development Code (the municipal code) to stated reference to the code to statements regarding brush thinning and/or transition to open space, and to specific reference to brush management. These references were found in various places within the plan texts including sections dealing with open space, landscaping, fire protection, or a few specific brush management sections. Specific references to brush management were referenced in the plans for Clairemont Mesa, Miratnar Ranch North, Black Mountain Ranch, Torrey Pines, Sorrento Hills, Rancho Penasquitos, and Pacific Highlands (Subarea III). Written or silent in the individual plan text, brush management is a important consideration in city wide land use and in development adjoining portions of the City which has been designated for natural open space.

The areas identified for potential villages by the recently adopted citywide development and growth strategy, the SFE, are mostly urban infill/redevelopment located along established major

transit corridors. Potential villages were identified and limited to those which avoid naturally vegetated open space and/or the MHPA. Therefore, brush management should not be an issue with this citywide strategy.

Land use regulation such as brush management is one of the police powers which has been long upheld as legitimate use by municipalities in protecting public health and safety. There is a need to balance protection of structures from wildfires and the preservation of natural open space. This balance has been addressed by the City of San Diego (as well as the subregion) evidenced by its adoption of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and by its continuing implementation of the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), the planned habitat preserve. (See following discussion of the MSCP-MHPA and the related separate biological impact analysis.) In a more practical view, the proposed sufficient brush management expansion as determined for this project, is a necessity for public safety as well as a tool to not only balance land uses by buffering open space and development but also to allow these seemingly divergent land uses to coexist side-by-side in our semi-arid climate. Brush management is a demonstrated need in a populated region with prolonged dry, hot summers.

The proposed brush management expansion would not pose a significant land use effect because it is generally consistent with the goals and policies of community and specific plans of the City, it would not impact the regional planned land use balance of development and open spacehabitat preservation within a urbanized area, and it is a demonstrated, needed public safety measure.

The Biological Opinion acknowledged that edge effects from fire management could occur (page 67) and that direct and indirect effects to the gnateatcher will be minimized through preservation of large, connected blocks of habitat (page 70). The proposed increase in the brush management zone two would have minimal impacts to the core/linkages areas(0.7 percent) and the 12,176 acres of associated coastal sage scrub habitat (81 acres/0.5 percent). Per the regional vegetation database developed for the MSCP, only 5 sites out 377 of known gnateatcher locations would be potentially impacted by the additional thinning and pruning activities associated with the increased width of brush management zone two. The proposed project would be in compliance

with the MOU between the USFWS, CDFG, and various Fire agencies and would have a low potential to impact gnateatchers during the breeding season within the MHPA.

# MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Impacts to land use would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

## B. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following discussion is based on a biological resources study completed for the Canyon Sewer Cleaning Program and Long-Term Sewer Maintenance Program EIR (LDR No. 6020, SCH No. 2002041129) by Merkel & Associates in December 2002 and a biological technical report written by Holly Cheong, City of San Diego, MSCP-Planning staff. A copy of the biological technical report written by Holly Cheong is included as Appendix B.

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing biological resources documented in this section were determined through an extensive review of the most current biological literature and Geographical Information Systems (GIS) data available for the City of San Diego. Vegetation communities and the distribution of the proposed brush management regulations relative to the MHPA and sensitive plant and animal species were identified based on the regional vegetation map, prepared by the City of San Diego, which is incorporated into the MSCP database (SANGIS 1995).

General flora and fauna species were determined based on the identified vegetation communities and the species that typically occur in these habitats. The presence or potential for presence of sensitive biological resources was assessed based on the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB 2002) records and general knowledge of species-specific habitat requirements.

#### Biological Habitats and Communities

A host of upland and wetland vegetation communities, defined according to the current Holland Code (HC) classification system (Holland 1986) and San Diego County terrestrial vegetation community descriptions (Oberbauer 1996), occur within the City of San Diego. Only those communities which could potentially be impacted by the proposed brush management revisions within the project area are discussed. For ease discussion, some of the habitats have been grouped under broader habitat categories that are specifically addressed within the City Land Development Manual – Biology Guidelines (as amended May 19, 2001). These categories are organized by habitat tiers, as specified in the City's Biology Guidelines, rather than natural habitat groupings (Table V.B-1). ł

1

T

ï

ł

1

į

UPLAND HABITATS	
	Habitat Type
Tier I:	Southern Foredunes
(rare uplands)	Torrey Pines Forest
	Coastal Bluff Scrub
	Maritime Succulent Scrub
	Maritime Chaparral
	Scrub Oak Chaparral
	Native Grassland
	Oak Woodland
Tier II:	Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS)
(uncommon uplands)	CSS/Chaparcal
Tier III A:	Chaparral
(common uplands)	Mixed Chaparral
	Chamise Chaparral
Tier III B:	Valley and Foothill Grasslands
(common uplands)	Non-native Grasslands
Tier IV;	Urbatt/Developed
	Disturbed
(other uplands)	Agriculture
	Eucalyptus Woodland
WETLAND HABITATS	
Coastal	Salt Marsh
	Salt Panne/Mudflat
Riparian	Oak Riparian Forest
•	Riparian Forest
	Riparian Woodland
	Riparian Scrub/Riparian Scrub in the Coastal Overlay
	Zone
	Riparian and Bottomland Habitat
Freshwater Marsh	Freshwater Seep
	Freshwater Marsh/Freshwater Marsh in the Coastal
	Overlay Zone
Disturbed Wetland	Disturbed Wetland
Unvegetated Freshwater	Non-vegetated Channel, Floodway, Lakeshore Fringe
	Unvegetated Habitat Freshwater
Marine Habitats	Unvegetated Habitat Estuarine
	Unvegetated Habitat Beach
	Unvegetated Habitat Marine Intertidal
	Unvegetated Habitat Marine Subtidal
	Unvegetated Habitat Shallow Bay
	Unvegetated Habitat Intermediate Bay

# Table V.B-I - Habitat Types within the City of San Diego

Source: Merkel & Associates, 2003

X.

## **Upland Habitats**

## <u>Tier I Habitats – Rare Uplands</u>

Tier I habitats include the upland habitats that are considered to be rare within the City of San Diego. These habitats have suffered substantial historic losses on top of naturally narrow distribution patterns, such as in the case of southern foredunes and Torrey pine woodlands. Alternatively, the habitats were once common, as was the case for native grasslands, but historic land conversion has resulted in precipitous declines that threaten the continued persistence of the habitats in the region.

#### Southern Foredunes

Southern foredunes (HC 21230) are a relatively uncommon constituent of today's City beaches, but two hundred years ago were widely dispersed at the upper edge of the region's oceanic high tides where they occupied hummocky areas of sand and the interstitial swales. The most common components of this vestigial vegetation are two species of abronia (*Abronia maritima*, *A. umbellata*), beach evening primrose (*Camissonia cheiranthifolia*), and beach ambrosia (*Ambrosia bipinnatisecta*).

#### Torrey Pines Forest

This remnant coniferous forest habitat (HC 83140) is now restricted in mainland United States to several stands of Torrey pines at Torrey Pines State Park and around the City of Del Mar. It appears to rely on moisture supplied by frequent fogs and is strongly correlated with marine sandstone substrate.

## Coastal Bluff Scrub

Few native plants can survive on the erosive slopes of San Diego's coastal bluffs. Typically, this scrub (HC 31000) is comprised of plants that are adapted to a regime of fogs, and a generally wetter environment that is found a short distance inland, including some succulent-leaved plants such as *Coreopsis* spp. and coast pincushion flower (*Chaenactis glabriuscula* var. *orcuttiana*). Other plants are adapted to salt tolerant conditions and include species of saltbush (*Atriplex* spp.)

and pineapple weed (*Chamomilla suaveolens*). This vegetation community is declining as the bluffs erode, where very disturbed weedy mesa vegetation is replacing the existing coastal bluff scrub.

#### Maritime Succulent Scrub

This scrub (HC 32400) is largely associated with the flora in northern Baja California. It occurs in the United States primarily in the extreme southwestern portions of San Diego County near the Mexican border. Dominant shrubs here typically include jojoba (*Simmondsia chinensis*) and flat-top buckwheat (*Eriogonum fasciculatum*). This phase of sage scrub also includes several desert elements such as four-wing saltbush (*Atriplex canescens*), waterjacket (*Lycium andersonii*), and sometimes very unusual species for western San Diego County such as smooth-stemmed fagonia (*Fagonia laevis*) and desert filaree (*Erodium texanum*).

#### Maritime Chaparral

1

This phase of coastal chaparral, southern maritime chaparral (HC 37C30) is a vestigial remnant of the wetter and cooler Pleistocene. It generally is restricted to sandstone substrates and usually includes at least one of the following shrub species: Del Mar manzanita (*Arctostaphylos glandulosa* ssp. *crassifolia*), Nuttall's scrub oak (*Quercus dumosa*), and/or coast white lilac (*Ceanothus verrucosus*).

#### Scrub Oak Chaparral

Scrub oak chaparral (HC 37900) is a dense, evergreen chaparral reaching up to 20 feet tall. The vegetation is dominated by Nuttall's scrub oak (*Quercus dumosa*), with inclusions of interior mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus betuloides* var. *betuloides*) and a substantial accumulation of leaf litter. This chaparral type typically occurs in more mesic locations, and often at a slightly higher elevation, than other chaparral types, thus enabling the vegetation to recover more quickly from fire.

#### Native Grassland

Valley needlegrass grassland (HC 42110) typically supports extensive stands of purple needlegrass (*Nasella* pulchra) as the indicator species for its presence. A limited association of

herbaceous perennials and annuals are often found growing among the clumps of needlegrass – including several rare species.

## Oak Woodland

Oak woodlands within the City of San Diego are dominated by coast live oak woodlands (HC 71160). These habitats are evergreen woodlands primarily dominated by coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), with a relatively open and low-growing understory that supports perennial grasslands, annuals, and herbaceous perennials, as well as a mix of shrubs and sometimes-dense thickets of western poison oak. Additional characteristic flora species include California blackberry, San Diego sedge (*Carex spissa*), California coffeeberry (*Rhamnus californica*), California rose (*Rosa californica*), nodding needlegrass (*Nassella cernua*) and large clarkia (*Clarkia purpurea*).

Dense coast live oak woodland (HC 71162) is a dense phase of oak woodland characterized by a contiguous canopy of coast live oak with few additional tree or shrub components. Understory may be less diverse than one associated with a less mature phase of oak woodland.

# <u> Tier II Habitats – Uncommon Uplands</u>

# **Coastal Sage Scrub**

The most common native vegetation type remaining within the boundaries of the City of San Diego (MSCP Table of Vegetation Communities 1998) is Diegan coastal sage scrub (HC 32500). This phase of sage scrub is a low-lying, relatively open scrub with desert affinities, and is comprised of soft-woody, drought deciduous species that provide the majority of the vegetative cover. Characteristic flora species include California sagebrush (*Artemisia californica*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), California encelia (*Encelia californica*), goldenbush (*Isocoma menziesii*), laurel sumac (*Malosma laurina*), foothil) needlegrass (*Nassella lepida*), lemonadeberry (*Rhus integrifolia*), black sage (*Salvia mellifera*), San Diego monkeyflower (*Mimulus aurantiacus*), and California brickellbush (*Brickellia californica*).

A disturbed form of coastal sage scrub is broom baccharis scrub. This habitat supports many of the same species as Diegan sage scrub, but is typically found as a disturbance following I

community that is generally best developed along alluvial floodplains and within areas of sandy soils. The habitat is dominated by broom baccharis (*Baccharis sarothroides*).

#### Coastal Suge Scrub/Chaparral

This "hybrid" of two common vegetation types (HC 37G00) usually indicates either an area of seral sage scrub growing on disturbed substrates, converting into a mature chaparral vegetation; or a mature ecotone in which ecological conditions for each of these two vegetation types does not allow one habitat type to out-compete the other.

#### <u>Tier IIIA Habitats - Common Uplands</u>

#### Chaparral

Chaparral (HC 37200), generally including mixed chaparral and chamise chaparral as described below, typically occupies dry, rocky, and often steep north-facing slopes, and is dominated by relatively tall (between 1.5-3 meters), broad-leaved, deep rooted woody shrubs. Chaparral vegetation located on south facing slopes is typically more open and can form a mosaic with sage scrub vegetation. Identification of shrub dominants usually allows for a more specific phase of chaparral to be identified.

<u>Mixed Chaparral</u> - Southern mixed chaparral (HC 37120) is a mid-sized to tall chaparral, with limited shrub diversity in drier areas, but a floristically varied understory with numerous species of subshrubs, herbaceous perennials, bulbs and annuals in shaded and wetter areas. Characteristic flora species include mission manzanita (*Xvlococcus bicolor*), Ramona ceanothus (*Ceanothus tomentosus*), San Diego mountain-mahogany (*Cercocarpus minutiflorus*), holly-leaf redberry (*Rhamnus ilicifolia*), sugar bush (*Rhus ovata*) and fuchsia-flowered gooseberry (*Ribes speciosum*).

<u>Chamise Chaparral</u> - Chamise chaparral (HC 37200) is locally common on poorly developed soils throughout the City, and is a lower growing chaparral community dominated by chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*), with comparatively limited shrub diversity and arid understory conditions.

## Tier IIIB Habitats - Common Uplands

## Valley and Foothill Grassland

This general vegetation category indicates there is insufficient information to more accurately identify the grassland components present (HC 42000). Included here may be areas of scattered native perennial grasses interspersed with larger stands of introduced non-native grasses. This habitat is classified as a Tier IIIB habitat for this analysis since it is highly probable that the majority of this habitat will ultimately be determined to be non-native grasslands rather than native grasslands when reviewed at the project-specific level.

## Non-native Grassland

Non-native grasslands (HC 42200) are widely dispersed throughout the San Diego region. This "introduced" grassland consists of a dense to open cover of predominantly Eutasian grasses that have become widespread on disturbed or heavily grazed lands. Local grasslands are dominated by non-native grasses such as bromes (*Bromus madritensis* ssp. *rubens*, *B. hordeaceus* and *B. diandrus*) and slender wild oat (*Avena barbata*), as well as non-native forbs, such as mustard (*Hirshfeldia incana* and *Brassica nigra*), and filarees (*Erodium brachycarpum*, *E. cicutarium*, and *E. moschatum*). The quality of these grasslands is expected to coincide with the quality of the surrounding vegetation communities and land uses.

## Tier IV Habitats - Other Uplands

## Urban/Developed

Much of the peripheral study area (OC 12000) is comprised of residential and commercial development dominated by non-native/exotic vegetation, cucalyptus woodland, and disturbed habitats. Urban and semi-urban areas contain numerous and varied horticultural plantings

L

#### Brinh Management Resistants to the Land Development Case SHR/EA

located within residential yards, active-use parklands, and golf courses. In the older, urbanized portions of the City, tall exotic plantings, such as eucalyptus trees (*Eucalyptus* sp.) with allelopathic toxins that tend to inhibit understory growth, form well developed, dense woodlands. Occasionally, other planted woodlands such as introduced pines, ash, and elm are present. Disturbed areas are typically located adjacent to urbanization and contain a mix of primarily weedy species, including non-native forbs, annuals, and grasses, usually found pioneering on recently disturbed soils. Characteristic weedy species include prickly sow thistle (*Sonchus asper*), common sow thistle (*Sonchus oleraceus*), bristly ox-tongue (*Picris echioides*), Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*), giant reed, hottentot-fig (*Carpobrotus edulis*), wild lettuce (*Lactuca serriola*), tree tobacco (*Nicotiana glauca*), castor-bean (*Ricinus communis*), pampas grass, smooth cat's-ear (*Hypochoeris glabra*), red-stem filaree (*Erodium cicutarium*), short-beak filaree (*Erodium brachycarpum*) and white-stem filaree (*Erodium moschatum*). These urban lands do not typically contain native vegetation or provide essential habitat connectivity; and therefore, tend to have reduced biological value.

#### Disturbed Habitat

Disturbed habitat is another broad category of disturbed lands (OC 11300) that usually supports no vegetation, or retains only pioneering weedy species, but does not include a disproportionately strong component of non-native grasses. Such disturbed habitats may establish on recently graded or severely brushed lands.

#### Agriculture

Agricultural practices throughout the City are quite varied. They include orchards and vineyards, intensive agriculture such as dairies, and extensive field crop and livestock grazing agriculture.

While once a distinctive characteristic of the region in the late 1800s and early 1900s, today only small portions of the City of San Diego are still comprised of groves/orchards (OC 18100), consisting primarily of woody crops such as citrus fruits and avocados. The majority of these crops are located to the east of the City infrastructure -- within the foothills and along the San Pasqual Valley. Herbaceous understory growth may be planted or provide natural cover, and is

typically open in density to facilitate with crop harvesting. Although groves and orchards also tend to have reduced biological value, they do provide cover for wildlife movement, as well as perch and nest sites for raptorial and passerine species.

Few such areas under the general agricultural heading (OC 18200) remain within the City. Where present, such as in portions of the San Pasquai Valley, habitat within the active footprint areas is usually extremely degraded and devoid of any significant biological resources.

Truck crops (OC 18300) are still occasionally planted in the extreme northern and southern portions of the City of San Diego. Typically all areas historically used for agriculture (controlled by the owner/renter) that can be deeply disked and planted for harvest are employed for that purpose. Fallow areas of agricultural fields overwhelmingly consist of non-native weedy species. Occasionally, rare bulbs may survive in lightly disked fields that have not been regularly planted.

## Eucalyptus Woodland

Eucalyptus woodland (OC 11100) is a prominent component of the City's canyon lands, but is a relatively late introduction into the region. Quite a few eucalyptus species were intentionally introduced from arid portions of Australia to provide a readily grown tree. The understory within eucalyptus woodland is often devoid of all but the most ubiquitous non-native weeds.

## **Botanical Resources-Flora**

San Diego County has the highest floristic diversity of any county in the continental United States and the City of San Diego hosts the highest floristic diversity of any City in the county. The diversity of the City of San Diego is attributable both to the size of the City as well as the diverse array of habitats that it includes. Among the most floristically diverse regions of the City are coastal canyons that support remnants of once more common scrub communities. In a general sense, the diversity of the City's flora decreases away from the coast and to the north, such that the highest floristic diversity in the City is observed in the southwestern regions while the lowest floristic diversity is found in the northeastern portions of the City. Over the past
century, the native flora of the City has been increasingly impacted. This has occurred as a result of rapidly changing land-uses that have lead to the loss of much of the regions native habitat, particularly on the immediate coast and over the flat coastal plains. In addition there has been a continued degradation of the remaining natural areas by intensifying recreational pressures, alteration of fire conditions, and perbaps most importantly, the expansion of invasive exotic plant species. As a result of these historic impacts, the flora with the highest affinity for coastal environments has been tremendously diminished within the City and only remnant representatives of the original floral diversity remain along the coastal fringe and within urban canyons. Conversely, the data are too coarse to include smaller drainages that may be found via field surveys.

### Zoological Resources-Fauna

The City of San Diego is located within a coastal plain largely developed with urban and agricultural uses, but still retains a network of undeveloped canyonlands. Such development now limits the extent and connectivity of the wildlife habitat; however, the identified native vegetation communities, and to some extent the non-native categories, support a number of locally common, as well as sensitive species. The following text discusses many of the faunal groups occurring within the City limits. Faunal species are discussed in a regional context; therefore, existing site-specific conditions thay differ from this more genetic coverage. Sensitive species are not specifically discussed in these summary sections since they are addressed in more detail later in this document.

#### Invertebrates

Limited cohesive information is available to provide a thorough description of the many invertebrate fauna found within the City of San Diego region; however, the range of butterfly species and vernal pool branchiopods have been fairly well documented within the City. Butterfly species occur in a wide range of habitats; including sage scrub and chaparral, open areas devoid of substantial shrub cover such as non-native grasslands and agricultural/disturbed land, as well as more densely vegetated areas such as riparian habitat and oak woodlands. These habitats provide various host-specific plants suitable for larval development, adult nectar resources; as well as topographical features, such as hilltops or open ground that aid in courtship and mating. In contrast, vernal pool branchiopods are strongly restricted to vernal pool habitat, and consequently, many of these species are considered to be sensitive. According to City MWWD staff, no vernal pools are expected to occur in close proximity to canyon/other environmentally sensitive land pipeline projects. As a result, vernal pools are not addressed in this analysis (i.e., impacts to vernal pools are not anticipated to occur).

# Fishes

Insufficient information exists to provide a complete description of the freshwater fish associations found within the City of San Diego. While fish species within the various reservoirs are fairly well known, fish occurring along the City's streams are not well documented. The only native freshwater fish species potentially present within the study area is an almost extinct race of steelhead trout (Oncorhyhnchus mykiss) that once spawned in some of the larger stream systems of Southern California. Within the City of San Diego, this species once occurred in such drainages as the San Diego River and Rose Creek; however, it was extirpated in the middle of the last century. The freshwater fish community occurring in the area's reservoirs and streams arc presently believed to consist exclusively of exotic species that have been introduced at various times over the past two centuries to provide game fish and a forage base. Fish species found in the City include largemouth bass, a number of centrarchid sunfish, bluegill, black crappie, threadfin shad, several catfish, rainbow trout, carp and goldfish, several minnows, and the ubiquitous mosquitofish (Gambusia affinis). While most of the established fish populations are found in association with the major reservoirs and deeper ponds along perennial streams and rivers in the City, mosquitofish have been introduced in nearly every freshwater body as a biotic control to mosquitos.

# Amphibians

Amphibians typically occur in riparian habitats with peripheral upland vegetation. Riparian ecosystems often provide temporary ponding water used as breeding habitat by various amphibious species, as well as abundant vegetation for cover and foraging. Amphibians will also create burrows in adjacent upland habitats, such as sage scrub and non-native grasslands, where they will aestivate (or spend time in a dormant state, similar to hibernation). Amphibian

#### Breech Management Revisions to the Land Detechpment Code SEIR/194

species known or with a potential to occur in the San Diego region include the garden slender salamander (*Batrachoseps major*), arboreal salamander (*Aneides lugubris*), western toad (*Bufo boreas*), California chorus frog (*Pseudacris cadaverina*), Pacific chorus frog (*Pseudacris regilla*), and the bullfrog (*Rana catesbeiana*), a non-native species. Two sensitive species, the western spadefoot toad (*Scaphiopus hammondii*) and arroyo toad (*Bufo californicus*) also occur within the City at a few locations.

#### Reptiles

I

Ì

Relatively uncommon in coastal canyons and other environmentally sensitive lands is the western whiptail lizard (*Cnemidophorus tigris*); a species more typically seen in the inland arid foothill region. In contrast, the sensitive orangethroat whiptail (*Cnemidophorus hyperythrus*), which has a sporadic but widespread range in coastal San Diego County, is locally common within areas of native vegetation, including peripheral wetlands habitat. Western fence lizards (*Sceloporus occidentalis*) and side-blotched lizards (*Uta stansburiana*) are common to abundant in open areas throughout the City's canyons. Southern alligator lizards (*Elgaria multicarinala*) are regularly found in ecotonal habitat on the periphery of residential areas. Expected to occur occasionally in open, sandy habitat in areas of sage scrub is the coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei*). This lizard needs an abundant supply of ants as a food source, and is heavily predated upon by feral cats and pet collecting children.

Western pond turtle *(Clemmys marmorata)* are known to occur in many stock ponds and riverine pools within the City's canyon, but are now extirpated from most of their natural habitats. The pond slider *(Chrysemys scripta)* is an introduced species that is also found regionally. This large aquatic turtle is native to the eastern United States and various areas of Mexico.

The western rattlesnake (*Crotalus viridis helleri*) is commonly found within the canyons of the City and is most often encountered along the riparian fringe of urban canyons. During the summer months, this species often moves up to irrigated yards along canyon crests where it is often killed. While regionally common, this snake is being depleted in more urbanized areas. The larger ponds and marsh areas along the major rivers are particularly suitable to the requirements of the two-striped aquatic garter snake (*Thamnophis hammondii*). This species has

been historically observed in many of these wetlands regionally. Common reptiles such as the gopher snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus*), the coachwhip (*Masticophis flagellum*), the California striped racer (*Masticophis lateralis*), and common kingsnake (*Lampropeltis getutus*) occur within many of the region's canyons. Herpetologist Lawrence Klauber's field notes (unpublished/undated) from the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century include a variety of canyon sightings for now locally uncommon or infrequently observed species such as the glossy snake (*Arizona elegans*), the ringneck snake (*Diadophis punctatus*), the night snake (*Hypsiglens torquata*), and the long-nosed snake (*Rhinocheilus lecontei*). These species are likely depleted from the levels noted by Klauber.

Numerous species of lizards and snakes use rock crevices for cover within sage scrub and open chaparral habitat, and feed on small insects and insect larvae among the leaf litter. Other species are found in grasslands and agricultural/disturbed land, or in riparian areas and hunt small rodents. Quality reptilian habitat, primarily consisting of sage scrub, rocky outcrops, chaparral and oak woodland, is still located at many canyon sites; however, the small patch size available for various species makes local population extirpations increasingly more difficult to deter.

#### Birds

Over four hundred species of birds have been reported within the environs of the City of San Diego, supporting some of the highest avian diversity in the United States. Both yellowbreasted chats (*Icteria virens*) and yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia*) also nest locally in this habitat. Also noteworthy due to its sensitive status is the California gnateatcher (*Polioptila californica*). There are many historical sightings of this gnateatcher in open space, privately owned lands and on other sensitive lands.

A number of common birds, which nest in riparian woodland or adjacent sage scrub uplands in San Diego County are known to nest in the City's canyons and other environmentally sensitive lands. These include the Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*), black-chinned hummingbird (*Archilochus alexandri*), mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*), great horned owl (*Bubo virginianus*), burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia*), black phoebe (*Sayornis saya*), cliff swallow (*Hirundo pyrrhonota*), common raven (*Corvus corax*), bushtit (*Psaltriparus minimus*), house finch (*Carpodacus mexicana*), black-headed grosbeak (*Pheucticus melanocephalus*), spotted towhee (Pipilo maculatus), California towhee (Pipilo crissalis), red-winged blackbird (Agelaius phoeniceus), tricolored blackbird (Agelaius tricolor), phainopepla (Phainopepla nitens), ash-throated flycatcher (Myiarchus cinerascens), orange-crowned warbler (Vermivora celata), common yellowthroat (Geothlypis trichas), song sparrow (Melospiza melodia), hooded oriole (Icterus cucullatus), northern oriole (Icterus galbula), lesser goldfinch (Carduelis psaltria), and American goldfinch (Carduelis tristis). Many other birds, primarily migrants and winter visitors, use the riparian trees as they pass though the coastal lowlands to and from their breeding grounds to the north and south. Migrant songbirds from the Emberizidac family found in spring include Nashville warbler (Vermivora ruficapilla), black-throated gray warbler (Dendroica nigrescens), hermit warbler (Dendroica occidentalis), Townsend's warbler (Wilsonia pusilla).

Some species of waterfowl more typically found in large bays and ponds occur seasonally and sporadically in coastal canyon wetlands and on the City's reservoirs. These include lesser scaup (*Aythya affinis*), bufflehead (*Bucephala albeola*), northern pintail (*Anas acuta*), ruddy duck (*Oxyura jamaicensis*), eared grebe (*Podiceps nigricollis*), Clark's grebe (*Aechmophorus clarki*), western grebe (*Aechmophorus occidentalis*), northern shoveler (*Anas clypeata*), canvasback (*Aythya valisineria*), and redhcad (*Aythya americana*). Other species detected that are often associated with freshwater marshes and ponds include picd-billed grebe (*Podilymbus podiceps*), green-winged teal (*Anas crecca*), cinnamon teal (*Anas cyanoptera*), sora rail (*Porzana carolina*), common moorhen (*Gallinula chloropus*), and American coot (*Fulica americana*).

Some avian species such as the greater roadrunner (*Geococcyx californianus*) are now rarely observed in the City open space. These large ground-dwelling cuckoos are becoming less and less common in coastal Southern California as their open scrubland habitat is developed.

Numerous birds of prey still regularly use open space for hunting. These include white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), sharp-shinned hawks (*Accipiter striatus*) and merlin (*Falco columbarius*) in the winter, golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), and red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*).

#### Bruth Management Reteining to the Varial Development Code SEIR/BA

Native and non-native vegetation communities provide habitat for numerous species of resident and migratory birds. A number of common avian species breed within sage scrub and chaparral habitats, and forage among the leaf litter in the vegetative understory. Rocky outcrops, particularly on undisturbed slopes or peaks can provide significant perching or roosting sites for raptors; and grasslands and agricultural lands located adjacent to woodland areas provide significant foraging habitat for resident, wintering and migrant raptors. Avian diversity and abundance is substantial within riparian and oak woodland habitats. These habitats are comprised of several horizontal niches including canopy, shrub, herb, and ground, which provide a network of valuable roosting, foraging and breeding areas for birds. Quality avian habitat within the City of San Diego is concentrated where the vegetation is less disturbed and provides habitat connectivity; however, the various creeks and tributaries within the City of San Diego, also provide some measure of habitat connectivity, and potential avian breeding and foraging areas.

#### Mammals

Without trapping, the presence of mammal species must be discerned through habitat suitability, species range and biological records. Many mammals are nocturnal and secretive, and indirect signs for a number of species, particularly rodents, can be similar. Small mammal species typically occur in sage scrub, chaparral, grasslands and agricultural/disturbed areas, and several of these species will intermittently use riparian and woodland habitats for foraging and cover. Various species of bats will also forage in grasslands and woodland habitats. Larger mammals often require greater blocks of connected habitat for hunting and travel within their range. Quality babitat for small mammal species is generally located throughout the study area, but as with reptiles, small remaining patch size can undercut the ability of some species populations to survive in open space.

Despite the extensive urban development within the City core, a number of regionally common mammals still reside within City open space and other now often isolated pockets of remaining native vegetation. Included are coyote, desert cottontail, California ground squirrel, Virginia opossum, and striped skunk.

#### Wildlife Corridors

l

i

I

A wildlife corridor is considered herein to represent linear landscape features that allow animal movement between two patches of more substantial habitat. A corridor is not expected to provide sufficient space and resources to meet all of the life history needs of its target species.

Depending upon the species considered, corridors function in a variety of ways and may function differently over the course of a year. For the purposes of general discussion, wildlife corridors can be broken down into three categories: regional corridors, local corridors, and short corridors.

Regional corridors accommodate the needs of a broad suite of animals. Such corridors are especially important to dispersing individuals (i.e., juveniles) that use these corridors to find unoccupied ranges and mates. This effectively links otherwise distinct populations of animals and serves to maintain genetic diversity. Because of the high degree of habitat fragmentation in coastal southern California, particularly to Diegan coastal sage scrub vegetation, regional wildlife corridors have received considerable attention by resource agencies and conservation groups, and have been a focus of regional conservation planning. In regional planning, attention often focuses on large, wide-ranging "umbrella" species. Under this concept, if a preserve plan can accommodate the needs of wide-ranging species, it will allow sufficient connectivity to meet the lesser needs of other species. A typical width of greater than 1,000 feet is recommended for regional corridors serving large mammals (Ogden 1992). Constricted sections of the corridor should have maximum lengths of less than 500 feet and a minimum width of 400 feet. Where possible, canyon corridors should extend from run to rim (Ogden 1992, 1998). For planning purposes, widths of a 2:1 proportion (length to width) are generally considered to be necessary for wildlife corridors on an average basis to provide essential buffering of wildlife activities. Narrower or wider corridors may also function depending upon the particular physiography, adjacent land uses, and corridor lengths. Spencer and Mock (1997) noted the value of transmission casements as potential contributors to meeting corridor needs in urbanized environments. Where corridors are narrow and already tenuous, special management measures are required including implementing measures to control runoff, noise, lighting, exotic predators and invasive plants. Such measures have been adopted as the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines (see Section V.A, Land Use).

[/.B-16

Local corridors are much shorter than regional corridors and permit movement between discrete vegetation patches, thereby forming "habitat linkages." These corridors allow two or more small connected patches of habitat to function as a larger block of habitat. The larger interconnected block enables viability and promotes population stability through regular genetic interchange, even though each individual habitat patch may be too small for the long-term survival of a wildlife population. To serve effectively as wildlife corridors, habitat linkages must permit unobstructed movement of the species. This becomes an important consideration with respect to connectivity between preserve areas, particularly where additional urban development is to occur on a limited basis. Depending upon the particular parameters of the linkage, connectivity may also be made by utility corridors, emergency access routes, and recreational trail facilities. Local corridors are generally considered to require widths of 400 to 600 fect to function for wildlife movement, depending upon the corridor lengths, species using the corridor, cover, topography, as well as adjacent land uses (Ogden 1998).

Short corridors function like their larger counterparts, but typically serve the daily needs of individuals. These corridors allow animals to move through unsuitable habitat to access bedding sites, watering sites, and foraging areas. Because of their frequent and regular use, such areas of concentrated wildlife movement are often referred to as "travel routes."

# Threatened, Endangered, Endemic and Sensitive or MSCP Covered Species

# Sensitive Flora

Table V.B-2 summarizes the sensitive plant species that could be affected by the proposed Programs. Sensitive plants include those listed by USFWS (1999), CDFG (2002), the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) (Smith and Berg 1988), and Narrow Endemic Species (City of San Diego 2001). The following abbreviations are used in the table: FE = Federally Endangered, FT = Federally Threatened, FSC = Federal Species of Special Concern, SE = State Endangered, SR=State Rare, NE = Narrow Endemic Species; habitat codes are synonymous to those used in the California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (Skinner and Pavlik 1994), including CCPrs = closed-cone conifer forest, Chprl = chaparral, CoSer = coastal scrub, CmWld = cismontane woodland, MshSw = marshes and I

!

Í

swamps, Medws = meadows and seeps, RpWld = riparian woodland, VFGrs = valley and foothill grassland.

Scientific Name	Commou Name	Habitat	Federal Status	California Status	CNPS List	MSCP Status	Status On-site
Acanthomintha ilicijolia	San Diego thoin- mint	Chpri, CoSer, VFGrs, /olay	FT	SE		Coverad NE	Putentially Present
Adulphia californica	California adolphia	Chprt, CoSer	None	None	2	Not Covered	Potentially Present
Agave shawij	Shaw's agave	CoSer	Nous	None	2	Covared NE	Potentially Prosent
Ambrosia pumila	San Diego antbrosia	CoScr,RpWkl	FE	None	Bt (	Covered NE	Potentially Present
Aphanisma blitoides	aphanisma	CaSer	None	None	18	Covered NE	Not Expected
Arctostaphylos glundulosa ssp. crassifolia	Del Mar manzinita	Chpr]	нЕ.	None	1 <b>B</b>	Covered	Potentially Present
Arctostuphylos otayensis	Otay manzinite	Сіца) .	FE	None	18	Covered	Potentially Present
Astragatus desnet	Dean's milk-vetch	CoSec, Chipi	None	None	(B	Covcred	Potentially Present
Astragalus tener var. titi	) coastal duncs milk- verch	Dunes	FE	SE	10	Covered NE	Not Expected
Buccharis vunessan	Encinitas baccharis	Clipd (sandstone)	FT	SE	113	Covered NE	Potentially Present
Bergetveactus emoryl	goldenspined cereux	CaSer, Chpri	Noua	Nonc	2	No1 Covered	Potentially Present
Brodiaea orcutti	Orcutt's brodisca	CCFrs, Chprl, CmWld, Medws, VPGrs, clay	Non¢	None	18	Covered	Potentially Presem
Calamagrossis koelerinides	dense roed grass	Chprl	None	None	Nnac	Covered	Potentially Presque
Calochortus dunnii	Dunn's mariposa lify	Chpri	None	SR.	[ []]	Covered	Potentially Present
Caulanthus stenocarpus	slænder pod jewelflower	Chprl, CoSer	None	SR	None	Covered	Potentially Present
Coanothus cyaneus	Jakoside ceanothus	Chprl	None	Кале	1B	Covered	Potentially Present
Ceanollais verrucosus	wart-steanned ceaลงมีมร	Сћрн	FSC	Νίπο	2	Covered	Present
Centromadia pungen ssp. laeviv	smootli tærplant	VFGrs	None	None	JB	Not covered	Not Expected

Table V.B-2 - Local Special Status Plant Species Potential Presence and Status

Scientific Name	Common Name	Habitat	Federal Stat <u>us</u>	California Status	CNPS List	MSCP Status	Status On-site
Chamaebatia australis	southern mountain misery	Chprl	None	None	4	Not covered	Potentially Present
Chorizanthe orcuttana	Orcutt's spineflower	Собст	तत्	SE	<u>ו</u> ם	Covered	Potentially Present
Comarastaphylis diversifolla ssp. diversifolia	summer-holly	Chprl	None	Nne	18	Not Covered	Potentially Present
Convohiulus simulans	small-flowered monsing glory	Clupr) (openings)	None	None	4	Not covered	Potentially Present
Cordylanthus orenttianus	Orputt's bird's-beak	. CoSor	Nune	None	2	Covered	Potentially Present
Corethrogyne filaginifolia yar. incana	Point Loma sand aster	Chprl	None	None	18	; Not Covered	Potentially Present
Coreihrogyns filaginifolia var. Iintfolia	Del Mar sand #5ter	CoSer, Chprl, VFGns	None	None	IB.	Covered	Potentially Present
Deinandra conjugens	i Otay tarplant	VFGrs	FT	SE	18	Covered NE	Potentially Present
Dickondra occidentalis	western dichoudra	Chprl, CoSer	None	None	4.	Not covered	Potentially Present
Dudleya blochmaniae ssp. blochmaniae	Blochman's dudleya	CoSer	FSC	SE	ıв	Covered NE	Potentially Present
Dudleya varlegata	variegated dudleya	CoSar	Nonc	None	113	Covered NE	Potentially Present
Dudleva viscida	sticky dudleya	Chprl, CuScr (steep north facing slopes)	None	Nume	4	Covered	Potentially Present
Eupkorbia misera	cliff spurge	CoSer	None	None	2	Not covered	Potentially Present
Ferncactus viridescens	San Diego battel caetus	Chprl, CoSer	None <u>FSC</u>	None	2	Covered	Potentially Present
Fritillaria biflora vat. biflora	chocolate lily	Chprl, CoSer, VFGrs/clay	None	None	Unlisted	Not covered	Potentially Present
Gitkopsts diffura ssp. filicardis	mission canyon blue-cup	Churi (openings)	None	Noue	3	Not covered	Potentially Present
Harpagonella palmeri	Palmer's grappling hook	Chprl, CoSer, VFGrs/clay	None	None	4	Not covered	Potentially Present
Hazardia orculti	Orcutt's hazardia	Chprl	None	Candidate	fB	Not envered	Not Expected
Holocarpha virgata	graceful templant	VEGTS	None	None	4	Not covered	Potentially Present
Horkelia truncata	Ramona horkelia	Chprl, CmWl&' clay	None	None	មេ	Not covered	Potentia ly Present
Isocoma menzeisti var. decumbens	decumbent goldenbush	CoSets	None	None	\$b	Not covered	Potentially Present
Lepechinia cardiophylla	Gander's pitcher sage	Chprl	None	None	1B	Covered	Potentially Present
Mackaerunthora junced	nish-likə əristleweçd	Chprl, CoSct	None	None	4	Not covered	Potenrially Present

i

.

:

÷

Brish Munugement Revisions to the Lond Development Code VERVEA

Scientific Name	Common Name	Habitat	Federal Status	California Status	CNPS List	MSCP Status	Status On-site
Microseris douglasti	small-flowered microsoris	VFGrs (clay)	Nono	None	4	Not Covered	Potentially Present
Monardella hypoleuca ssp. lunata	fott-leaved monardella	Copri	None	יi ∣None	(D)	Covered	Potentially Present
Muilla clevelundii	San Diego goldenstar	Chprl, CoSer (openings)	Nune	None	н	Covered	Potentially Present
Nolina intervata	Dehesa hear-grass	Chpri	None	SE	100 I	Covered	Not Expected
Opuntia californica var. californica	snake cholla	CaSer	None	None	18	Covered NB	Potentially Prescut
Phacelia stellaris	Brand's phacelia	CoScr, Dunes	None	None	ІВ	Nat Covered	Potentially Present
Pinus Vorreyana	l'orrey pine	Coniferous Forest	None	None	j jB	Coversd	Potentially Present
Polygula cornuta ssp. fishlae	Fish's milkwort	Chprl, CmWld, RpWld	None	None	4	Not covered	Potentially Present
Quercus dumosa	Nuttall's scrub oak	Chorl	None	None	113	Not covered	Potentially Present
Quercus engelmanni	Engelmann osk	Chpri, CmWid, RpWid, VPGra	None	None	4	Not covered	Potentially Present
Rosa minutiflora	small-leaved rose	CoSer, Chprl	None	SE	2	Covered	Potentially Present
Satureja chandleri	San Miguel savory	Сіргі	None	None	18	Covered	Potentially Present
Senecio ganderi	Gander's butterweed	Chprl	None	SR	30	Covered	Potentially Present
Solanum tenuilohanım	narrow-leaved nightshade	Сірл	None	i None	None	Covered	Potentially Present
Vigniera lociniata	San Diego County viguiera	CoSer	None	None	4	Not	Potentially Present

NE=Narrow Endemic Source: Merkel & Associates, 2002

#### Sensitive Fauna

I

Table V.B-3 summarizes the sensitive fauna species that could be affected by the proposed work. Sensitive animals include those listed by USFWS (1999) and CDFG (2002). The following abbreviations are used in the table: FE = Federally Endangered, FT = Federally Threatened, FSC = Federal Species of Special Concern, SE = State Endangered, SR=State Rare, ; habitat codes are synonymous to those used in the California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants of California (Skinner and Pavlik 1994), including CCFrs = closedcone conifer forest, Chprl = chaparral, CoSer = coastal scrub, CmWld = cismontane woodland, MshSw = marshes and swamps, Medws = meadows and seeps, RpWld = riparian woodland, and VFGrs = valley and foothill grassland.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Habitat	Federal Status	California Status	MSCP Status	Status O <u>n-site</u>
Suphydryas editha guino	Quino checkerspot butterfly	Open grassland and openings within shrub habitats (hat support Dwarf Plantain ( <i>Plantago srecta</i> )	FC	SA	Nane	Potentially Present
Lycaona hermes	Hernies copper	Openings in chaparral, associated with the larval host plant Spiny Redberry ( <i>Rhamnus</i> crocen), adults feed on neetar from Flat-top Buckwheat	FSC	SA	Noue	Potentially Present
Danaus plexippus	monarch butterlly	Migratory concentrations found on trees	None	None	Nonc	Potentially Present
Bufo callfornicus	southwestern arroyo tord	Shallow pools, open sand, and gravel flood terraces of intermittent to parennial streams; may also occupy adjacent upland communities within 1,2 km	FE	CSC, Protected	Covered	Potenrially Present
Scaphiopus hajnmondll	western spadeftiol toad	<ul> <li>Froters see dy or gravely snil in gresslands, sage scrub, open chapartal, and pine-oak woodlands; grasslands with shatlow temporary pools are optimal</li> </ul>	FSC	CSC, Protected	None	Potentially Present
Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillii	San Diego horned lizard	Chaparral, sage scrub, oak woodlauds, and grasslands; sometimes occurs along seldom used dirt paths where native ant species are prevalent	FSC	CSC, Protected	Covered	Expected
Eumeces skiltonianus interparietalis	Coronado skink	Variety of habitats including grasslands, sage scrub, and various woodlands including oak, pine, juniper, and tiparian	FSC	CSC	None	Expected
Cnemidophorus hyperythrus	orangethroat whiptail	Sage scrub (and chapanral), prefers saudy areas with patches of briesh and rocks; may be associated with buckwheat and Black Sage	FSC	CSC, Protected	Covered	Expected
Anniela pulchra pulchra	silvery legloss lizard	Shows a preference for leaf litter and sondy substrates	FSC	CSC	Not covered	Expected
Cnemidophorus tigris multiscutatus	constal western whiptail	Coastal sage scrub, chaparral, and grasslands	F5C	SA	None	Expected
Salvadora hexalepis virgultea	eqast patch-nosed snake	Chaparral and sage scrub; may require mammal burrows or woodna nests for overwintering	FSC	CSC, Protected	None	Expected

# Table V.B-3 - Local Special Status Animal Species Potential Presence and Status

I

ļ

ł

١.

I,

ł

/ i

ţ

Scientific Name	Common Name	Habitat	Federal Status	California Status	MSCP Status	Status On-site
Diadophis punctatus similis	San Diego ringueok snake	Chaperral, forest, and grasslands	None	SA	None	Reported
Llohamera trivirgato roseqfuson	coastal rosy boa	Rocky outcrop areas within chaparral and sago scrub	PSC	5A.	None	Putentially Present
Crotabas ruber ruber	northern red diamone rattlesnake	Occupies rocky unterops and areas of heavy brish or rugged torrain in chaparial, sage scrib, or desert scrub on both coastal and desert slopies, usually below 4000 feet	FSC	csc	None	Expected
Catharies aura	iorkey vulture	Open habitats with protected large trees and snags	FSC	CSC	None	Expected
Elanus leucurus	white-tailed kite	Grasslands, agricultural fields, and open habitats with areas of dense deciduous tress for nesting	None	SA, Fufty Protected	None	Expected
Aquila chrysaetos	golden eagle	Nests in cliffs (or trees), found in generally mountainous or hilly terrain	Nono	CSC, Fully Protected	Covered	Expected (to forage on occasion)
Falco peregrinus anatum 	American persgrine falenn	Foraiges near coast	FE	СЕ	Covered	Expected (to forage on occasion)
Accipiter striutus	sham-shinned hawk	Mixed woodlands near open areas, prefors but not restricted to riparian habitats	None	CSC	None	Expected (seasonally)
Circus cyaneus	notthem hander	Forages over marsh and open terrain	None	CSC	Covered	Expected
Buteo regalis	ferrugisous bawk	Ury, прев terrain	FSC	csc	Covered	Expected (seasopally)
Lanius Judovicianus	loggettead shrike	Found within grassland or open habitats with bare ground and sparse shrub and/or tree cover for nesting and perching	FSC	csc	None	Potentially Present
Eremophila alpestria actia	California horned lark	Grasslands, disturbed areas and open habitats with sparse, low vegetation	None	csc	None	Potentially present

Scientific Name	Common Name	Habitat	Federal Status	California Status	MSCP Status	Status On-site
Spectyto cynicyfaria kypwgaea	burrowing owl	Hunts open ternsin generally with borrow at a slight elevational rise	None	CSC	Covered	Potentially present
Polioptila californica californica	Califyrnia gnateatcher	Various successional stages of sage senab	FT	csc	Covered	Expected
Stalia mexicana	western bluebirt	Open woodlands, farmlands, and orchards	Nune	None	Covered	Potentially (present in appropriate season)
Campytorhynch-ns brunneicapillus cousei	coastal cactus wren	Areas of sage scrub with robust stands of prickly pear and choila	Nune	CSC	Covered	Potentially Present
Almophila rigleops canescens	Southern California rufous-errowned sparrow	Rocky hillsides supporting sparse, low scrub or chaparral, sometimes mixed with grasses	FSC	CSC	Covered	Expected
Amphispiza belli belli	Bell's sage spanow	Chaparral and dense sage scrub	FSC	csc	None	Expected
Ammodramus savannarum	grassho <del>pper</del> sparrow	Grasslands and pastures	None	SA	None	Expected
Felis concolor	mountain lion	Found in areas of extensive dense native vegetation	Nune	Calif: Rogulated	Covered	Potentially Present
Odocoileus hemionus fullginata	ສາມປາຍາກ ການໂບ door	Found in areas of extensive dense native vegetation	None	Calif. Regulated	Crivered	Expected
Taxidea taxus	American badger	Found in open grasslands on periphery of native vegetation	Nano	None	Covered	Expected
Lepus californicus beunettii	San Diego black- tailed jackrabbit	Relatively open chaparral and sage scrub and grasslands	FSC	csc	Noue	Expected
Perognathus lon <u>e</u> imembris pacificus	Dulzura California pocket mouse	Found in areas of fine sandy ground, (Coostal sage scrub)	FSC	csc	None	Potentially Present

I I

e .

:

ı

| |-

i

I i

i

1

Scientific Name	Common Name	Habitat	Federa <sup>I</sup> Status	California Statns	MSCP Status	Status On-site
Chaetodipus fàliax fallax	northwestern San Diego pneket mouse	Found in Coustal sage scrub	FSC	csc	None	Expected
Neatoma lepida intermedita	San Diegn desert woodrat	Chaparral, particularly abundant in areas of rock outprops	FSC	CSC	None	Expected
Myotis yumanensis	Yuma myolis	Uses multiple habitats (primarily woodiands and forests) but forages over water	FSC	csc	None	Potentially Present
Myolis evotis	long-cared niyotis	Uses stultiple babitats for roosting (mainly crevices), forages in oak/coniferous forests, may require water. As with stany bat species in the region, little information is available on microhabitat use	FSC	Nono	None	Potentially Present
Myatin thynanodes	fringed myotis	Uses multiple habitats for roosting (mainly crevices), feeds in coniferous forests	FSC	None	None	Potentially Present
Myotis volans	long-legged myotis	Uses multiple habitats for roosting (mainly envires), feeds in conferents forests	FSC	None	None	Potontially Present
Myotis ciliolabrum	small-fuoted myotis	Uses a variety of habitats, prefers open stands in foreats/woodlands, brushy habitars, and ripartan areas	FSC	None	None	Potentially Present
Buderma Mäculaium	spotted bai	Roosts in high rocky cliffs, forages in tiparian and edge habitats	FSC	csc	None	Potentially Present
Corynorhinus Iavnsendti	Townsend's hig- eared bat	Cave rooster, feeds in forest/woodland habitats or along habitat edges within 15 km of roost site	FSC	csc	None	Potentially Present
Antrozous pallidus	pallid bat	Uses open forest and grassland habitats for feeding and multiple habitats for receiving	None	CSC	None	Potenrially Present

.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Habitat	Federal Status	California Status	M8CP Status	Status On-site
Nyetinomops Jemorosaccus	pocketed froe- tailed hat	Cliff rooster, feeds in multiple habitats	Nune	csc	None	Potentially Present
Nyatinomops maarotis	big free-tailed bat	Chilf roaster, prefers rugged, rocky canyons, foods in multiple babitats including over water	None	csc .	None	Potentially Present
Eumops perotis	western mastiff bat (see California mastiff bat in text)	Extensive open areas with abundant most locations in rock outerups, (found where oaks and chaparral occur)	FSC	csc	None	Potentially Prosent

Source: Merkel & Associates, 2002

# ISSUE STATEMENTS

- Would the project reduce the number of any unique, rare, endangered, sensitive, fully protected species of plants or animals?
- 2. Would the project interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors?
- 3. Would the project impact any sensitive habitat, including, but not limited to oak woodland, coastal sage scrub or chaparral?
- 4. Would the proposal result in any conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

# IMPACT

# Criteria for Significance Determination

Impacts must be identified and quantified whenever possible to evaluate the potential environmental damages that could result from a proposed project. Impacts must be further

ï

evaluated for significance. CEQA defines a "significant effect on the environment" as a "substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the environment." According to CEQA, a mandatory finding of significance is appropriate for a project that has the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory; the project has the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals; or the project has possible environmental effects which are individually limited but cumulatively considerable. The City of San Diego has developed the CEQA Significance Determination Guidelines (rev. July 2002) for evaluating biological impacts. Habitat impacts are anticipated to occur where there is vegetation removal. Pruning of limbs within brush management zone two are not considered to result in impacts and are currently considered impact neutral within the San Diego LDC.

The Guidelines follow a stepwise progression in evaluating the potential for biological effects to be considered significant under CEQA. The determinations contained herein are based on those Guidelines. Impacts would be considered significant under the following circumstances:

- Project encroachments into the MHPA are considered significant.
  - Impacts to Tier I, II, IIIA and IIIB are considered significant based on site-specific circumstances. However, lacking the capacity to analyze project level information at the SEIR/EA level, these impacts are categorically significant.
  - Any impacts to federal or state-listed threatened or endangered species, or impacts to narrow endemic species as specified in the City's Biology Guidelines (July 2002).
  - Impacts to individual sensitive species may also be considered significant, based on the species rarity and extent of the impacts.

# Analysis of Impacts

For the purpose of this analysis, the biological evaluation included brush management conducted by the City of San Diego, homeowner's associations, and private property owners. A total of 25 brush management areas were evaluated as part of this project. Of all the brush management areas evaluated, 13 were thinned by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department, 11 were thinned by private landowners, and one brush management area was thinned by a homeowner's association.

For purpose of comparison, adjacent areas that were not brush managed were also evaluated, if available. These areas are referred to as controls. However, it was difficult to find comparable control areas. Most brush management is conducted in a comprehensive manner so it was difficult to find comparable areas that had not been brush managed. Only two control areas have been evaluated as part of this effort.

A variety of brush management areas throughout the City were selected. Park and Recreation staff, David Monroe and Josh Woods, selected 13 areas where brush management was conducted by Park and Recreation staff. Areas selected by Park and Recreation varied in size and date of brush management conducted. For example, some of the brush management areas had been thinned as recently as February 2004 whereas others selected areas have not been thinned for over five years. This variety in brush management areas helped provide information on both the long term effects of brush management as well as the immediate impacts.

Planning Department staff, Khalil Martinez, selected an additional 12 areas where brush management was conducted by either the homeowner or the homeowner's association. Since there was no information available on the date of brush management for these sites, Mr. Martinez selected four brush management areas within three different canyons: Peñasquitos Canyon, San Clemente Canyon, and Tecolote Canyon. Areas were selected throughout the canyons to give a good evaluation of the different kinds of private brush management conducted.

Each site was visited during the daylight hours by Holly Cheong, Environmental Biologist for the MSCP. Sites were each visited once on either March 1, 2004, March 4, 2004, or March 9, 2004. The surrounding vegetation communities were surveyed to determine habitat type. Habitat type was considered disturbed if 50% or more of species cover within the habitat were exotic plant species. Undisturbed native habitat contained less than 50% exotic cover. Native i

#### Brush Management Revisions in the Land Development Code SHIR/HA

1

ł

1

habitats observed included coastal sage scrub, mixed chapatral, chamise chapatral and oak woodland. Areas were considered ornamental if over 90% cover was attributed to exotic plant species. Eucalyptus woodland, which could also be considered an ornamental area, is identified specifically where observed. The percent cover of exotic and native species was estimated within each brush management area. Any dominant exotic and native species were noted. Plant regrowth within the brush management areas was evaluated and the height of vegetation within the brush management areas was estimated. Slope gradient and aspect were noted as well as any on-site irrigation. Soil type was also determined by visual observation. If it could be determined, it was noted whether the brush management area was on a manufactured or natural slope.

The date that brush management was first performed and the last date brush managed was performed was noted for each site if that information was available. The size of the brush management area was also noted. For Park and Recreation sites, this was based on the information provided by them for each site. For homeowner and homeowner's association sites, the size of the brush management area was estimated from the SANGIS parcel layer assuming that the brush management area would correspond to the area outside of the development area on the site. The date that brush management was conducted was not available for homeowner and homeowner's association brush management sites.

The conclusion from City staff evaluation is that invasion of exotic plant species into brush management areas appears to be the biggest impact associated with biological resources and performing brush management. Ninety-six percent (96%) of the twenty-five slopes evaluated contained some level of exotic plant invasion. Exotic invasion could not be directly attributed to the quality of the adjacent habitat. Thirteen of the 24 brush management areas (54%) with exotic plant invasion were adjacent to undisturbed native habitat. Exotic plant invasion may also be associated with what was planted within the brush management areas during the time of construction of the housing developments or what was installed by the owners or homeowner's association after construction. In many cases, this encroachment may be considered out of compliance with the City of San Diego Municipal Code and would not be included in the evaluation of impacts associated with the implementation of brush management as allowed by

the City of San Diego Municipal Code. Although the information from this report should be treated as purely anecdotal, evaluation of these 25 slopes can help the City of San Diego determine the general impacts associated with brush management. Please see Section V.A, Land Usc/MSCP, Issue 3 for a full discussion on the project's consistency with the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and other habitat conservation plans.

### **Direct Impacts**

Direct impacts occur when biological resources are altered or destroyed during the course of work, or as a result of project implementation. According to the CEQA Guidelines (2001), direct impacts refer to a direct physical change in the environment that is caused by and immediately related to the project. Examples of such impacts include removal and grading of native vegetation. Other direct impacts may include substantial loss of foraging or nesting habitat, and loss of individuals of sensitive species as a result of brush management activities.

#### Habitat Loss

The aerial extent, or "footprint", of surface impacts associated with the development of revised brush management zones was determined by evaluating current brush management zone impacts and comparing the existing conditions to the proposed impacts due to the implementation of the revised brush management zones that are included within the proposed brush management revisions. Some areas may be increasing the width of zone one and zone two, but the increases depend on the location of the property relative to Interstate 5 and Interstate 805. While the revised brush management zones are proposed to be, 100 feet wide, the 100-foot-wide average that was assumed for this analysis includes additional areas to address needs for increasing or decreasing existing widths of zone one and zone two brush management. However, at no time will the combined two brush management zones be more than 100 feet. Table V.A-23 (Land Use Section), quantifies the impacts of the proposed Brush Management revisions using this approach.

Using the regionally-based evaluation methods, the proposed actions would result in impacts to sensitive habitats, including sensitive uplands located within the boundary of established MHPA lands. In accordance with City Significance Determination Guidelines (July 2002), any encroachment into the MHPA is considered to be significant. Encroachment into the MHPA for brush management zone two is allowed, since brush management in zone two is considered impact neutral.

### Sensitive Species

ı.

i

I

i

i

ļ

ł

For the purpose of the present assessment, impacts to sensitive species that are considered direct impacts would be those that result in a direct physical loss of individuals in the case of plants and animals, or the loss of necessary supporting habitat in the case of animals. While an argument may exist that direct effects may also include such impacts as construction noise, lighting, or dust, these impacts rely on intermediate behavioral or physiological changes to be manifested as measurable impacts. Because these impacts are less tangible and certain to result in measurable adverse effects, they have been addressed as indirect effects rather than direct effects.

#### Impacts to California Gnateatcher

The proposed changes to the brush management regulations would increase the width of the brush thinning zone (zone two) by approximately 20 to 60 feet. The proposed changes could result in potential direct impacts to the California gnateatcher (*Polioptila california california*) due to incidental impacts to nesting birds, within the MHPA, and reduction of suitable habitat by brush thinning or controlled goat grazing. The California gnateatcher is a federally threatened species under the Endangered Species Act.

A review of the regional sensitive species database, established for the Multiple Species Conservation Program, resulted in only five out of 377 occutrences proposed to be impacted within the MHPA by the new width of brush management zone two. This database however does not contain a comprehensive survey of all lands in the City of San Diego, and occupation of habitat by gnatcatcher will vary from year-to-year. As such, the true impacts to individual birds cannot be assessed.

To address impacts to the California gnateatcher resulting from changes in the brush management regulations, an analysis was conducted using the coastal California gnateatcher habitat evaluation model (2002) constructed for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The gnateatcher habitat evaluation model classified potential gnateatcher habitat into one of four categories: low/none, moderate, high and very high. The areas of potential impacts from brush management changes previously generated by City staff, were compared to the results of the gnateatcher habitat model using a geographic information system. The results were divided into potential impacts Citywide and impacts to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. The results are shown in Table V.B.-4.

# TABLE V.B.-4

Potential Impacts to California Gnatcatcher Habitat based upon the 2002 coastal California gnatcatcher habitat evaluation model.

<b>_</b>	Total Acres	Potential Impacts	Total Aeres	Total Potential Impacts in MHPA
	in City	Citywide from proposed	h MHPA	from proposed brush management
	ĺ	brush management		changes (% of Total Acres in
	l	changes (% of Total		MHPA)
		Acres in the City)		
Low-None	78	0 (0%)	63	0 (0%)
Moderate	1566	33 (2.1%)	1037	14 (1.3%)
High	11617	257 (2.2%)	6182	106 (1.72%)
Very High	15545	139 (0.9%)	10317	78 (0.8%)
Total	28806	430 (1.5%)	17599	198 (1.1%)

The overall impacts to suitable gnatcatcher habitat citywide and within the MHPA are 1.5% and 1.1% of the total habitat area, respectively. While the coastal California gnatcatcher habitat evaluation model is not 100% accurate, it is useful in regional habitat impact assessment.

## Sensitive Habitat

T

ì

ĥ

I

The proposed revisions to the Land Development Code related to brush management, zone two would result in an estimated City-wide impact of 2,880 acres. Of this total, 715 acres would be within the MHPA which includes 242 acres within the core biological areas and habitat linkages. The MHPA will preserve 52,012 acres, which includes 35,648 acres within the core biological and habitat linkages areas. Therefore, impacts from the thinning and pruning activities associated with zone two brush management would potentially impact 1.4 percent of the MHPA and 0.7 percent of the core/linkages areas.

Table V. A-42, (Land Use section) further identifies the anticipated impacts that would occur by Habitats Tier. A majority of the city-wide impacts are to Tier IV which includes lands (i.e. disturbed land, agriculture, eucalyptus woodland, and ornamental plantings) that are not considered to be sensitive. No brush management is required within wetland areas; therefore, no impacts to wetlands are expected to occur with implementation of the proposed LDC code revisions.

A majority of the impacts from the proposed brush management revisions would occur within smaller utban canyons and would not be part of the larger core biological areas and linkages. Impacts to core biological and linkage areas would be limited to 0.7 percent (242 acres). Fifty of these acres would be Tier IV (lands that are not considered sensitive). Additionally, all impacts would be within the 200-foot buffer identified in the MSCP EIR/EIS for edge effects. No impacts to narrow endemic species are expected to occur because these species are generally less than eighteen inches in height and would not be subject to thinning or clearing per the brush management regulations. The exception would be Encinitas baccharis, which has an average height of eighty inches; however no known locations of this species are within the proposed brush management zone two areas.

Where brush management conducted by humans could avoid impacts to narrow endemics, it is conceivable that goats could indiscriminately graze on narrow endemics. The areas identified for expanded brush management activities are not located within any of the narrow endemic species' major population areas discussed in the MSCP Plan Table 3.5 'details for the rationale for identifying species as covered.<sup>2</sup> Additionally, the MSCP database identifies no narrow endemic species locations within the areas identified for expanded brush management. Any future projects located within or adjacent the MHPA would be reviewed by MSCP staff, and all brush management areas would be included in the review and impact analysis. As discussed above, impacts to narrow endemics within the MHPA must be avoided, and outside the MHPA they must be avoided, managed, enhanced, or transplanted as appropriate.

As proposed, brush management would be prohibited from (March 1 – August 15) in gnateatcher habitat (i.e., coastal sage scrub and southern maritime scrub). This period coincides with the flowering periods of many narrow endemic species. The prohibition on brush management activities during the gnateatcher breeding season would eliminate impacts on narrow endemics in coastal sage scrub and southern maritime scrub during this time.

Vernal pools were extensively mapped by the City in 2002-2003: no vernal pools are located in the proposed brush management area. No impacts on vernal pool narrow endemic species would result from the proposed project. Potential impacts on narrow endemics from the proposed project would be less than significant.

The MSCP Subarea Plan (Table 3-5) and City of San Diego Biology Guidelines places restrictions on grading, clearing, and grubbing during the breeding season of seven sensitive species. Six of these species would not be affected by the proposed change to the brush management regulations because either they occur outside of the areas proposed for brush management (e.g. beach areas) or the habitats they occur in will not be impacted (e.g. wetlands). These species include western snowy plover, southwestern flycatcher, least tern, cactus wren, least bell's vireo, and the tricolored black bird. For the remaining species, the California gnateatcher, no timing restrictions apply outside the MHPA. Within the MHPA, restrictions on grading, clearing, and grubbing activities apply during the breeding season (March 1 – August 15). This limitation is proposed in brush management activities preformed within zone two.

4

I

T

## SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

The impacts to biological resources that could result from implementation of the proposed brash management revisions would be significant. While the impacts to biological resources that could result from implementation of the proposed brash management revisions would be significant, they are rendered less than significant by existing City regulations and implementation of the MSCP. These impacts are summarized as follows:

• The proposed brush management revisions would result in significant impacts to <u>Direct and immediate impacts to</u> Tier I, II, IIIA, and IIIB habitats within zone one and zone two (invasives) brush management implementation result in the loss of habitat value and invasion of non-native plants. These impacts could occur based on three types of scenarios: the first being where an existing home owner is doing brush management and zone one already exists; secondly, thinning activities performed by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department; and lastly, issuance of Right-Of-Entry permits to private citizens from the Park and Recreation Department to perform brush management activities. If the entire zone one requirement is not met then zone two would be included in these potential impacts.

The BIR/EIS for the MSCP concluded that impacts to covered species and their habitats from brush management were significant but mitigated to below a level of significance with the implementation of preserve management and planning guidelines identified in each City's MSCP Subarea Plan and associated implementing regulations. As documented in this SEIR/EA, impacts to biological resources that could result from implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would be significant in that the project would expand the area within which invasive weeds establish. In that the increase impacts would occur within the 200-foot edge effected area located within the MHPA. This SEIR/EA concludes, like the EIR for the Land Development Code, that the impacts are rendered less than significant by implementation of the MSCP except for impacts occurring outside the MHPA for significant impacts to non-covered species. The draft SEIR/EA erroneously interpreted the LDC EIR to mean that biological resource impacts from implementation of Zone 2 was significant everywhere. Upon further review, it is clear that the conclusion of the LDC EIR that impacts are significant is limited to the situation described above.

New development would be required to comply with the City's Biology Guidelines and would be required to mitigate significant brush management impacts to noncovered species outside the MHPA in accordance with Mitigation Method "D", "Species Specific Mitigation". Significant impacts from brush management for existing development to non-covered species outside the MHPA would remain significant.

- Properties located within the MHPA lands are normally required to restrict brush management activities within zone two to occur outside of the breeding season of gnatcatchers (March 1<sup>st</sup> through August 15<sup>th</sup>). However, if the brush management activities cannot be conducted outside of the gnatcatcher breeding season, then the impact is considered significant. While Limiting brush management activities within the MHPA, would mitigate impacts to gnatcatchers to below a level of significance, it is not and is proposed by the applicant. Brush management activities would be limited to occur outside of the California gnatcatcher breeding season (March 1 August 15). Since brush management activities will be limited, direct impacts to gnatcatcher nests would not be significant; therefore, mitigation is not required. Mitigation is also available in the form of requiring a qualified biologiet prior to commencing brush management activities to survey the project sites for gnateateher nests. This mitigation is not proposed as part of this SEIR/EA.
- Based on the results of City Staff's evaluation of 25 sites within the City of San Diego, thinning within brush management zone two allows for invasive species to grow into the areas that previously contained native vegetation. Controlled goat grazing could be used for thinning activities in zone two. Goats do not have a specific diet and will feed on most any type of shrubbery or vegetation. Studies have

shown that they will cat plants almost to ground level but leave the room, graze on the lower branches of large trees and shrubs. Goats are browsers, and are not likely to eat the ground-cover vegetation down to the soil level, particularly when they are moved along and managed correctly. They are much more likely to cat portions of the taller vegetation, thus retaining vegetation cover for the soil. They don't tend to pull up the vegetation by the roots when they cat, and don't eat as close to the ground as do sheep and cattle. They will do little actual 'grazing', unless the weeds and brush run out. Impacts to sensitive vegetation associated with this alternative would not be significant whether thinning is conducted by humans or by goats. Invasive plant types would be introduced into zone two as a result of the thinning, creating a significant impact. Further, as goats digest certain plant types containing seeds, the goat feces could also spread invasive plants within zone two as the seeds could take hold in the soil and sprout. This would also result in a significant impact to biological resources by distributing the seed of non-native species into previously undisturbed areas. Impacts associated with the establishment of invasive plants are significant and unmitigated. Impacts associated with the establishment of invasive plants are mitigated by the implementation of the MSCP; therefore, biological impacts related to invasive plants are mitigated to a level below significance.

 The proposed brush management revisions would result in potentially significant impacts to sensitive species. [This has been deleted as a result of the discussion under the first two bullets above.]

#### Tituing of Brush Management Activities

Properties located within the MHPA lands are normally required to restrict brush management activities within zone two to occur outside of the breeding season of gnateatchers (March 1st through August 15th). However, if the brush management activities cannot be conducted outside of the gnateatcher breeding season, then the impact is considered significant. While limiting brush management activities within the MHPA, would mitigate impacts to gnateatchers to below a level of significance, it is not proposed by the applicant. Mitigation is also available in the form of requiring a qualified biologist prior to commencing brush management activities to survey the project sites for gnateatcher nests. This mitigation is not proposed as part of this SEIR/EA.

#### Invusive Species

Based on the results of City Staff's evaluation of 25 sites within the City of San Diego, thinning within brush management zone two allows for invasive species to grow into the areas that previously contained native vegetation. Controlled goat grazing could be used for thinning activities in zone two. Goats do not have a specific diet and will feed on most any type of shrubbery or vegetation. Studies have shown that they will eat plants almost to ground level but leave the roots, graze on the lower branches of large trees and shrubs. Impacts to sensitive vegetation account with this alternative would not be significant whether thinning is conducted by humans or by goats. Invasive plant types would be introduced into zone two as a result of the thinning, creating a significant impact. Further, as goats digest certain plant types containing aceds, the goat feees could also spread invasive plants within zone two as the seeds could take hold in the soil and spreut. This would also result in a significant impact to biological resources by distributing the seed of non-native species into previously undisturbed areas. Impacts as associated with the establishment of invasive plants are significant and unmitigated.

### MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Mitigation is available to mitigate the potentially significant impacts to the California Gnateatcher to biological resources associated with implementation of the brush management revisions.

Bio. 1- Improts associated with the California gnateatcher would be reduced to below a level of significance by acquiring an amount of acreage, approximately 198 acres per table V.B-4 in the Biological Resources Section, of equal value gnateatcher habitat over a time period to be determined by the City Manager. This mitigation however, has not been agreed to by the applicant. [This mitigation measure is no longer needed since the proposed revisions to the brush

Brush Management Revisions in the Land Development Code SEIR/EA

management or<u>dinance</u> has been revised to prohibit brush thinning during the breeding season of the California gnateatcher (March 1 – August 15)]

Bio. 2. In order to mitigate significant impacts to biological resources as a result of the establishment of invasive species in brush management zone two, the Land Development Code EIR identified that mitigation would be required to the same extent as brush management zone 1, based on the mitigation ratios per habitat type identified in the City of San Diego Biology Guidelines. This mitigation however, is not proposed.

Bio. 3In order to mitigation significant impacts to non-covered species located outsidethe MHPA, a mitigation measure would be required to the same extent as brush managementzone one, based on the mitigation ratios per habitat type identified in the City of San DiegoBiology Guidelines. However, this mitigation is not agreed to by the applicant.

# C. HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY/EROSION

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

Hydrology, the study of water, encompasses the occurrence, distribution, movement, and chemistry of all waters of the Earth, including water in rivers, oceans, lakes, and subsurface. Hydrogeology is the field of hydrology that studies the interrelationships of geologic materials and processes with water, with an emphasis in groundwater. Groundwater is water that occurs below the ground surface and occupies open pore spaces, voids, and fractures in sediment and rock. Any rock or sediment that is water-bearing and that yields economical quantities of water to wells and springs is referred to as an aquifer. One or more aquifers composed primarily of unconsolidated deposits found in valleys of major rivers and streams are generally defined as groundwater basins. A hydrologic unit is the designation given by the State Water Resources (highlands) to classify total watershed areas, including water-bearing and non-water-bearing formations. Each Hydrologic Unit is further divided into Hydrologic Areas (and Hydrologic Subareas) with unit boundaries generally based on surface drainage boundaries, although subsurface characteristics may also define a division of groundwater.

# Surface and Groundwater Hydrology<sup>1</sup>

Implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would occur within the City of San Diego. The City of San Diego region forms the southwest corner of California and occupies approximately 3,900 square miles of surface area. The western boundary of the region consists of the Pacific Ocean coastline, which extends approximately 85 miles north from the United States-Mexico border. The northern boundary of the region is formed by the hydrologic divide starting near Laguna Beach and extending inland through El Toro and easterly along the ridge of the Elsinore Mountains into the Cleveland National Forest. The eastern boundary of the region is formed by the Laguna Mountains and other lesser known mountains located in the Cleveland

T

Ι.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Surface and Groundwater Hydrological Data is from the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9). September 8, 1994.

National Forest. The southern boundary of the region is formed by the United States-Mexico border.

The San Diego Region encompasses most of San Diego County, parts of southwestern Riverside County and southwestern Orange County. The region is divided into 11 major hydrologic units, 54 hydrologic areas, and 147 hydrologic subareas. The hydrologic units that are within the jurisdiction of, or could be affected by, the City of San Diego (i.e., the proposed brush management revisions) include the San Dieguito Hydrologic Unit, Penasquitos Hydrologic Unit, San Diego Hydrologic Unit, Pueblo San Diego Hydrologic Unit, Sweetwater Hydrologic Unit, Otay Hydrologic Unit, and the Tijuana Hydrologic Unit.

#### Water Ouality - Point and Non-Point Sources

1

The 1972 Clean Water Act established the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program to regulate the discharge of pollutants from industrial, commercial, and institutional processes, and point sources to waters of the United States. Since then, considerable progress has been made in reducing conventional forms of pollution from known sources such as sewage treatment plants and industrial facilities, through the implementation of the NPDES program and other federal, state, and local programs. The adverse effects of some of the persistent toxic pollutants were addressed through manufacturing and land use restrictions and through cleanup of contaminated sites. On the other hand, pollution from land runoff (including atmospheric deposition, urban, suburban, and agricultural) was largely unabated until the 1987 Clean Water Act amendments, which established a framework for regulating urban storm water runoff and other non-point source pollutants. These sources, including urban storm water runoff, now contribute a larger portion of many kinds of pollutants than those from the more thoroughly regulated point sources.<sup>2</sup>

Non-point source pollution, which is the diffused, fugitive pollution not traceable to a specific source, poses public health risk and safety concerns. Urban runoff potentially contains a host of, pollutants ranging from aesthetic nuisances such as trash and debris to materials harmful to the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> City of San Diego. Urban Runoff Management Plan. Adopted January 2002.

biological system such as oil and grease, sediments, nutrients, metals, and toxic chemicals to organisms that endanger human health such as bacteria and viruses. These contaminants can adversely affect receiving and coastal waters, associated biota, and public health. While the impact of urban runoff pollution may not be immediately realized, the eventual, cumulative effect can be dramatic. Urban runoff pollution is not only a problem during rainy seasons, but also year-round due to unconstrained use of imported water.<sup>3</sup>

Storm water pollution affects human life and plant and animal life. Potentially harmful viruses and bacteria are found in our coastal waters along with soil particles, solids/debris, litter, oil, and chemical compounds. Oil and grease from parking lots and roads, leaking petroleum storage tanks, pesticides, cleaning solvents, and other toxic chemicals can contaminate storm water and this contamination can be transported into water bodies and receiving waters. Fertilizer constituents from lawns and golf courses can cause algal blooms and encourage microbial growth to create an increasing downward spiral of biological activity known as eutrophication. Disturbances of the soil from construction grading can allow silt to wash into storm channels and receiving waters making them muddy, turbid, and inhospitable to aquatic organisms. Many artificial surfaces of the urban environment such as galvanized metal, paint, or preserved wood containing metals, contribute to pollution by run off or leaching by storm water as the surfaces corrode, flake, dissolve, or decay. Heavy metals are toxic to organisms and may bio-accumulate to eventually affect animals high on the food chain including humans.

# Impaired Water Bodies within the City

Section 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA, 33 USC 1250, et seq., at 1313(d)), requires States to identify waters that do not meet water quality standards after applying certain required technology-based effluent limits ("impaired" water bodies). States are required to compile this information in a list and submit the list to U.S. EPA for review and approval. This list is known as the Section 303(d) list of impaired waters. As part of this listing process, States are required to prioritize waters/watersheds for future development of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs). The California SWRCB and local Regional Water Quality Control Boards

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> City of San Diego. Urban Runoff Management Plan. Adopted January 2002.

#### Brush Management Residents to the Land Development Code SEIR/EA

ì

1

3

1

1

1

(Regional Boards) have ongoing efforts to monitor and assess water quality, to prepare the Section 303(d) list, and to subsequently develop TMDLs. The San Diego RWQCB (Region 9) most recent list, finalized in March 2002, includes 51 listed water bodies with 30 unique pollutants for the San Diego Region. The seven hydrologic units identified above (that are within, or could be affected by, the City of San Diego) contain some of the listed water bodies and pollutants/stressors.<sup>4</sup> Many of the areas would be affected by the proposed brush management revisions, drain into listed impaired water bodies and has the potential to adversely affect water quality in listed water bodies, both directly and indirectly.

# Regulatory Framework for Addressing Water Quality Within the City of San Diego<sup>5</sup>

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 require that Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) be prepared for the nine state-designated hydrologic basins in California. Basin Plans guide conservation and enhancement of water resources and establish beneficial uses of inland surface waters, tidal prisms, harbors, and groundwater basins for each of the nine regions within the state. The San Diego Region Basin Plan (Basin Plan) was approved by the SWRCB on March 20, 1975 and updated in 1994. The San Diego Regional Board's Basin Plan is designed to preserve and enhance water quality and protect the beneficial uses of all regional waters. Specifically, the Basin Plan: (1) designates beneficial uses for surface and ground waters; (2) sets narrative and numerical objectives that must be attained or maintained to protect the designated beneficial uses and conform to the State's anti-degradation policy; (3) describes implementation programs to protect the beneficial uses of all waters in the Region; and (4) describes surveillance and monitoring activities to evaluate the effectiveness of the Basin Plan [California Water Code §13240 - 13244, and §13050(j)]. Additionally, the Basin Plan incorporates by reference all applicable State and Regional Board plans and policies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board. Final Draft Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List of Impaired Waters 2002 Update. March 8, 2002.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9). September 8, 1994,

The Basin Plan is the Regional Board's plan for achieving the balance between competing uses of surface and ground waters in the San Diego Region. Accordingly, this Basin Plan establishes or designates beneficial uses and water quality objectives for all the ground and surface waters of the Region. Beneficial uses are the uses of water necessary for the survival and well being of man, plants and wildlife. Water quality objectives are the levels of water quality constituents or characteristics which must be met to protect the beneficial uses. This Basin Plan also establishes an implementation program describing the actions by the Regional Board and others that are necessary to achieve and maintain the designated beneficial uses and water quality objectives of the Region's waters.

The Regional Board regulates waste discharge and reclaimed water use to minimize and control adverse effects on the quality and beneficial uses of the Region's ground and surface waters. The Regional Board issues permits, called "waste discharge requirements" and "master reclamation permits", which require that waste and reclaimed water not be discharged in a manner that would cause an exceedance of applicable water quality objectives or adversely affect beneficial uses designated in the Basin Plan. The Regional Boards enforce these permits through a variety of administrative means.

The City of San Diego has prepared an Urban Runoff Management Plan (URMP) as part of the City of San Diego's Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), and the Standard Urban Stormwater Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), in accordance with requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board NPDES permit procedure. These documents address the process that the City will undertake to improve water quality. The elements of the City program as described in the URMP and SUSMP documents are summarized below. In addition to the URMP and SUSMP, protection of surface water quality is also provided through the NPDES General Construction Permit for the State of California.

# Urban Runoff Management Program

The requirement to implement a program for development planning is based on federal and state statutes including: Section 402 (p) of the Clean Water Act, Section 6217 of the Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments of 1990 ("CZARA"), and the California Water Code. The Clean

ì

ł

1

Water Act amendments of 1987 established a framework for regulating urban runoff discharges from municipal, industrial, and construction activities under the NPDES program. The Municipal Permit requires the implementation of a Jurisdictional URMP. The primary objectives of the Jurisdictional URMP requirements are to:

- Ensure that discharges from municipal urban runoff conveyance systems do not cause or contribute to a violation of water quality standards;
- Effectively prohibit non-urban runoff discharges; and
- Reduce the discharge of pollutants from urban runoff conveyance systems to the Maximum Extent Practicable (MEP statutory standard).

Implementation activities for each program area listed above are contained in the URMP. Each City department is responsible for performing those tasks that are applicable and necessary to be in compliance with the City's Municipal Permit. This includes implementing the applicable procedures and policies to address the activities covered in the permit issued to the City of San Diego by the Regional Board, providing the appropriate staff training, keeping records of compliance activities, performing self-assessments, and preparing status reports for an annual report.

#### Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan

ł

i

j

The Model SUSMP was developed to address post-construction urban runoff pollution from new development and redevelopment projects that fall under "priority project" categories. The goal of the Model SUSMP is to develop and implement practicable policies to ensure that urbanization does not increase the urban runoff flow rates, velocities or pollutant loads from a project site. This goal may be achieved through site-specific controls and/or drainage area-based or shared structural treatment controls. This Model SUSMP, collectively adopted by the Co-permittees (other governmental agencies in the County of San Diego), contains Best Management Practices (BMPs) that must be used for certain designated project types to achieve this goal. The Co-permittees are required to adopt the requirements set forth herein in their own Local SUSMP.

Under the Local SUSMP, the City of San Diego will approve the SUSMP project plan(s) as part of the development plan approval process for discretionary projects, and prior to issuing permits for ministerial projects. To allow flexibility in meeting SUSMP design standards, structural treatment control BMPs may be located on- or off-site, used singly or in combination, or shared by multiple developments, provided certain conditions are met.

All new development and significant redevelopment projects that fall into one of the following "priority project" categories are subject to these SUSMP requirements. In the instance where a project feature, such as a parking lot, falls into a priority project category, the entire project is subject to these SUSMP requirements. These categories are:

- Residential development of more than 100 units
- Residential development of 10 to 99 units
- Commercial development greater than 100,000 square feet
- Automotive repair shops
- Restaurants
- Hillside development greater than 5,000 square feet
- Projects discharging to receiving waters within Environmentally Sensitive Lands
- Parking Lots ≥ 5,000 square feet or with ≥ 15 parking spaces and potentially exposed to urban runoff
- Streets, roads, highways, and freeways
- Retail gasoline outlets

As indicated above, the majority of the categories pertains to urban development and would not apply to the types of activities anticipated under the currently proposed project. Of the two categories that could pertain to non-urban development, those categories being hillside development and projects that discharge to environmentally sensitive lands, the proposed project is not anticipated to require hillside development greater than 5,000 square feet and would not involve any discharges to environmentally sensitive lands.
In addition to the priority project categories indicated above, the City has established standard permanent stormwater requirements that apply to projects with any of the following:

- New impervious areas such as rooftops, roads, parking lots, driveways, paths and sidewalks;
- New pervious landscape areas and irrigation systems;
- Permanent structures within 100 feet of any natural water bodies;
- Trash storage areas;

I

i

- Liquid or solid material loading and unloading areas;
- Vchicle or equipment fueling, washing, or maintenance areas;
- Require a General NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Industrial Activities (except construction);
- Commercial or industrial waste handling or storage, excluding typical office or household waste;
- Any grading or ground disturbance during construction; and
- Any new storm drains, or alterations to existing storm drains.

Projects involving one or more discretionary actions and include any of the above improvements or activities are subject to the City's Storm Water Standards as defined in the Land Development Manual (*Manual for Construction & Permanent Storm Water Best Management Practices Requirements, October 23, 2002*).

#### General Construction Permit

The State has issued a general permit for storm water associated with construction activities (State Board Order 99-08-DWQ, NPDES No. CAS000002), addressing both storm water and certain non-storm water discharges for construction-sites of five acres or more. The General Construction Permit requires development of a project-specific SWPPP that incorporates appropriate BMPs. Effective March 10, 2003, in conjunction with the State's most recent revisions to the General Construction Permit, Order 99-08-DWQ, the Permit extends to projects involving one or more acres of surface disturbance, providing that the applicant files a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the SWRCB and abides by the conditions and requirements of the Permit.

#### Watershed Management Plans

The City of San Diego is participating in a regional effort to develop plans to improve water quality on a larger watershed approach. The SWRCB set up requirements for improving water quality based on a watershed approach through passage of the Costa-Machado Water Act of 2000 (Proposition 13). Article 2 of the Costa-Machado Water Act established the Watershed Protection program to, " provide funds to assist in implementing watershed plans to reduce flooding, control crossion, improve water quality, and improve aquatic and terrestrial species habitats to restore natural systems of groundwater recharge, native vegetation, water flows, and riparian zones."

In accordance with the requirements of the SWRCB and the Costa-Machado Water Act, the City of San Diego, in conjunction with the City of Poway, City of Del Mar, and the County of San Diego, is in the process of developing a Watershed Management Plan, in accordance with the watershed urban runoff management plan requirements of the Municipal Permit, that will identify specific water quality issues and propose measures to improve water quality within the Los Peñasquitos watershed. The Los Peñasquitos Lagoon, the receiving body for the watershed, is considered impaired by the California Unified Watershed Assessment. Stressors such as sedimentation and encroachment of urban development are resulting in changes to velocity and volume of stream flow as well as increased pollutants in urban runoff. Based on an assessment of existing conditions within the watershed, the Watershed Management Plan will identify specific locations for wetland enhancement and restoration projects as well as measures to address hydrology, including adjustments to stream flows, velocity and volumes. The projects recommended in the Plan would provide for long-term solutions to water quality issues associated with the watershed.

The City of San Diego and the County of San Diego are also in the process of preparing watershed management plans for other watersheds in the region. Plans will be prepared based on the watershed approach adopted by the SWRCB and the Regional Board for the San Dieguito River, Mission Bay, and the San Diego River watersheds. Similar to the planning effort for the Los Peñasquitos watershed, these management plans will seek to identify solutions to specific issues affecting water quality. Each jurisdiction covered under the NPDES Municipal Permit is ì

required to prepare and submit a Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Plan (JURMP), which addresses water quality issues specific to each jurisdiction.

Information and measures identified in the individual watershed management plans will be integrated into a regional planning effort currently being completed. The SWRCB and the Regional Board have authorized the preparation of a Regional Wetlands and Watershed Management Plan for Coastal Southern California. It is anticipated that watershed plans completed in the next one to two years will be the basis for identifying any regional solutions available to improve water quality.

### Storm Water Management through Multiple Species Conservation Program

The MSCP is a regional effort between local jurisdictions, as well as federal and state agencies to develop a comprehensive habitat conservation planning program that addresses multiple species habitat needs and the preservation of native vegetation communities in southwestern San Diego County. The City of San Diego MSCP Subarea Plan has been prepared pursuant to the overall MSCP guidelines to address habitat conservation goals within the City boundaries. The City Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA), which is identified in the City MSCP Subarea Plan, delineates a 52,000-acre core biological resource area and comidors targeted for conservation. The City MSCP Subarea Plan also includes a Framework Management Plan and specific management policies and directives for management of resources within the MHPA.

In association with management of MHPA lands, the City MSCP Subarea Plan contains guidelines for minimizing impacts of urban development on upland and wetland ecosystems and water quality. All developments proposed adjacent to the MHPA must conform to the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines of the City MSCP Subarea Plan. The Land Use Adjacency Guidelines require that all new and proposed parking lots and developed areas in and adjacent to the MHPA must treat urban runoff prior to discharging into the MHPA. All developed and paved areas must prevent the release of toxins, chemicals, petroleum products, exotic plant materials, and other elements that might degrade or harm the natural environment. Potential impacts can be minimized through the use of a variety of measures including natural detention basins, grass swales or mechanical trapping devices. The MSCP also requires that these systems be maintained routinely throughout the life of a project.

The City MSCP Subarea Plan also requires that land uses such as recreation and agriculture, which use chemicals or generate potentially toxic byproducts, incorporate storm water best management practices to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials into the MHPA. Where applicable, the requirement to minimize impacts to water quality is also incorporated into leases on publicly owned property as leases come up for renewal.

The City MSCP Subarea Plan provides specific management directives requiring that restoration of native riparian habitat take place within many of the important drainage systems and watersheds within the City. For example, the portion of the Los Peñasquitos Watershed located within the City of San Diego is addressed in the City MSCP Subarea Plan. Major drainages within the Los Peñasquitos watershed including Los Peñasquitos Canyon, Lopez Canyon, Carmel Creek, and portions of Carroll Canyon are located within the MHPA. The guidelines and specific management policies of the City MSCP Subarea Plan require that enhancement of these drainages take place, where appropriate. The Subarea Plan also requires restoration and enhancement of native riparian lands within the Otay River Valley, Tijuana River Valley as well as several smaller "urban canyons" within the central and southern portions of the City. Many of these drainages are surrounded by urban development and restoration of native riparian areas is intended to minimize impacts from urban runoff to water quality as well as provide habitat for animal and plant species.

# ISSUE STATEMENTS

- 1. Would the proposal result in an increase in pollutant discharges, including downstream sedimentation to receiving waters during or following construction?
- 2. Would the proposal result in substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes?
- 3. Would the proposed project affect slope stability and on or off-site soil erosion?

i

### IMPACT

1

### Criteria for Significance Determination

The following criteria were used to assist in making determinations of significant hydrology/water quality/erosion impacts (City of San Diego, 2003).

- Impacts on stream hydrology may be significant due to increased sedimentation and erosion (i.e., erosion and sediment transport leading to the potential for deposit buildup to substantially alter stream hydrology) if a project, in general, were located on slopes over a 25 percent grade, and would drain into a sensitive water body or stream; except in limited cases, projects which would disturb over five acres of land would have a significant hydrology impact.
- Impacts on existing drainage patterns may be significant if the project would result in substantial changes to stream-flow velocities or if existing vegetation would decline because long- or short-term, soil-plant-water relationships would no longer meet habitat requirements.
- 3. Impacts on downstream properties may be significant if the project, when identified in a drainage study, would cause adverse impacts on downstream properties as a result of increased runoff.
- 4. Impacts on water quality from pollutants/contaminants may be significant if: (1) the project would generate or accidentally release any amount of highly noxious substance; (2) the project would generate large amounts of substances which in small amounts are insignificant, but are cumulatively hazardous; and (3) the project would result in the deterioration of the quality of a drinking water source.
- 5. Impacts on water quality may have significant impacts on biological communities if the project would generate, accidentally release, or result in the accumulation of substances which affect health or cause genetic defects of wildlife, either by direct physical contact with contaminated water, or by water quality changes which cause a decline in riparian or lacustrine vegetation which provides wildlife habitat.

### Analysis of Impacts

## <u>Hydrology</u>

Implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would include the creation of brush management zones located in open space, private lands and other environmentally sensitive lands. Creation of the proposed brush management zones could involve several activities/techniques, depending on the physical/biological conditions of the project site. The various types of potential activities/techniques are described below:

- Thinning ~ utilizing a landscaping piece of equipment or goats to thin existing native vegetation to 50% within Brush Management Zone Two.
- Mowing mowing of brush and other vegetation on the surface to allow adequate Brush Management Zone One. This technique is not allowed within Brush Management Zone Two.
- 3. *Trimming/Pruning* trimming 50 % of existing vegetation to 6 inches and then pruning remaining plants within Brush Management Zone Two.

Each of the techniques described above would not involve <u>minimal</u> surface disturbance <u>and</u> <u>would not substantially affect existing hydrologic conditions</u>. Surface water transport of sediments to downstream receiving water-bodies and possible buildup of sediment deposits could result in incremental impacts to stream hydrology including stream-flow velocities. However, since the proposed brush management zones are not disturbing the existing-soil conditions, impacts are limited to water creating new ruts in the soil where the soil crodes more quickly. Implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would not require any groundwater dewatering.

### Water Quality

Current brush management regulations, based on the current assumptions and existing GIS data, would impact approximately 3,815 3,753 acres of vegetation. Implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would impact an additional 2,474 2.880 acres, for a total impact to vegetation of 6,289 6,663 acres. In addition to the potential for stream hydrology impacts, the

ł

1

minimal erosion and sedimentation associated with surface disturbance would not pose the potential for water quality impacts to receiving water bodies and streams. The minimal amount of erosion and sedimentation would be filtered by existing vegetation and would not reach receiving water bodies and streams.

Further, any landscaping equipment (ic. weed-whacker) that would operate within open space, private lands or other environmentally sensitive lands could affect water quality through unintentional releases of fluids or other substances. Any such releases from equipment are not expected to be substantial given that very limited quantities of hazardous substances would be present and that, should a spill or release occur, there would be trained personnel present that could respond immediately, when brush management is occurring on city owned property.

Based on the currently listed contaminants of potential concern (COPC) in the Section 303(d) list for the San Diego Region, the greatest potential for water quality impacts to affected impaired water bodies from implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would be related to the following constituents: siltation/sedimentation and total dissolved solids resulting from exposure of soils in open space areas; trash, either introduced from thinning activities in open space, private lands and other environmentally sensitive lands, or existing trash would be mobilized/released during thinning of vegetation; and trace toxics or other elements that could result from the operation of landscaping equipment in open space, private lands and other environmentally sensitive lands. Such potential for water quality impacts is considered minimal, given the relatively minor amounts of soil disturbance and the benign nature of the operation of landscaping equipment (as relates to release of toxic substances).

Currently, Municipal Code Section 44.0307.1 states that "Droppings from cattle, goats or sheep shall not be permitted to accumulate so as to create a health or sanitation problem, or the breeding of flies." This section has been amended to add "or the potential for discharge into the storm water system." Additionally, a new Section 44.0307.3 has been added that includes the following criteria for goats being brought in for brush management: "Goats shall be within a secure enclosure at all times. They may be moved to a separate holding pen at night, which shall be located as far as possible from residences. In addition to the requirements of Section 44.0307.1, droppings in the holding pen shall be removed and properly disposed of daily."

According to the City of San Diego Metro Wastewater Stormwater Section, as long as goat droppings are not stockpiled or allowed to accumulate in pens, it would be consistent with the City's current Best Management Practices. Additionally, sun light kills bacteria in a short period of time. The goats will be browsing at the top of slopes, not at the bottom of canyons, thus the potential for water quality impacts will be further reduced. Only an intense rain event could wash some of the droppings downstream. Goat feees are hard pellets with low water content, and do not easily dissolve in water. Typically, goats do not like to enter water and will avoid direct water contact if possible.

Based on the nature of the proposed brush management revisions, impacts to groundwater quality are not expected to occur.

# Erosion

Implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would include the creation of brush management zones located in open space, private lands and other environmentally sensitive lands. According to the Biological Technical Report prepared by Holly Cheong, Environmental Biologist City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program, out of 25 sites that were analyzed, two brush management areas showed evidence of erosion on the site. The proposed techniques for thinning would not result in a significant impact to potential erosion and sedimentation. The potential for erosion and sedimentation would be greater in cases where creation of the proposed brush management zones requires a notable amount on steep slopes (i.e., more than one acre on slopes of greater than 25 percent grade).

Soil erosion was observed on two slopes that had been brush managed. These areas were brush managed by homeowners. The erosion within the brush management areas can be attributed to the sandy soils on the slope and, in the case of brush management area 24, the way the slope was constructed. Brush management area 24 was cut quite steep in order to accommodate a utility

Brash Management Revisions to the Land Development Code SEIR/EA

i

ı

access road. The sandy soils have moderate erosion due to this steep cut. In both cases, there is no clear association between brush management and the erosion on-site. <u>Surface water transport</u> of sediments to downstream receiving water bodies and possible buildup of sediment deposits could result in incremental impacts to water quality.

Potential erosion impacts associated with livestock stem from mismanagement--such as too high stocking rates of livestock per area, kept in one area too long, or animals having become feral---resulting in overgrazing and over-browsing. A common source of erosion and/or soil compaction stems from the animals using the same entry and exit from pens over a long period of time, or when they congregate around watering areas, feed troughs, supplement containers, salt/mineral blocks for long periods of time.

Per the proposed amendments to Section 44.0307, goats would be restricted to 75 per acre and would be moved along as soon as the 50% thinning goal is reached. Additionally, all feeding and most of the watering would occur in the holding pens, located in non-sensitive areas away from the slopes. Any water available on the slopes would be moved constantly as the goats are moved. These restrictions would minimize the opportunity for either crossion or soil compaction impacts.

Goats are cloven/split hooved, which means they have two toes on each hoof, not one large solid hoof like a horse. Less soil compaction results from a cloven hoof than a solid foot or hoof, or from a heavier animal. The toes act separately and grip the soil, and even though there are eight toes per animal, damage is minimal. Goats' smaller feet tend to not create sloughing-off of slopes and are less destructive on the underlying vegetation, even compared to a human adult.

Additionally, goats are browsers, and are not likely to eat the ground-cover vegetation down to the soil level, particularly when they are moved along and managed correctly. They are much more likely to eat portions of the taller vegetation, thus retaining vegetation cover for the soil. They don't tend to pull up the vegetation by the roots when they eat, and don't cat as close to the ground as do sheep and cattle. They will do little actual 'grazing', unless the weeds and brush run out. All of these characteristics reduce the soil erosion potential. Goats also tend to spread out when browsing and not congregate in a group. They tend to not use the same trail, or follow one another, like cattle and people do, so path/trail making, bare areas and resulting compaction would not be as likely, therefore reducing the potential for soil crossion.

Based on the nature of the proposed brush management revisions, manner in which goats would feed and move, impacts to erosion are not expected to occur. Surveys of existing zone two brush managed areas indicate that human brush management activities do not cause erosion; therefore, humans nor goats would cause erosion in expanded zone two brush managed areas.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

As described above, based on current assumptions and existing GIS data, proposed brush management revisions would not exceed the City's significance thresholds relative to hydrology, water quality and erosion, and are not considered to have significant impacts.

# MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Impacts to hydrology, water quality, and erosion would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

# D. NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER/AESTHETICS

The following analysis of potential impacts to neighborhood character and aesthetics focuses on impacts associated with proposed brush management revisions.

# EXISTING CONDITIONS

The existing brush management regulations throughout the City of San Diego are intended and designed to protect structures of potential fire hazards while also being considerate of existing vegetation in open space, private lands and other environmentally sensitive lands. Current brush management regulations for zone one allows for pavement and permanently irrigated ornamental planting. Current brush management regulations within zone two require that 50% of the plants over eighteen inches in height shall be cut to six inches in height with the remaining plants to be pruned. Trees and shrubs within zone two are to be pruned to three times the height of the lower plants within the zone. Trees and shrubs are not removed from zone two. No permanent irrigation is allowed within brush management zone two.

# ISSUE STATEMENT

J. Does the proposed project impact mature trees which could have a significant effect on neighborhood character/aesthetics?

# IMPACT

# Criteria for Significance Determination

The City of San Diego Development Services Department, Environmental Analysis Section's *Significance Determination Guidelines Under the California Environmental Quality Act* (April 2001) evaluates the significance of impacts to visual quality relating to public views, neighborhood character/architecture and aesthetics. CEQA Guidelines (Appendix G, I), states that a Lead Agency should evaluate the environmental effect of a project on aesthetics including visual quality using the following criteria: (a) substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista; (b) substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and

historic buildings within a state scenic highway; (c) substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings; and (d) create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

Projects that severely contrast with the surrounding neighborhood character are considered significant if one or more of the following conditions apply: (a) project exceeds the allowed height or bulk regulations by a significant margin; (b) project would have an architectural style or use building materials in stark contrast to adjacent development where the adjacent development follows a single or common architectural theme; (c) project would result in the physical loss, isolation or degradation of a community identification symbol or landmark (ex. a stand of trees, coastal bluff, historic landmark) which is identified in the General Plan, applicable community plan or local coastal program; (d) project is located in a highly visible area (ex. on a canyon edge, hilltop or adjacent to an interstate highway) and would strongly contrast with the surrounding development or natural topography through excessive bulk, signage, or architectural projections; and (e) project would have a cumulative effect by opening up a new area for development or changing the overall character of the area.

#### Analysis of Impacts

Implementation of the proposed Brush Management revisions would serve to improve the amount of defensible space from structures to high fuel load vegetation. The brush management revisions would help avoid large brush fires, like the recent Cedar Fire of October 2003, thereby avoiding impacts to neighborhood character/aesthetics.

There is the potential that private land owners could impact mature trees with the proposed brush management revisions. However, the current brush management regulations require that trees be thinned, not removed from brush management zones one and two. Brush management zone two is thinned to 50% as shown in Figure 4 of Section III, Project Description. If controlled grazing is used to thin acreage it is likely that goats could be viewed for short periods of time from areas within the City. This would be a temporary situation. Therefore, the proposed brush management revisions would not result in a significant impact to neighborhood character/aesthetics.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF IMPACT

The proposed brush management revisions would serve to minimize any potential impacts to mature trees, and any individual thinning projects on private lands, open space or other environmentally sensitive lands are not anticipated to result in changes to neighborhood characteristics or aesthetics. No mature trees will be removed with the proposed brush management zones. As such, no significant impacts are expected. The temporary situation of citizens being able to view goats in certain neighborhoods for a short period of time would not create a significant impact to neighborhood character/aesthetics.

## MITIGATION, MONITORING, AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Impacts to neighborhood character/aesthetics would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation measures are required.

# SECTION VI GROWTH INDUCEMENT

The purpose of this section is to discuss the ways in which the proposed Brush Management revisions could foster economic or population growth, or construction of additional housing. The proposed brush management revisions involves ongoing thinning activities located on private lands, open space and other environmentally sensitive lands that would serve to maintain the proposed 100 foot wide defensible space between structures and vegetation. The proposed brush management revisions would not have the potential to directly or indirectly induce growth or otherwise foster the potential for growth. This SEIR/EA does not address future development and is focused on existing developed properties. Therefore, no growth inducing impacts, direct or indirect, are anticipated to occur as a result of the implementation of the revised brush management regulations.

# SECTION VII CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

This section addresses the potential for impacts from the proposed Brush Management revisions to combine with impacts from other projects in the study area and result in cumulative impacts to the environment. Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines "cumulative impacts" as referring to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts. The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment that results from the incremental impact of a project when added to other closely related past, present and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

Section 15130(b) of the CEQA guidelines indicates that the discussion of cumulative impacts needs to include either of the following elements:

- (A) A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency, or
- (B) A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document, or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact.

# A. PROJECTS CONSIDERED IN CUMULATIVE IMPACTS DISCUSSION

There are several categories of projects, regional or citywide in scope, which could result in incrementally significant impacts. For purposes of this SEIR/EA, the Canyon Sewer Cleaning Projects EIR was used when considering cumulative impacts.

# B. PLANS CONSIDERED IN CUMULATIVE IMPACTS DISCUSSION

The proposed brush management revisions would be implemented throughout the City of San Diego. It is anticipated that the future environmental conditions will be influenced by several citywide regional planning programs. Such regional plans and programs include the San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), the City of San Diego Land Development Code (LDC), the City of Villages Growth Strategy – Strategic Framework Element and all of the community plans within the City of San Diego.

# 1. MULTIPLE SPECIES CONSERVATION PROGRAM (MSCP)

San Diego Regional Plan - MSCP was developed to provide a regional mitigation solution for impacts to multiple, rather than single, species and their habitats. The MSCP is a cooperative effort consisting of federal and state resource agencies, local jurisdictions, environmental groups, property owners, and experts in the fields of biology, environmental planning and conservation. The MSCP is part of the statewide Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP) program that was established under California law (Section 2800 et seq, of the California Fish and Game Code) "to provide for regional protection and perpetuation of natural wildlife diversity while allowing compatible land use and appropriate development and growth". The MSCP is one of several regional conservation planner efforts coordinated with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). In conjunction with the MSCP, a Multiple Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) focused planning area for the City of San Diego comprised of over 50,000 acres was identified for the purpose of preservation. The 1996 Recirculated EIR/EIS (LDR. No. 93-0287, SCH No. 93121073) related to the MSCP found that the proposed MHPA would result in significant unavoidable impacts for certain land use and community plans, including as related to population, housing, public services and utilities; however, cumulative impacts (with focus on biological resources, land use, and public facilities) would be less than significant.

# 2. LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE

In 1997, the San Diego City Council approved a comprehensive update and revision to various land development regulations in the form of the Land Development Code (LDC). Adoption of

÷

VII.2

#### Brisch Management Revisions to the Land Development Code SistR/FA

the LDC included amendments to certain chapters of the Land Development Code, amendment of the Local Coastal Program, modification of existing zone regulations and of planning and zoning support documents, and readoption of the Uniform Building Code, the National Electrical Code, the Uniform Mechanical Code, and the Uniform Plumbing Code. In that the LDC applies Citywide to new development, the EIR (LDR. No 96-0333, SCII No. 96081056) completed for the LDC considered potential impacts on a citywide basis and included in the cumulative effects analysis numerous regional plans and programs, various community plan updates and amendments, rezones associated with the MSCP, and regulatory relief amendments to the Land Development Code. Given that the LDC EIR evaluates development impacts on a Citywide basis relative to implementation of the LDC and other regional plans and programs, the cumulative impacts discussion in the LDC EIR provides a reasonable and appropriate basis by which to consider the additional effects of the proposed brush management revisions. Various plans and programs of a citywide or regional nature that are considered in the LDC EIR include a variety of conservation planning efforts ranging from the MSCP to the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park, numerous community plan updates, and the 1996 regulatory relief amendments to the Land Development Code. Cumulative impacts associated with these plans and programs that were addressed in the LDC EIR include soils/erosion hazards, air quality, hydrology/water quality, biological resources, land use, transportation/circulation, neighborhood character/aesthetics, cultural resources, paleontological resources, human health and public safety – all of which were found to be cumulatively significant.

# 3. CITY OF VILLAGES GROWTH STRATEGY – STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK ELEMENT

The City of Villages Growth Strategy – Strategic Framework Element (SFE) provides a longterm strategy to direct future growth as San Diego shifts from an era of building upon abundant open land to one of reinvesting in existing communities. The City of Villages concept builds upon what the City already has by creating a network of village centers served by transit systems. The Final EIR for the SFE (October 2002, LDR No. 40-1027) addressed the potential environmental impacts associated with such development, along with proposed increased density and housing units that were subsequently deleted from the SFE that was approved by the City

:

Council on October 22, 2002. The EIR found project-related impacts that could not be mitigated to a level less-than-significant would include traffic and solid waste disposal, and impacts that could be mitigated to a level less-than-significant would include paleontological resources, geology hazards, noise, historic resources, and human health and safety. The Final EIR also considered the cumulative effects of future development associated with the subject proposal along with numerous other private and public development proposals as addressed within the 128 environmental impact reports completed by the City of San Diego between 1991 and 2000. As in the case of the LDC EIR described above, the SFE EIR provides an analysis of potential impacts associated with the proposed citywide brush management revisions. The SFE EIR's discussion of cumulative impacts is reflected in the proposed brush management cumulative impacts analysis below.

### C. IMPACTS ANALYSIS

### LAND USE

As discussed in Section V.A, implementation of the proposed brush management revisions is not expected to result in land use impacts, with the exception of consistency with the Environmentally Sensitive Lands-regulations as it relates to the gnatesteher breading season. Of the 377 known gnatesteher sites, five-sites or 1.3 % would be impacted as a result of the project. These impacts when considered with other reasonably foreseeable projects are not considered to be cumulatively significant.

#### BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

As a result of the project 2880 acres of habitat would be impacted, of which 715 acres are within the MHPA. The MHPA has preserved 52,012 acres. 1.4 % of the habitat within the MHPA would be impacted with implementation of the brush management revisions. Weed invasion in conjunction with past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects is together considered to be cumulatively significant and the contribution of the revised brash management regulations is considerable and therefore significant. Since the project is consistent with the MSCP, cumulative biology impacts are mitigated by the MSCP to a level below significant.

### HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY/EROSION

As discussed in Section V.C, implementation of the proposed brush management revisions is not expected to require any groundwater dewatering. Based on the nature of the proposed brush management revisions, impacts to groundwater quality are not expected to occur. Based on the nature of the proposed brush management revisions, impacts to erosion are not expected to be significant. Therefore, it is anticipated that the proposed brush management revisions would not considerable contribute to cumulatively significant hydrology/water quality/erosion impacts.

# NEICHBORHOOD CHARACTER/AESTHETICS

As discussed in Section V.D, implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would serve to minimize any potential impacts to mature trees, and any individual thinning projects on private lands, open space or other environmentally sensitive lands are not anticipated to result in changes to neighborhood characteristics or aesthetics during thinning activities. No mature trees will be removed with the proposed brush management zones. As such, the proposed brush management revisions would not contribute to the cumulatively significant neighborhood character/aesthetics impacts.

### CONCLUSIONS REGARDING CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Based on the above, cumulative impacts related to land use, hydrology/water quality/erosion and neighborhood character/aesthetics are anticipated to be loss than significant. Cumulative impacts related to biological resources are considered at this time to be significant and unmitigated. Cumulative biological impacts for this project are mitigated by the implementation of the MSCP. Therefore, cumulative biological impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

# SECTION VIII ALTERNATIVES

The following describes all of the options that were considered as alternatives to the currently proposed brush management revisions.

# ALTERNATIVE 1 - NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

### DESCRIPTION

Pursuant to CEQA, the No Project Alternative, the existing brush management zones would remain in effect. Current brush management regulation state that the width of zone one varies from twenty feet to thirty-five feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and thirty feet to forty-five feet on the east. Zone two currently varies for twenty feet to thirty feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and forty feet to fifty feet on the east.

# ANALYSIS

In the absence of implementing any of the activities associated with the proposed brush management revisions, none of the environmental impacts described in Section V would directly occur. The following describes, by environmental topic area, the proposed brush management revisions-related impacts that would be directly avoided under this Alternative.

### **Biological Resources**

The No Project Alternative would avoid direct impacts to sensitive habitat.

# Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion

The No Project Alternative would avoid direct impacts to hydrology/water quality/erosion.

### Land Use

The No Project Alternative would avoid direct impacts to land use.

#### Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics

The No Project Alternative would avoid direct impacts to neighborhood character/aesthetics.

#### ALTERNATIVE 2 - NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

#### DESCRIPTION

NEPA requires that the No Action Alternative be described. The No Action Alternative assumes that there would be no federal funding available for the implementation of the brush management revisions within City owned open space areas and as a result, no federal action to approve. The proposed brush management revisions could still be implemented by the City; however, funding would need to be acquired from different sources. This alternative would not achieve the objectives of the project of providing additional defensible space from structures to vegetation because the City does not have alternative sources of funding for the project.

#### ALTERNATIVE 3 CLEAR AND RE-PLANT ZONE TWO

#### **DESCRIPTION**

Under Alternative 4 <u>this alternative</u> complete clearing would occur in zone two and would be replanted with low height native plant types. Proper planting protocol would be to lightly scarify the soil surface before planting for better seed/soil contact. Temporary inigation would be installed for a period of up to two years for plant establishment. The assumptions associated with this alternative are that the irrigation would not be installed or monitored properly thereby allowing runoff to cocur down slope of zone two. This can be substantiated by evidence that irrigation runoff is the primary source of water in our drainages within the City during the summer. The newly planted vegetation would be successful in reducing impacts to wood invasion.

#### ANALYSIS

#### **Biological Resources**

Under this alternative, significant impacts to biological resources in zone two would not occur as the habitat being replaced would be native, non-invasive and low growing. Potentially

significant impacts to the habitat down slope of zone two could result from irrigation-runoff from the temporary irrigation lines.- This would include the establishment of plant types that thrive in wetter soil conditions as a result of the runoff. In addition, impacts to consistive species, i.e. gnateatcher would remain significant as the existing habitat would be completely removed.

## Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion

The clear and re-plant alternative would utilize temporary irrigation for a period of up to two years to allow plant establishment in zone two. Based on the assumption noted above, monitoring of irrigation is not unticipated and would therefore create a significant impact to soil erosion down slope of zone two due to runoff from the temporary irrigation lines at least during the time period that it would take for plant establishment. Potentially significant impacts associated with water quality would also occur from the runoff which carries silt and sediment down slope and could potentially impact any off-site water body. Impacts associated with erosion and water quality would be considered significant and unmitigated.

# Land Use

No impacts associated with land use would occur under the clear and re-plant alternative,

### Neighborbood Character/Aesthetics

No impacts associated with neighborhood character/nesthetics would occur with this alternative.

# ALTERNATIVE-4 3 - INCREASING BUILDING REGULATIONS

# **DESCRIPTION**

Under this alternative, proposed changes to the building regulations would occur thereby eliminating the need for increased brush management zones. Revisions to the building regulations could include fire walls which would be constructed at the boundary between zone two and open space. Additional building regulations could include alternative architectural features for structures where brush management would normally be required. The revision to include fire walls has been added to the Land Development Code regulations is included in the proposed ordinance which is attached to this SEIR/EA as Appendix C. Additionally, as a result of the 2003 fires the City Council passed an ordinance which identifies the requirement for roof

materials on structures to be replaced by a certain date in the future. For this alternative a similar ordinance would be passed to make buildings "fire-proof".

### ANALYSIS

### **Biological Resources**

Under this alternative there would be no impacts to biological resources or sensitive species because brush management would not occur. The building regulations would reduce the fire hazard to structures and the habitat on site would remain undisturbed. This alternative would require that increased building regulations be implemented and would not give citizens the choice of either providing zone two brush management or providing alternative architectural features to structures as is the case with the current regulations.

### Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion

No impacts associated with hydrology/water quality/erosion would occur with this alternative.

### Land Use

No land use impacts would result from this alternative.

### Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics

Under this alternative there may be situations where fire walls would be constructed in areas where only vegetated open space could previously be viewed. If necessary, construction of fire walls at the boundary of zone two and the open space area would normally be six feet in height and generally be constructed of a solid masonry type. This could create a change to the visual quality of a community if viewed from public rights-of-way, however on a city wide basis this would not create a significant impact to neighborhood character/aesthetics.

# SECTION IX - ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED

# 1-EDUCATION/TRAINING

### DESCRIPTION

The Education/training alternative would rely on existing information which is available to the public for the purposes of brush management and creating defensible space around structures. Much of this educational information is readily available to the public via the City of San Diego website, brochares and flyers which are available through the Fire-Rescue and Park and Recreation Departments. There has been a substantial amount of public outreach on the subject of brush management. With respect to training, the city staff from the Park and Recreation Department that is responsible for conducting brush management on City lands has received training on how brush management is done in the field. There are currently no training classes available, nor is a training program on brush management for the public. This alternative is unreasonable due to the fact it is assumed that not everyone who requires brush management on their site would necessarily partake in any of the educational materials and/or conduct brush management per the required procedures in the regulations or as required in any development permit conditions.

# ANALYSIS

### **Biological Resources**

Under this alternative, based on the assumptions mentioned above, there would be a significant impact to sensitive biological resources as a result of the establishment of non-native plant species in zone two and down slope of zone two. In addition, impacts to the California gnateatcher would occur as the assumption is that brush management could likely occur during the breeding season. Mitigation identified in section V.B. Biological Resources would partially reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Impacts associated with invasive plant species would remain significant and unmitigated.

# Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion

No impacts associated with hydrology/water quality/erosion would occur with this alternative.

#### Land Use

No land use impacts would result from this alternative.

#### Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics

No impacts associated with neighborhood character/aesthetics would occur with this alternative.

#### 2 - PRESCRIBED BURN ALTERNATIVE

#### DESCRIPTION

Under this alternative, prescribed burning of vegetation would be allowed within or beyond brush management zone two to allow fuel load reduction. Prescribed burns can be used to create a mosaic of age-classes of shrublands; reducing fuel load adjacent to structures; protecting oak and conifer woodlands through understory burning; and removal of unwanted or exotic species. The effectiveness of prescribed burns is questionable. Research indicates that this type of fuel management may be effective at controlling fires that burn under moderate weather conditions, but ineffective at controlling fires that ignite under severe weather conditions (i.e., Santa Ana). It has been suggested that multiple prescribed burns to create a mosaic of fuel loads in the shrublands is not practical and focus should be on the interface between developments and native habitat areas.

Prescribed burns creates a significant liability issue, and can only be conducted at certain times of the year based on humidity, wind, fuel load and availability of response crews to suppress unwanted burns. An incomplete assessment of any factor for a prescribed burn can lead to loss of property and life with serious liability questions to both the landowner and the one responsible for the burn. This alternative is not supported by the City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department.

#### ANALYSIS

ł

#### **Biological Resources**

This alternative would result in significant impacts to biological resources as a result of habitat being destroyed by the controlled burn. Although native habitat can regenerate following the effects of a fire, the initial result is a significant impact. This impact would occur inside and outside of the MHPA, and would remain significant and unmitigated. The benefits of exotic species removal by prescribed burns requires continued burning to remove the exotic species from the seed bank. Exotic species will return if the interval between prescribed burns is too long. Conversely, prescribed burns that occur too frequently can result in a type conversion of habitat; chaparral and coastal sage scrub can be converted to grasslands. Sensitive species would also be significantly impacted by this alternative. Fire could substantially reduce the number of rare and endangered species. This impact would be significant and unmitigated.

### Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion

Fire results in a greater than 50% reduction of vegetative cover, thus exposing a soil surface that is highly erodible. While habitat does re-establish post fire it does take years to regenerate to viable habitat. Significant impacts to erosion and water quality would result from this alternative. These impacts would remain significant and unmitigated for a number of years until such time that the habitat became re-established.

#### Land Use

This alternative would result in significant land use impacts as it would not be in conformance with the community plans that identify preservation of open space as a controlled burn would denude open space areas. In addition, controlled burn would not be in conformance with the Environmentally Sensitive Lands ordinance (ESL) as the sensitive habitat regulated by ESL would be destroyed by fire. This would be considered a significant and unmitigated impact.

### Neighborhood Character/Acsthetics

This alternative would potentially create a significant impact to the character of a neighborhood. As can be referenced from the numerous photos that were shown by the media as a result of the Cedar and other fires in October 2003, fire can have a devastating affect on a neighborhood from not only a character perspective but also an acsthetic/visual perspective. This impact would be considered significant and unmitigated.

### Air Quality

Prescribed burning produces smoke, which is a mixture of toxic particles and gases. If not carefully managed, smoke can be a nuisance to residents and businesses, and it can adversely impact community health. Smoke can contribute levels of pollution that exceed health protective air quality standards. However, to minimize smoke impacts and protect public health, burners and air regulators work together to match burning with appropriate atmospheric conditions.

For the reasons identified above, the Prescribed Burn alternative is unreasonable.

# ALTERNATIVE 3 - CLEAR AND RE-PLANT ZONE TWO

# **DESCRIPTION**

Under Alternative 4 this alternative complete clearing would occur in zone two and would be replanted with low height native plant types. Proper planting protocol would be to lightly searify the soil surface before planting for better seed/soil contact. Temporary irrigation would be installed for a period of up to two years for plant establishment. The assumptions associated with this alternative are that the irrigation would not be installed or monitored properly thereby allowing runoff to occur down slope of zone two. This can be substantiated by evidence that irrigation runoff is the primary source of water in our drainages within the City during the summer. The newly planted vegetation would be successful in reducing impacts to weed invasion.

# <u>ANALYSIS</u>

# **Biological Resources**

Under this alternative, significant impacts to biological resources in zone two would not occur as the habitat being replaced would be native, non-invasive and low-growing. Potentially significant impacts to the habitat down slope of zone two could result from irrigation runoff from the temporary irrigation lines. This would include the establishment of plant types that thrive in wetter soil conditions as a result of the runoff. In addition, impacts to sensitive species, i.e. gnateatcher would remain significant as the existing habitat would be completely removed.

# Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion

The clear and re-plant alternative would utilize temporary irrigation for a period of up to two years to allow plant establishment in zone two. Based on the assumption noted above, monitoring of irrigation is not anticipated and would therefore create a significant impact to soil erosion down slope of zone two due to runoff from the temporary irrigation lines at least during the time period that it would take for plant establishment. Potentially significant impacts associated with water quality would also occur from the runoff which carries silt and sediment down slope and could potentially impact any off-site water body. Impacts associated with erosion and water quality would be considered significant and unmitigated.

# <u>Land Use</u>

No impacts associated with land use would occur under the clear and re-plant alternative.

# Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics

No impacts associated with neighborhood character/aesthetics would occur with this alternative.

# <u>4 – THINNING BY PLANT TYPE</u>

# **DESCRIPTION**

Under this alternative, thinning of vegetation would occur based on the plant types located within brush management zone two for fuel load reduction. The first plant types to be thinned would be the most flammable and the most invasive within the specific brush management zone two area. Next, the more flammable native or naturalized plants would be thinned. Finally, the least flammable and more sensitive native or naturalized plants would be thinned for a total reduction in ground cover to 50%. The effectiveness of thinning by plant type is questionable. Thinning the most flammable and the most invasive plant types first would address the most harmful plant types, but these plant types could establish themselves rather quickly after the initial brush management occurs. This alternative is rejected because it is not potentially feasible to assume that everyone who requires brush management on their property would be able to identify all plant types located in zone two brush managed areas.

# <u>ANALYSIS</u>

### **Biological Resources**

This alternative would result in significant impacts to biological resources as a result of habitat being thinned by plant type. Although native habitat can regenerate following the effects thinning, the initial result is a significant impact. This impact would occur inside and outside of the MHPA, and would remain significant and unmitigated. The benefit of exotic species removal of thinning by plant type requires continued thinning to remove the exotic species from the seed bank. Exotic species will return if the interval between thinning activities is too long. Conversely, thinning by plant type that occurs too frequently can result in a type conversion of habitat; chaparral and coastal sage serub can be converted to grasslands. Sensitive species would also be significantly impacted by this alternative. This impact would be significant and unmitigated.

# Hydrology/Water Quality/Erosion

No impacts associated with hydrology/water quality/erosion would occur with this alternative.

# <u>Land Use</u>

No land use impacts would result from this alternative.

# Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics

No impacts associated with neighborhood character/aesthetics would occur with this alternative.

#### SECTION 1X

#### EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

During the initial environmental assessment process, the Development Services Department determined that the Revisions to the Brush Management regulations project would not entail significant environmental impacts with respect to Air Quality, Agriculture, Archaeological Resources, Energy, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Mineral Resources, Noise, Paleontological Resources, Public Services, Recreation, and Utilities/Services Systems. Accordingly, these issues are not included in Chapter V of this SEIR/EA. A brief discussion regarding each of these issues is provided below.

### A. AIR QUALITY

The proposed brush management revisions would not have a substantial affect on the Air Quality within the City. While citizens and Park and Recreation department staff may use gas powered tools to conduct brush management the emissions would be temporary and would not significantly contribute to regional air quality degradation. The project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable Air Quality Attainment Plans or a Congestion Management Plan, violate a stationary source air quality standard, contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation, result in a net increase of any criteria pollutants, create or contribute to a non-stationary source "hot spot", nor expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

### B. AGRICULTURE

The proposed brush management revisions would not affect agricultural areas. As such, there would be no impact to Prime Farmland, Unique Farmlands, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

#### C. ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The proposed brush management revisions do not include any surface or subsurface disturbance. Pruning and thinning activities would all take place above ground and no grubbing or grading would be required. <u>Areas that are</u> 1

brush managed would initially have some areas of visibility related to existing surface archaeological sites. However, as invasive species establish in brush managed areas, these surface archaeological sites would not be visible. Pruning and thinning activities would be performed with hand tools or utilizing goats. No heavy machinery is allowed in performing brush management activities. Therefore, no impacts to archaeological resources would result from the proposed project.

#### D. ENERGY

The proposed project would not require excessive amounts of fuel or energy, and would not significantly affect attainment of regional energy conservation goals. Therefore, no significant impacts with respect to energy are anticipated with implementation of the proposed brush management revisions.

### E. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The projects would not entail the permanent transport, use, disposal, or emission of hazardous materials. All brush management activities occur above ground in public and privately owned parcels and would therefore not impede any roadways or entail the closure of any streets or emergency access routes.

#### F. MINERAL RESOURCES

The proposed project would not result in any subsurface activity as grading and grubbing are not a part of brush management. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource either regionally or locally.

### G. NOISE

Brush management activities may include the use of power tools such as weed whackers or saws. These tools can generate nuisance noise which is of intermittent duration (lasting a few hours for a few days) based on the brush management area being thinned. Construction noise from these tools is difficult to quantify because of the many variables involved, including the size of the equipment being used, and the percentage of time and number of picces of equipment that would actually operate on the site. Due to the fact that brush management occurs sporadically on any given site, impacts associated with noise would not be significant.

### H. ODOR

Controlled grazing would utilize a herd of goats for a certain number of days to be closely monitored on a specific parcel of land. The number of goats would vary depending on the acreage to be thinned. Livestock can often emanate an odor which humans find offensive. The goats are only placed for a very limited amount of days to graze and then removed or re-located to another site, at which time the odor would terminate. Therefore, impacts associated with odor would not be significant.

#### I. PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Brush management activities are limited to pruning and thinning and no grading or grubbing would occur. Therefore, no subsurface activity is anticipated and there would not be any loss of Paleontological resources.

#### J. POPULATION/HOUSING

The proposed brush management revisions would provide a greater defensible space from the threat of fire. The project would not impact population growth or displace exiting bousing or population.

#### K. PUBLIC SERVICES

The project would not significantly affect public services with the exception of the Fire-Rescue department. Increasing brush management zone two would have a positive effect on the Fire-Rescue Department by providing an increased defensible space when the threat of fire is imminent.

## L. RECREATION

i

1

ì

I

I

The proposed brush management rovisions would not significantly affect the usage of any recreational facilities. Park and Recreation Department is responsible for brush management on City owned property including public park facilities. However, brush management activities occur for very limited amounts of time on a property and would not create any significant impact to recreational facilities.

#### M. UTILITIES/SERVICE SYSTEMS

The project is intended to create a greater defensible space from fire for the citizens of San Diego. There would not be any significant impacts associated with implementation of the project as it relates to utilities/service systems.

#### SECTION X

# SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES THAT WOULD BE INVOLVED IN THE PROPOSED ACTION, SHOULD IT BE IMPLEMENTED

Implementation of the proposed brush management revisions would result in significant irreversible environmental changes. The proposed revisions consist of a City wide 100 foot brush management area consisting of 35 feet of zone one and 65 feet of zone two. In addition, zone two would be expanded accordingly to achieve 100 feet of brush management where zone one is less that 35 feet from existing structures. These revisions could result in an impact to land use as they would not be consistent with the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations as further described in Section V.A. – Land use. These impacts would remain significant and unmitigated.

The brush management revisions would also result in significant irreversible changes to biological resources. The thinning activities in zone two-allows for the establishment of invasive species to grow within zone two and potentially down slope of zone two. Impacts to noncovered species located outside the MHPA would be significant and unmitigated. These impacts would remain significant and unmitigated and are further described in Section V.B. Biological Resources.

# SECTION XI SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

Section 15126(b) of the CEQA guidelines requires an EIR to "describe any significant impacts, including those that can be mitigated but not reduced to a level of insignificance. Where there are impacts that cannot be alleviated without imposing an alternative design, their implications and the reasons why the project is being proposed, notwithstanding their effect, should be described."

Land-Use Impacts would remain significant and unmitigated as a result of the potential inconsistency with the revisions to the brush management regulations as they relate to the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations.

Impacts to biological resources would result from the brush management revisions as it has been verified through field inspections that invasive plant types establish within zone two once thinning has occurred. These impacts would remain significant and manitigated. The Land Development Code EIR determined that a potentially significant impact on biological resources related to brush management outside the bounds of the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) where non-covered species are affected could occur. The current project has made the same determination; therefore, the potential impacts to non-covered species outside the MHPA would remain significant and upmitigated.

#### SECTION XII

#### REFERENCES

Beauchamp, R.M. 1986. A Flora of San Diego County. Sweetwater River Press, National City, CA.

<u>California Native Plant Society. 2004. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants.</u> http://www.northcoast.com/~cnps/cgi-bin/cnps/sensiny.cgi. Accessed 8/04.

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region 1994. Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. September.

City of San Diego, 1979. Progress Guide and General Plan.

City of San Diego, 1996. City of San Diego, Development Services Department, Environmental Analysis Section/Public Projects and United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Recirculated Draft Joint EIR/EIS Issuance of Take Authorizations for Threatened and Endangered Species Due to Urban Growth Within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Planning Area, LDR. No. 93-0287, SCH No. 93121073. August.

City of San Diego, 1997. Land Development Code EIR, LDR No. 96-0333, SCH No. 96081056

City of San Diego, 2003. Canyon Sewer Cleaning Program and Long Term Sewer Maintenance Program, Project No. 6020, SCH No. 2002041129.

City of San Diego, 1997. Biological and Conference Opinions on Issuance of an Incidental Take Permit to the City of San Diego pursuant to the Multiple Species Conservation Program (I-6-97-FW-47). June 1997.

City of San Diego, 1997. City of San Diego MSCP Subarca Plan. March 1997.

City of San Diego, 1996. Council-Approved MSCP Policy Positions. July 2, 1996

City of San Diego, 1998. Final Multiple Species Conservation Program/MSCP Plan. August 1998.

City of San Diego, 1997. Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, City of San Diego. July 1997.

City of San Diego, 1996. City of San Diego Councilmember Judy McCarthy District Seven Memorandum: MSCP Policy Direction – Council Meeting of April 23, 1996. April 1996.

 $X ll_{\gamma} f$ 

I

÷
ĥ

City of San Diego, 1996. Recirculated Draft Joint EIR/EIS Issuance of Take Authorizations for Threatened and Endangered Species Due to Urban Growth within the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). August 1996.

City of San Diego – Community Plans and Precise & Specific Plans with (MHPA acreages), initial plan text adoption date and annotated page citations

Black Mountain Ranch, July, 2002 – Pages 3.2 and 3.7 brush management and reference city requirements

NCFUA Framework Plan, Feb., 1995 – Page 75; transition treatment; Page 85: brush management

Carmel Valley (1152.3 acres)

Pacific Highlands (1436.5 acres); July, 1999 – Pages 19 & 21: brush management reference to city requirements

Del Mar Mesa (1161.5 acres); June, 2000 – page 34: LTM reference;

Subarea II (544.3 acres)

Torrey Highlands (491.0 acres); Aug., 1996; Page 14 – brush management, Zone 1 and Zone 2

Sorrento Hills (83.9 acres), July, 1997 - Page 100: brush management, reduce fire risk

Carmel Mountain Ranch, Jan., 1995 – Page 75: brush management section, Figures 25 &29 transistion

City Heights (Mid City) (104.6 acres); August, 1998 – Page 41: setbacks, landscaping requirements

Clairemont Mesa (797.8 acres); Sept., 1989 – Pages 110-111: brush clearing and thinning; fire retardant roofing

College Area (213.9 acrcs); Oct., 1993 - Page 104: thinning, fire retardant plants

Greater North Park (117.2 acres); Nov., 1986 – thinning, fire retardant plants

Golden Hill (26.3 acres); April, 1988 – Page 88: fuel management, thinning

Kearny Mesa (365.6 acres); Oct., 1992 (none)

La Jolla (541.9 acres); March, 1975 (none)

Linda Vista (370.2 acrcs); Dec., 1998 – Page 59: preserve CSS, setback from top of slope

Mira Mesa (2,240.2 acres); Oct., 1992 – Page 113: reference to ordinance

Miramar Ranch North (285.5 acres)

Mission Valley (342.2 acres); June, 1985 – preserve southern slopes

Navajo (3,091.7 acres); DEC., 1982 - preserve open space

Old Town; July, 1987 - Page 62: firebreaks

Otay Mcsa (2,447.5 acres); April, 1981 – Page 98: transition areas

Otay Mesa-Nestor (1,411.6 acres); May, 1997 -- Page 98: transition areas

Pacific Beach (83.9 acres): Feb., 1995 - Page 55: reference LTM

Peninsula (142.3 acres); July 1987

Ranch Betnardo (533.9 acres); March, 1978 – Page 5: reference to zoning and ordinance to resolve problem

Rancho Encantada, (NA); August, 2001- Page 60 reference to muni code, brush management

Rancho Penasquitos (1,828.1 acres): June, 1993 – Page 94: fire management zone

Sabre Springs (743.6 acres); Sept., 1987 – Page 115: fire prevention, Page 119: 50% natives, transition

San Pasqual (6447.4 acres); June, 1995

Scripps Ranch (1,071.4 acres); July 1978 – Page 23: eucalyptus trees

Serra Mcsa (242.5 acres): June, 1977

Skyline-Paradise Hills (105.4 acres); June, 1987 – preserve drainages

Ticrrasanta (3,893.6 acres); July, 1982 – Page 55: landscaped transition

Torrey Pines (1,147.3 acres); Jan., 1996 - Page 87: brush management section, fire code

University (1,801.9 acres); July, 1987 -- Page 238: fire buffers

ļ

Т

J.

1

I

Í

i

Uptown, (NA); Feb., 1988 - preserve open space

Via de la Valle (NA); April, 1984 - Page 44: transition, Page 47: LTM

County of San Diego, 1997. Memorandum of Understanding between The Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of Interior, The California Department of Fish and Game, The California Department of Forestry, The San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County. February.

Escobar, E. Nelson. Internet, July 2004. Langston University — Sustainable Use of Goats as a Vegetation Management Tool.

Goats and Soil Erosion: The Evidence by Kris Dixon . SDc World Animal Production. 1996-1999-2000.

Goldman, William I., Principles and Practice of Urban Planning, 1968

Hart, SP. 2001 Recent Perspectives in Using Goats for Vegetation Management in the USA, prepared from E de la Graza Institute for Goat Research Langston University, Langston, OK.

<u>University of California/ California Agriculture Magazine issue for July/September2004</u>, <u>Volume 58 Number 3. Livestock/Cattle grazing impacts</u>.

# SECTION XIII CERTIFICATION PAGE

# INDIVIDUALS AND AGENCIES CONSULTED

This Joint Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment was prepared for the City of San Diego, Fire-Rescue Department. The following professional staff were either consulted with or contributed to its preparation:

# **City of San Diego Planning Department**

Keith Greer, Deputy Director Jeanne Krosch, Senior Planner John Kovac, Senior Planner Holly Cheong, Biologist Chad Kane, Associate Planner Michael Klein, Information Systems Analyst II <u>Melanie Johnson, Associate Planner</u>

# City of San Diego Fire-Rescue Department

Samuel Oates, Fire Marshal Eddie Villavicencio, Deputy Fire Marshal

## City of San Diego, Park and Recreation Department

Ann Hix, Deputy Director David Monroe, District Manger – Open Space Josh Woods, Brush Management Utility Supervisor Jan Eby, Grounds Maintenance Manager

## City of San Diego, Development Services Department

Kelly Broughton, Deputy Director Chris Zirkle, Assistant Deputy Director Allison Raap, Senior Planner Laura Black, Associate Planner

## City of San Diego, Information Technology and Communications Department

Sean Bohac, GIS Intern Teri Gerhart, GIS Intern

## TECHNICAL APPENDICES

# DRAFT <u>FINAL</u> SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

# BRUSH MANAGEMENT REVISIONS TO THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE AND FEDERAL GRANT FROM THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES (OES), FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANGEMENT AGENCY (FEMA)

# PROJECT No. 31245 SCH # 2004031041

ļ

ì

ł

í

íl A

ł

## Prepared for:

City of San Diego, Fire-Rescue Department Executive Complex, 1010 Second Avenue, M.S. 603 San Diego, CA 92101 Contact: Samuel Oates, Fire Marshal 619-533-4406

# Prepared by:

City of San Diego, Development Services Department Development Services Center, 1222 First Avenue, M.S. 501 San Diego, CA 92101 Contact: Allison Raap, Senior Planner 619-446-5379

May September, 2004

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

!

Т

Ί

# APPENDICES

- A. Notice of Preparation and Responses
- B. Biological Resources Report
- C. Draft ordinance amending the Brush management Regulations
- D. MOU between USFWS, CDFG, CDF, SD County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of SD County
- E. Methodology for Biological Impact Assessment
- F. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- G. <u>Draft goat amendments to the Municipal Code</u>

# APPENDIX A

# NOTICE OF PREPARATION AND RESPONSES

1

. . . .

i

!

÷

:

ł

i

Т

1

1

;

Т

I

ı i

T

i

T

City of San Diego Development Services Department LAND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW DIVISION 1222 First Avenue Mail Station 501 San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 446-5460

i

ì

ļ

I

ì

!

L

ì

ŝ,

#### NOTICE OF PREPARATION OF A DRAFT JOINT SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT/ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND OF AN SEIR/EA PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO will be the Lead Agency and will prepare a draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (SEIR/EA) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA - SEIR) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA - EA) for the project described below. A Public SEIR/EA Scoping Meeting will be held on Friday, March 19, 2004, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at: Balboa Park War Memorial Building, 3325 Zoo Drive, San Diego, CA 92101. Verbal and written comments regarding the scope of the proposed SEIR/EA will be accepted at the meeting.

PROJECT: Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from the Office of Emergency Services (OES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) COUNCIL APPROVAL to allow for revisions to the Municipal Code Chapter 12, Article 2, Division 4 to modify the requirements of brush management pursuant to the recommendations of the Fire Chief as a result of the 2003 Cedar fire. The project proposes a City wide 100 foot brush management zone consisting of 35' of Zone One and 65' of Zone Two. Project implementation on City property is proposed to be initially funded by a grant from the Office of Emergency Services (OES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), which is being applied for by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department. The project is located within the City of San Diego, public and private lands and includes the City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA). Applicant: City of San Diego, Fire-Rescue Department.

Project NO.: 31245 SCH NO.: pending

Based on an Initial Study, it appears that the project may result in significant environmental impacts in the following areas: Land Use, Biology, Water Quality, and Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics.

For more information, contact Laura Krebs, Associate Planner at (619) 446-5346. To provide comments on the scope and content of the scope of work, please send written comments to Chris Zirkle, Assistant Deputy Director, at the above address. Written comments on the scope and content of the scope of work must be sent to the above address by no later than 30 days after receipt of this notice. Responsible agencies are requested to indicate their statutory responsibilities in connection with this project when responding.

Attachments: Draft SEIR/EA Scoping Letter Proposed Brush Management Regulations

# Distribution:

# Federal Government

U.S. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Environmental Planning Division (12)
Marine Corps Air Station, Miramar (13)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (19)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (23)
U.S. Department of Agriculture (25)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (26)
Federal Emergency Management Agency, Office of Emergency Services

i

Т

1

i

# Native Americans

Ron Christman (215) Louie Guassac (215A) Kumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225) Native American Distribution (225 A-R)\*

## State of California

California Department of Transportation (31) California Department of Fish and Game (32) California Integrated Waste Management Board (35) California Environmental Protection Agency (37) California Department of Parks and Recreation (40) Resources Agency (43) California Regional Water Quality Control Board (44) State Clearinghouse (46) California Coastal Commission (47) Native American Heritage Commission (222)

#### County of San Diego

Department of Planning and Land Use (68) County Water Authority (73) Hazardous Materials Management Division (75)

### City Government

City of San Diego:

Mayor Murphy Councilmember Peters, District 1 Councilmember Zucchet, District 2 Councilmember Atkins, District 3 Councilmember Lewis, District 4 Councilmember Maienschein, District 5

La Jolla Town Council (273) La Jolla Historical Society (274) La Jolla Community Planning Association (275) La Jolla Shores PDO Advisory Board (279) La Jolians for Responsible Planning (282) City Heights Area Planning Committee (287) Rolando Community Council (288) Kensington/Talmadge Planning Committee (290) Normal Heights Community Planning Committee (291) Normal Heights Community Association (292) Normal Heights Community Center (293) Oak Park Community Council (298) Webster Community Council (301) **Bastern Area Planning Committee (302)** Marshall Community Council (304) Darnell Community Council (306) Midway Community Planning Advisory Committee (307) Mira Mesa Community Planning Group (310) Mira Mesa Town Council (311) Friends of Penasquitos Preserve, Inc. (313) Mira Mesa Branch Library (315) Mission Bay Park Committee (320) League of Conservation Voters (322) Citizens Coordinate for Century III (324A) Mission Beach Precise Planning Committee (325) Mission Beach Town Council (326) Mission Hills Association (327) Mission Valley Community Council (328C) Friends of the Mission Valley Preserve (330) Mission Valley Unified Planning Organization (331) River Valley Preservation Project (334) Friends of Adobe Falls (335) Navajo Community Planners Inc. (336) San Carlos Area Council (338) Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens Advisory Committee (341) Carmel Mountain Ranch Community Council (344) Carmel Valley Community Planning Board (350) Carmel Valley Trail Riders Coalition (351) Carmel Mountain Conservancy (354) Arroyo Sorrento Homeowners Association (356) Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Citizens Advisory Committee (360) Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board (361) Greater North Park Planning Committee (363) Burlingame Homeowners Association (364) North Park Community Association (366) Ocean Beach Planning Board (367)

ź

ı

ý 1

i

į

ļ

÷

I

1

ļ

ļ

Υ.

I

I

Ocean Beach Town Council, Inc. (367A) Old Town Community Planning Committee (368) Pacific Beach Town Council (374) Pacific Beach Community Planning Committee (375) Crown Point Association (376) Rancho Penasquitos Community Council (378) **Torrey Pines Association (379)** Rancho Penasquitos Planning Board (380) Friends of Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve, Inc. (382) Rancho Penasquitos Town Council (383) Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve Citizens Advisory Committee (385) Sunset Cliffs Natural Park Recreation Council (388) Peninsula Community Planning Board (390) Rancho Bernardo Community Council, Inc. (398) Rancho Bernardo Community Planning Board (400) Sabre Springs Planning Group (406B) Sabre Springs Community Planning Group (407) Carmel Mountain Conservancy (408) The San Dieguito Lagoon Committee (409) San Dieguito Planning Group (412) San Dieguito River Park Citizens Advisory Committee Project Review Committee (415) Friends of San Dieguito River Valley (419) San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy (422) San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority (425A) San Pasqual-Lake Hodges Planning Group (426) San Ysidro Planning and Development Group (433) United Border Community Town Council (434) Becler Canyon Conservancy (436) Scripps Ranch Community Planning Group (437) Miramar Ranch North Planning Committee (439) Scripps Ranch Civic Association (440) Skyline/Paradise Hills Planning Committee (443) Sorrento Hills Community Planning Board (444A) Southeastern Development Corporation (448) Southeastern San Diego Development Committee (449) Encanto Neighborhoods Community Planning Group (449A) Central Imperial Redevelopment Project Area (452) College Area Community Council (456) Malcolm A. Love Library (457) **Tierrasanta Community Council (462)** Murphy Canyon Community Council (463) Mission Trail Regional Park, Citizens Advisory Committee (465) Torrey Pines Community Planning Group (469) Torrey Pines Association (472) Crest Canyon Citizens Advisory Committee (475) University Community Planning Group (480) University City Community Association (486)

I

q

I

I

University City Library (488) University Heights Community Association (497) Uptown Planners (498) Hillside Protection Association (501) Allen Canyon Committee (504)

Mr. Jimmy Ayala C/O Pardee Romes 12626 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100 San Diego, CA 92130

Mr. Mike Singleton 3916 Normal Street San Diego, CA 92103

ñ

ĝ

I

Т

.

ı.

.

Page 3 Mr. Sam Oates March 9, 2004

ŝ

÷

i

ł

1

i

i

Ì

Preparation of the joint SEIR/EA - CEQA/NEPA document will be reviewed by the City of San Diego serving as the Lead Agency under CEQA, and OES, FEMA serving as the Lead Agency under NEPA. A minimum 45-day public review period will be provided for the draft SEIR/EA.

Because there is a difference in the way the determination of "significance" is dealt with in CEQA versus NEPA, the SEIR/EA should be prepared generally in accordance with the City's "Environmental Impact Report Guidelines" (Revised September 2002), except that any discussion of the significance of impacts should be provided in a separate chapter entitled "CEQA Significance". The issues to be addressed are discussed below. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) will be distributed to Responsible Agencies and others who may have an interest in the project. Consequently, changes or additions to this scope of work may be required as a result of input received in response to the Notice of Preparation.

#### I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Discuss the goals, objectives, and major features of the project. Project objectives will be critical in determining the appropriate alternatives for the project which would reduce significant impacts. The SEIR/EA must also include a description of all permits and approvals required from federal, state, and other local agencies for which the SEIR/EA will be used. Please provide evidence of coordination with the State Coastal Zone Management agency or appropriate local agency. Describe all major project features associated with the project.

The SEIR/EA must include sufficient graphics and tables to provide a complete description of all major project features. Include descriptions of the increased width of Management Zone Two and how this proposed increase would impact surrounding open space, MHPA or private property. All plans should comply with the instructions for submittal requirements contained in the Applicant's Guide to Project/Permit Applications.

## II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Describe the location of the project and present it on a regional map. Provide a regional description of the environmental setting of the project. Provide a recent aerial photo of the site and surrounding uses, and clearly delineate the urban interface with open space, MHPA, and private property.

#### III. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

The potential for impacts must be thoroughly analyzed and mitigation measures to avoid or substantially lessen these impacts must be clearly identified and discussed. Address each of the issue statements identified below separately within each general environmental issue. Also, a separate section of the SEIR/EA should include a brief discussion as to why certain issues were not considered to be potentially significant. Identify a reasonable range of mitigation measures and/or alternatives, whether proposed or not, for each identified significant impact.

Significance determinations made in the SEIR/EA should reflect the fact that CEQA does not permit deferral of the establishment of mitigation measures and that an impact should be

Page 4 Mr. Sam Oates March 9, 2004

considered significant if it cannot be demonstrated with certainty that it is not (i.e., if a significant impact "may" result).

- A. Land Use
  - Issue 1: Would the project result in a conflict with the purpose and intent of any current planning process or adopted environmental plans or policies in the City of San Diego, including lands within the California Coastal Commission jurisdiction?
  - Issue 2: Would the proposed project result in a conflict with the purpose and intent of the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) regulations of the Land Development Code (LDC)?
  - Issue 3: How is the project consistent with the region's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) and the City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) - MSCP Subarea Plan?

Identify potential conflicts with the purpose and intent of Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) regulations of the Land Development Code (LDC), City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area, and the City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). Please discuss how the project would conform to the guidelines of the LCP.

Upland biological resources would be directly impacted with the project implementation. Please provide an analysis which details how the project would conform to the ESL Ordinance. Any required approval of findings for alternative compliance should be fully addressed in this section. The analysis should describe existing environmental conditions and propose adequate techniques to minimize short and long range effects resulting from the implementation of the proposed brush management revisions. Discuss the project's conformance to City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.

The land use section of the SEIR/EA should include any identified impacts and mitigation measures for potential impacts associated with the implementation of the proposed brush management revisions including environmentally sensitive lands.

Portions of the project are within the MHPA and would require conformance with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Please discuss how the project would address the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines in regards to land use, drainage, toxic substances, lighting, noise, invasive plant species, and predator and pedestrian management. Please identify all mitigation measures proposed to address project implementation within the MHPA. Please identify all proposed project features to reduce potentially adverse short and long range effects. Please summarize and make references to the Biological Resources section of the SEIR/EA for a full discussion of mitigation measures for impacts to vegetation and wildlife communities.

ı

I

Page 5 Mr. Sam Oates March 9, 2004

1

## B. <u>Biological Resources</u>

- Issue 1: Would the project reduce the number of any unique, rare, endangered, sensitive, fully protected species of plants or animals?
- Issue 2: Would the project interfere with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors?
- Issue 3: Would the project impact any sensitive habitat, including, but not limited to oak woodland, coastal sage scrub or chaparral?
- Issue 4: Would the proposal result in any conflict with the provisions of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program Subarea Plan or other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan?

Upland resources and sensitive wildlife would be directly and indirectly affected by project implementation and potential weed invasion. Provide an updated biological technical report prepared by a qualified biologist in accordance with the City of San Diego's "Biology Guidelines". In addition, please discuss how the project would meet the requirements of the federal Endangered Species Act, and the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) Land Use Adjacency Guidelines.

The SEIR/EA should describe the significance of the resources to be affected by the implementation of the proposed project. Address the potential for indirect impacts to any resources within, or adjacent to, subject properties within the City of San Diego.

Please discuss in the SEIR/EA alternative measures to minimize and avoid impacts to listed sensitive, threatened, and/or endangered species.

The mitigation section should propose measures to avoid any identified impacts or reduce them to below a level of significance. If any significant impacts are identified, provide mitigation ratios for the identified impacts in accordance with those specified in the Biology Review References.

The proposed project lies entirely within the limits of the City of San Diego. Please identify and discuss existing wildlife corridor movements and potentially adverse affects from the implementation of the proposed project.

Please discuss how the project would conform to the MHPA and operate in accordance with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines. Please discuss the timing of brush thinning and measures to avoid thinning activities within the breeding season. Please identify the type of all construction equipment and materials to be utilized in performing brush management thinning. Please include an analysis of noise levels with a comparison of ambient levels to project construction and operating levels. Page 6 Mr. Sam Oates March 9, 2004

## C. Hydrology/Water Quality

Issue 1: Would the proposal result in an increase in pollutant discharges, including downstream sedimentation to receiving waters during or following construction?

ł

L

I

- Issue 2: Would the proposal result in substantial alteration to on- and off-site drainage patterns due to changes in runoff flow rates or volumes?
- Issue 3: Would the proposed project affect slope stability and on or off-site soil crossion?

The project has the potential to result in downstream sedimentation during brush management activities. Please provide the type and amount of pollutants anticipated to be generated from the implementation of the proposed project. Please discuss how the project would comply with the City of San Diego Standard Urban Stormwater' Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). Please include any correspondence regarding formal or informal pre-consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and/or State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB).

#### E. <u>Neighborhood Character/Aesthetics</u>

Issue 1: Does the proposed project impact mature trees which could have a significant effect on neighborhood character/aesthetics?

The project proposes thinning areas which could include mature vegetation. Provide the affects this would have on shading, visual quality and neighborhood characteristics.

The City has determined that the following issues are not potentially significant and do not require analysis in the SEIR/EA: Agriculture Resources/Natural Resources/Mineral Resources, Air Quality, Energy, Historical Resources (Archaeology), Human Health/Public Safety, Noise, Paleontology, Population and Housing, Public Services, Transportation/Circulation, and Water Conservation.

However, if these or other potentially significant issue areas arise during detailed environmental investigation of the project or in the evaluation of project alternatives, then consultation with EAS is recommended to determine if these other issue areas that need to be addressed in the SEIR/EA. Additionally, as supplementary information is submitted the SEIR/EA may need to be expanded to include additional issue areas. Mitigation measures should be clearly identified and discussed and their effectiveness assessed in each issue section of the SEIR/EA. In addition, a monitoring and reporting program for each mitigation measure must be included. At a minimum, this program should identify: 1) the department responsible for the monitoring; 2) the monitoring and reporting schedule, 3) the completion requirements. The separate mitigation, monitoring and reporting program (MMRP) should also be contained (verbatim) in a separate section, which will be attached to the SEIR/EA. A separate section of the SEIR/EA should include a brief discussion of why certain areas were not considered to be potentially significant. Page 9 Mr. Sam Oates March 9, 2004

!

1

cc: Ann Hix - Park and Recreation Department Keith Greer – Planning Department Jeanne Krosch – MSCP, Planning Department Holly Cheong – MSCP, Planning Department Chad Kane – MSCP, Planning Department Carol Wood – Park and Recreation Department EAS Senior Planners EAS File

· · · · **、** . . . . .

Brolast Title	Compl	1400 Teres 01		Ap	MAR 0610	0014	
Bualant Title E	aringhouse, I	1400 Tenth Street, Sam	ramento, C.ª	4.93814 910 1-1	¥443-0013	SCH #	
Project Filler	nush Mar	lagement Kerisia	no to the	Land Dur	elegenent a	<u>ode and c</u>	man + from des, FE
Lead Agency: CI	IV OF SA	NDIEGO			Contact Perso	n: <u>UN</u>	A KEERS
Stream Advisors 12	122 Fie	ST AVE. MS S	<u>501 _</u>		Phone: 10	<u>17-44</u>	6-5346
tity: <u>SAN DI</u>	EGD (	CA	Zip: <u>12</u>	101	County: 21	tn die	<u>50                                    </u>
		<b></b>				<u> </u>	
Project Locati	70	•			-UT OF		
County: SAN I	<u> _1570 _</u>		City/Neares	st Community	<u>, ENTIPE</u>		
Cross Streets:		·	·			Total	Acres:
Assessor's Parcel N	lo	•					
Within 2 Miles:							
	Airports:		Railways:		Sci	haals:	
Document Typ	pe						
CEOA: XN	OP	Supplement/Subseque	ant .	NEPA:	[]] NOL	Other:	Joint Document
Ē.	arly Cons	EIR (Prior SCH No.)					🔲 Final Document
		🖸 Other			Draft EIS		🗋 Other
	haft EIR						· 
Local Action	———— Type						
General Plan U		🗍 Specific Plan	:		zone		Annexation
General Plan O	-pusse mendment	🖂 Spericie Fian		<b>L</b>	2008		C Redsvelopment
General Plan E	lement	🔲 Planned Unit D	evelopment	🗖 មិន	e Permit		Coastal Permit
Community Pla		🔲 Site Plan	-		nd Division (Subo		Deter (PVISIMS)
_				Pa	arcel Map, Tract l	Map, etc.)	Brush manger
	_						DEVELOPMENTO
Development						· _	
🛄 Residential:	Units	Acres Employ			] Water Facilities ] Transponation:		MGD
Connercial: 2	Sq.ft Sa.ft.	Acres Employ	yees	[=	] Mining:	Mineral	
🗌 Industriai:	Sq.ft.	Acres Emplo	vees	. [	Power:	Туре	Watts
Educationel					] Waste Treatmen	nt: Type	
📋 Recreational			·				
		9. j		L	Uther:		<u></u>
Project issue	s Discusse	ed in Document					
Aesthetic/Vist	al	🔲 Flood Plain/Floodi	rg	🔲 Schools/L	<b>J</b> niversities		Water Quality
Agricultural L		🔲 Forest Land/Fre H	azard	📋 Septic Sy			🔲 Water Supply/Groundwa
🖸 Air Quality		🔲 Geologic/Seismic				4	Weiland/Riparian
Archeological		☐ Minerals		Solid Wa	ion/Compaction/(	Jrading	☐ Wildlife ☐ Growth Inducing
<ul> <li>Coastal Zone</li> <li>Drainage/Abs</li> </ul>		🔁 Noise 🔲 Population/Housin	a Balance	📋 Sone wa		•	Canduse
Economic/Job		Public Services/Fa		_ □ Traffic/C		•	Cumulative Effects
🖸 Fiscal		Recreation/Parks		Vegetatio			🗍 Other
Present Lan	d Use/Zoni:	ng/General Plan Us	se				
		-					
			<u> </u>				
					J	1	no Gal
 Project Des	cuptica		160 000	anager	nent -20	me to l	w ret
Project Des	the f	equired bu		A-			A 7 -
Project Des	the r	equired bu	Ly	Qr.	Mag Cr	$t_{-}$ of	Jan Diego.
Froject Des Increase from St	the r	equired bn 2 for the en	utive an	vea of	the Cr	ty of	Jan Diego.
Froject Des Increase From St	the r mature	equired but e for the en	tive an	vea of acis to	the Ci The Cu	ty of went	Jan Diego. regulations
Project Bes Increase from St Perision	the r micture shill	equired bn e for the en require c	tive an	rea of ges to	the Cr the Cu	ty of went	Jan Diego. regulations
Froject Des Increase From St Perision Withint	the r mature s will he San	equired bn 2 for the en require c Diggo Lan	tive an hang a Dave	vea of ges to	the Cr the Cu + Code.	ty of went	Jan Diego. rigulations pject (e.g. from a Notice of Pre

Resources Agency		S - Document sent by lead agency
Boasing & Waterways		X = Document sen; by SCH
Constal Commission		<ul> <li>Suggested distribution</li> </ul>
Coastal Conservation	<b>ا</b> . 1.1 م م م م م م م	
Colorado River Board	Contragonautal #	ddadaa
Conservation	Environmental A	
Fish & Game	Air Resources Boar	a
Foresty	APCD/AQMD	
Office of Historic Preservation	California Waste M	
Parks & Recreation	SWRCB: Clean Wa	
Reclamation	SWRCB: Delta Uni	
S.F. Bay Conservation & Development Commission	SWRCB: Water Qu	•
Water Resources (DWR)	SWRCB: Water Ri	• · · ·
	Regional WQCB #	
Business, Transportation & Housing	Youth & Adult C	orrections
Aeroaaitles	Corrections	
California Highway Patrol	Independent Co	mmissions & Offices
CALTRANS District #	Energy Commissio	n,
Department of Transportation Planning (headquarters)		Ieritage Commission
Honsing & Community Development	Public Utilities Con	nmission
Food & Agriculture	Santa Monica Mou	intains Conservancy
Health & Welfare	State Lands Comm	ission
Health Services	Tahoe Regional Ph	anning Agency
State & Consumer Services		
General Souvers	Other	
General Services OLA (Schools)	Other	
General Services OLA (Schools)	Other	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
OLA (Schools)	Other	
OLA (Schools)	·	
OLA (Schools)	·	mil 8,2004
OLA (Schools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arting Date MARCH 9, 2004	Ending Date Ac	nil 8,2004
OLA (Schools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004	Ending Date Ac	
OLA (Schools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004	Ending Date Ac	
OLA (Schools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004	Ending Date Ac	
OLA (Schools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004 guature Aum Charles	Ending Date AC Date 08 08	<u>04</u>
OLA (Schools) chlic Review Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004 gramme Aum Charles gramme Aum Charles ead Agency (Complete if applicable):	Ending Date Ac	<u>04</u>
OLA (Schools) chlic Review Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004 gramme Autochangen gramme Autochangen ead Agency (Complete if applicable): pasulfing Firm:	Ending Date Ap Date D3 08 For SCH Use Onl	<u>04</u>
OLA (Sebools)  Chiic Review Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency)  aning Date MARCH 9, 2004  gname  Rum Chick  ead Agency (Complete if applicable):  pasulfiag Firm:	Ending Date A Date D3 08 For SCH Use Onl Date Received at SCH	<u>04</u>
OLA (Sebools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004 gnamme Automatic Statements ead Agency (Complete If applicable): onsulting Firm:	Ending Date Ap Date 08 08 For SCH Use Oni Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts	₩1 ₩1
OLA (Sebools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004 gname Automatic States of the second secon	Ending Date AC Date 08 08 For SCH Use Oni Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts Date to Agencies	йа 2-1
OLA (Schools)  ublic Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arting Date MARCH 9, 2004  grature  end Agency (Complete if applicable):  onsulting Firm:  ity/State/Zip:  ontact:	Ending Date AC Date 08 08 For SCH Use Oni Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts Date to Agencies	₩1 ₩1
OLA (Sebools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) aring Date MARCH 9, 2004 gramme Automatic States (Complete if applicable): casulting Firm: ddress: ity/State/Zip:	Ending Date AP Date 08 08 For SCH Use Oni Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts Date to Agencies Date to SCH	жа 2-1
OLA (Sebools) while Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004 grature Automatic State (Complete If applicable): casulting Firm: ddress: ity/State/Zip:	Ending Date AC Date D8 08 For SCH Use Oni Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts Date to Agencies Date to SCH Clearance Date	йа 2-1
OLA (Sebools) ublic Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arting Date MARCH 9, 2004 grature But Agency (Complete It applicable): onsulting Firm: ddress: ity/State/Zip: hone:	Ending Date AC Date 08 08 For SCH Use Oni Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts Date to Agencies Date to SCH Clearance Date Notas:	жа 2-1
OLA (Schools)  ublic Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency)  arring Date MARCH 9, 2004  ignature  ead Agency (Complete If applicable):  oasulting Firm:	Ending Date Ap Date DB 08 For SCH Use Onl Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts Date to Agencies Date to SCH Clearance Date Notes:	жа 2
OLA (Schools)  ubiic Heview Period (to be filled in by lead agency)  arting Date MARCH 9, 2004  ignature  ead Agency (Complete If applicable):  oasulfing Firm:  ddress:  ity/State/Zip:  ontact:  hone:  bone:  ignatis  CITY OF SAN DIRD FILE-RESU  ddiress:  itolD Ind Avenue, Suife 300, MS	Ending Date Ap Date DB 08 For SCH Use Onl Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts Date to Agencies Date to SCH Clearance Date Notes:	жа 2
OLA (Schools)  uhiic Heview Pariod (to be filled in by lead agency) arring Date MARCH 9, 2004  ignature  ead Agency (Complete If applicable):  onsulting Firm:	Ending Date Ap Date DB 08 For SCH Use Onl Date Received at SCH Date Review Starts Date to Agencies Date to SCH Clearance Date Notes:	жа 2

| | |

!

:

!

:

ŗ

! i i



Arnold Schwarzenegget Governor

# STATE OF CALIFORNIA Governor's Office of Planning and Research

State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit



Jan Boal Acting Deputy Director

Notice of Preparation

March 9, 2004

To: Reviewing Agencies

Rc: Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Grant from OES, FEMA SCH# 2004031041

Attached for your review and comment is the Norice of Preparation (NOP) for the Brush Management Rovisions to the Land Development Code and Grant from OES, FEMA draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within <u>30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency</u>. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Laura Krebs City of San Diego 1222 First Avenue, MS-501 San Diego, CA 92101

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

Uni Roberto

2- Scott Morgan Scotor Planuer, State Clearinghouse

Attachments cc: Lead Agency

> 1400 TENTH STREET P.O. BOX 3044 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812-3044 (916)445-0613 FAX(916)S23-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

# Document Details Report State Clearinghouse Data Base

ï

SCH# Project Title Lead Agency	2004031041 Brush Menagement Revisions to the Lar San Diego, City of	nd Development Code a	and Grant from OES, FEMA
Туре	NOP Notice of Preparation	·····	······
Description	Increase the required brush management of San Diego. Revisions will require cha development code.		
Lead Agend	cy Contact	· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Name	Laura Krebs		
Agency	City of San Diego		
Phone	619 446-5346	Fax	
email Address	1222 First Avenue, MS-501		
City	San Diego	State CA	Zip 92101
City Region Cross Streets Parcel No. Township Proximity to Highways Airports Railways Waterways	San Diego Range	Section	Base
Schools Land Use	· .		
Project Issues	Aesthetic/Visual; Vegetation; Water Quality; Landuse		
Reviewing Agencies	Resources Agency; California Coastal C Department of Parks and Recreation; De Region 5: Office of Emergency Services Patrol; Department of Housing and Com Quality Control Board, Region 9	epartment of Water Rea ; Native American Herli	sources; Department of Fish and Game, tage Commission; California Highway
Data Received	03/09/2004 Start of Review 03/0	9/2004 End of l	Review 04/07/2004

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

ı.

Т

<ul> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game Scott Flint</li> <li>Envirormental Services Division</li> <li>Deneld Koch</li> <li>Region 1</li> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 2</li> <li>Sanky Cartis</li> <li>Region 2</li> </ul>	Projection         Alen Robertson         Preservation         Preservation         Harts Kneutoberg         Bept of Parks & Recreation         B. Alosh Tilgbrian         Envisonmental Stamentship         Section         Reclamation Board         Low Bullonti         Reclamation Board         Low Bullonti         Based Mountains         Comessonery         Pauly Edeman         Stave Mountains         Devit Communition Mountains         Devit Edeman         Stave Modulation         Based Mountains         Comessonery         Pauly Edeman         Based Mountains         Conservation         Stave Modulation         Based Of Mather Resources         Respit of Bannel         Valuet Genout         Stave Model Genout	10P Distribution List <u>BEQUIDES Agency</u> Resources Agency Nadel Gayou Dept of Buating & Waterways Suzi Esizier California Constant Commission Elizabeth A. Fuche Dept of Constant Saradi R. Zhmenmein Saradi R. Zhmenmein Saradi R. Zhmenmein Saradi R. Zhmenmein Saradi R. Zhmenmein Commission Postanting Faylor Commission Environmental Office Environmental Office
Governor's Office of Planning & Research State Clearinghouse Native American Heritage Comm. Debbie Treadway	George issac Marine Region Frod & Agriculture Steve Shaffer Dept. of General Services Robert Steppy Environment Services Wayne Hubbard Dept. of Health Services Wayne Hubbard Dept. of Health Danking Water Commissions, Soards Commissions, Soards Deta Protection Commission Encloy Eddy Office of Emergency Services	<ul> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 3 Robert Ficerite Region 3</li> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 4 William Leudemuik Region 4</li> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 5 Don Chadwick Region 5, Hebitat Conservation Program</li> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 5 Gabrine Getchsi Region 6, Habitat Conservation Program</li> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 6 Hegion 6, Habitat Conservetion Program</li> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 6 UM Tammy Allen Region 6, Involtano, Habitat Conservation Program</li> <li>Dept. of Fish &amp; Game 6 UM</li> </ul>
Depit, of Transportation 6 Narc Binbaum District 6 Depit, of Transportation 7 Stephen J. Buswell District 7		Country: <u>Counties</u> Ran Lewis Stats Lante Commission Kan Lewis Stats Lante Commission Jean Sarix Tahoe Regional Planulug Agency (TRPA) Cherry Jacques Cherry Jacques Colfarins - Division of Aeronautics Sandy Hesnard California Highway Patrol John Ologinii Office of Special Projects
_	Aurresources Board Airport Projects Jin Lemer Transportzium Projects Kurt Kaperce Industrial Projects Mike Tolkitup Colifornia Integrated Waste Kanagement Board Sus Of Leary State Water Resources Control Board Jan Horkenberry Division of Financial Assistance Stato Water Resources Control Board Stato Water Resources Control Board Stato Water Resources Control Board Stato Water Resources Control Board Stato Water Resources Control Board State Water Resources Control State Water Resources Control	Cal EPA
	Cantral Valley Region (5) Freeno Branch Office Central Valley Region (5) Radding Branch Office Canontan Region (6) Laboratan Region (6) Laboratan Region (6) Victorville Branch Office Colorado Hiver Basin Region (7) Colorado Hiver Basin Region (7) Revocce 8 Sente Ana Region (8) Serio Llego Region (8)	

-----

|

.. ļ

i ! .

> ! . .

. . .

> i . .

7.

. | . |

:

i i

.

; ; .

> I I

.

! .

į

¦ .

. . . · · · . •

.



# CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS SECTION (EAS) PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

This meeting is held pursuant to the *California Public Resources Code* Section 21083.9 et seq., and is provided to give the public and interested parties an opportunity to submit comments regarding the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. This information will be used to develop the scope and content of the proposed environmental document for the project action to be described at this meeting. Please record your comments in the space provided below and submit this form to City staff at the conclusion of the meeting. Thank You.

Project Brush Monogement Ordensince Date

# Comments

Please review the possible impacts associated with increase. Invosion species and introduction o tree removals From nobable Cesultine. Human Snd ten thot thurning improver Incover De. constilles 1 wella tor 1090110 ٦٥ <u>tive</u>' tion Crolocoment Flommoble Vegets with 13 mms ble and sootsinable thung Suplemental watering 652 06054000 with non-notice Ismmoble egenotion Mike Single Name Signature

Street 50 92103 Address

Use back of sheet if additional space is necessary.

March 19, 2004

Comments on NOP of EIR for Brush Management Revisions to Land Development Code

- Any proposed clearing, planting, or irrigation in Zone 2 would need to be consistent with the City of San Diego MSCP implementing agreement. Zone 2 is considered "impact neutral" under the current plan. Changes in codes or management that cause habitat changes to Zone 2 may require mitigation.

- The California State Code allows exemptions from brush management for structures that are fire-proof, and for land that has been set aside for its natural beauty or habitat conservation. We ask that the Code acknowledge that.

- At least as important as brush management, if not more so, is reducing the flammability of structures. The Code must include improvements in reducing structure flammability.... We suggest that the City investigate ways, such as grants, to help property owners retrofit their houses. Brush management is an annual expense: retrofitting homes is a one-time expense.

- When the fire department tells people that they must thin vegetation in Zone 2, many people interpret this as permission to clear all vegetation from the area. Excessive clearing leads to excessive erosion and invasion by weeds, many of which dry into kindling during the summer and fall. We request that a hotline be set up whereby citizens may obtain information about proper management techniques, and improper techniques may be reported.

- We request that City crows and contractors involved in brush management be properly trained to recognize native and non-native plants, and that non-native plants be prioritized for removal when thinning is needed.

- Use of non-vegetative combustible materials in Zone 1 is often overlooked, although things such as wood fences can create a fire ladder to a house. This should be prioritized before requiring changes to vegetation.

- We ask that the Code forbid the use of invasive plants as a "solution". The use of Freeway Iceplant in back yards over the years is leading loss of acres of habitat around the city, as it spreads downhill far from the original site. It would be optimal if the City would develop a guide to property owners concerning appropriate plants and management techniques. CNPS would be glad to offer support in developing this.

Carrie Schneider California Native Plant Society San Diego Chapter <u>info@cnpssd.org</u> 858-352-4413

2021 32ND ST

SAN 11260 CA 92/04

April 10, 2004



Chris Zirkle, Assistant Deputy Director Development Services Department Land Development Review Division 1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501 San Diego CA 92101

RE: Project no. 31245 Brush Management revisions to the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from OES and FEMA

Dear Ms. Zirkle:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposal. We agree that the accumulated fuel load in open space areas needs to be reduced. There are considerations to be made in the process, however.

Tecolote Canyon Natural Park was included in a fuel load reduction project some years ago after the devastating fire on the south slopes and finger canyons of Mission Valley. At that time, the native plants were cut back to about two feet from the ground. Plants were not uprooted. It is important, again, to keep plants and shrubs in place to prevent soil erosion.

Weed control would be an issue within Tecolote Canyon where soil around native plants is disturbed. Opportunistic weeds take advantage of disturbed areas and crowd out native species.

Please take into consideration nesting territories of birds, especially endangered species. Friends of Tecolote Canyon undertook a two-acre restoration project in 1981 that was a nesting site for the least Bell's vireo. The site is located adjacent to the San Diego Gas and Electric station, south of the golf course. This site is one we still monitor, and it has been used for nesting again.

Sincerely,

Sherlie miller

Sherlie Miller President

·

.



# San Diego County Archaeological Society, Inc.

Environmental Review Committee

14 March 2004

To:

Ms. Laura Krebs, Associate Planner Development Services Department City of San Diego 1222 First Avenue, Mail Station 501 San Diego, California 92101

Subject:

Notice of Preparation of a Draft Joint Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from the Office of Emergency Serivces (OES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Project No. 31245

Dear Ms. Krebs:

Thank you for the Notice of Preparation for the subject project, received by this Society earlier this month.

We note that historical resources are not included in the areas of significant impacts from this project. We do not agree with that assessment. While certainly not questioning the need to address the brush clearance zone, there is potential for both direct and indirect impacts to historical resources caused by brush clearance.

Direct impacts could occur particularly where the clearing is done mechanically, by operation of vehicles and equipment over sites. It could also occur outside the brush clearance zone in the access routes taken by such vehicles and equipment. Indirect impacts could result from exposure of sites in the cleared zones and subsequent illegal collecting of cultural material.

We also note that, with the proposed policy in place, any future project would have to include evaluation of the potential for impacts to historical resources in the zone where brush clearance would be required to occur.

Finally, involvement of federal funding in this project will require curation of all resulting archaeological collections in accordance with 36 CFR 79.

P.O. Box 81106 • San Diego, CA 92138-1106 • (858) 538-0935

With the addition of historical resources to the list of subject areas to be addressed in the DEIR, we look forward to reviewing it during the upcoming public comment period. To that end, please include us in the distribution of the DEIR, and also provide us with a copy of the cultural resources technical report(s).

SDCAS appreciates being included in the City's environmental review process for this project.

Sincerely,

ne a a v James W. Royle, Jr., Chairperson

Environmental Review Committee

cc: SDCAS President File

P.O. Box 81106 • San Diego, CA 92138-1106 • (858) 538-0935



San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park 18372 Sycamore Creek Road Escondido, CA 92025 (858) 674-2270 Fax (858) 674-2280 www.sdrp.org

JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Chair Parn Slater Supervisor, County of San Dieço

Vice-Chair Scott Peters San Diego City Counci.

Jerry Finnell Del Mar City Connci.

Ed **Gallo** Escondido City Countel

Betty Rexford Poway City Council

Tom Oolich Solana Beach City Council

Brisa Malenschein San Diego City Council

Dianne Jacob Supervisor: County of San Diego

Dr. Práilp Pryde Citizons Advisory Committee

Darlyn Davenport, Ex Officie 22nd District Agricultural Assoc.

Dick Bobetta Executive Director April 7, 2004

Chris Zirkle Assistant Deputy Director City of San Diego Development Services Dept. 1222 First Avenue, MS 501 San Diego, CA 92101

#### Subject: Comments on NOP for Draft SEIR/EA Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code

Dear Mr. Zirkle:

The San Dieguito River Park JPA staff has reviewed the NOP for the City's proposed brush management revisions to the LDC. The JPA is interested in this subject because a significant part of the San Dieguito River Park Focused Planning Area (FPA) consists of natural open space areas that are part of the City's MSCP, particularly the San Pasqual Valley. This area contains sensitive coastal sage scrub and chaparral habitat along the interface with suburban development. This habitat is vulnerable to edge effects associated with urban development including fire risk.

In addition to the issues identified in the scoping letter for the draft SEIR/EA, we request that the SEIR/EA also address the following:

- The SEIR/EA should thoroughly document the purpose and need for the brush management revisions. Reports have been made that no degree of brush management would have reduced the damage done by the Cedar Fire that tore through the San Diego region in 2003 due to its ferocity and other factors. Also, the City does not monitor or enforce its current brush management regulations and if more attention were made to managing the urban fire interface then the fire risk would be less. Please document how the proposed revisions will serve to reduce fire risk.
- The LDC should state that for new development the brush management zones shall not encroach into MSCP land. Therefore, the new zones should be included in the "developable" portron of a new development proposal, not the open space preserve. Along with evaluating the consistency of the proposed revisions with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines, the SEIR/EA should evaluate how the city would enforce compliance with MSCP so that application of the brush management regulations respect the adopted MSCP.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide input into the SEIR/EA and look forward to receiving a copy during the public review period. Thank you.

Environmental Planner

Recycled Paper

# DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

South Coast Region 4949 Viewridge Avenue San Diego, California 92123 (858) 467-4201 FAX (858) 467-4235



April 8, 2004

Laura Krebs, Associate Planner City of San Diego Development Services Center Land Development Review Division 1222 First Avenue, MS 501 San Diego, CA 92101

# Comments on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Joint Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment for Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from the Office of Emergency Services, Federal Emergency Management Agency (SCH# 2004031041)

Dear Ms. Krebs:

The California Department of Fish and Game (Department) has reviewed the notice of preparation (NOP) of a draft Joint Subsequent Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (draft EIR/EA) for brush management revisions to the Land Development Code and federal grant from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. We have also reviewed the January 21, 2004, City Manager's Report regarding the proposed revisions, and the March 9, 2004, letter from the City of San Diego's (City) Development Service's Department to the City's Fire-Rescue Department regarding the scope of work for the draft EIR/EA (City's letter). We and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) also attended a meeting with Ms. Ann Hix and Mr. Keith Greer of the City on January 9, 2004, about the proposed brush management revisions. On April 7, 2004, the City granted the Department a one-day extension on the comment period (pers. comm., Laura Krebs) for this NOP. We appreciate the extension. Because the project could affect a significant amount of the City's conserved habitat at the urban wildland interface, our comments are more detailed than usual on an NOP.

The proposed brush management revisions arise in response to the fires in the City and the County of San Diego in October of 2003. Currently Brush Management Zone I is the area adjacent to structures and consists of pavement and permanently irrigated ornamental plantings. Brush Management Zone II is an area of native plant material thinned to reduce fuel load. The width of Zone I varies from 20 to 40 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and 30 to 45 feet east of this intersection. Zone II varies from 20 to 30 feet west of the intersection, and 40 to 50 feet east of it. Put another way, the Zones I and II combined range from 40 to 70 feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and 70 to 95 feet east of the intersection. The proposed revisions would entail establishing a city-wide 100-foot wide brush management area consisting of Ms. Laura Krebs April 8, 2004

i

İ

I

I

ł

Ì

į

I

:

:

ł

ı

I

35 feet in Zone I and 65 feet in Zone II. In addition, Zone II would be expanded accordingly to achieve 100 feet of brush management where Zone I occupies less than 35 feet from existing structures. The purpose of the standard 100-foot brush management zone would be to allow for a greater defensible space against impending fire.

The City's Park and Recreation Department manages approximately 22,600 acres of open space. This open space includes 220 linear miles of urban wildland interface, and the City is responsible for brush management within Zone II. Preliminary calculations indicate that an assumed Zone II width of 65 feet would occupy approximately 1,750 acres. The City hopes to thin the entire area within Zone II on an average of every two years. Much of the City's open space is within the Multiple Habitat Preservation Area (MHPA) of the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan.

The draft EIR/EA would tier off of the EIR that was prepared for the City's *Land Development Code*. Final adoption of the proposed revisions would require approval by the California Coastal Commission for modifications of the City's Local Coastal Plan necessitated by the revisions. We offer the following comments to assist the City in minimizing and mitigating project impacts to biological resources, a particularly impacts on the MHPA.

- 1. We generally agree with the scope of work in the City's letter. We emphasize that the draft EIR/EA must ensure and verify that all requirements and conditions of the Subarea Plan and associated Implementing Agreement would be met if the proposed brush management revisions were approved and implemented. The draft EIR/EA should also address biological issues that are not addressed in the Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement, such as specific impacts to and mitigation requirements for wetlands or sensitive species and habitats that are not covered by the Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement.
- Issue areas in the draft EIR/EA that may be influenced by the Subarea Plan and Implementing Agreement include "Land Use," "Landform Alteration/Visual Quality," "Biological Resources," "Drainage/Urban Runoff/Water Quality," and "Cumulative Effects."
- 3. The draft EIR/EA should discuss whether the proposed brush management revisions are consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding, dated February 26, 1997, among the Department, the Service, and the San Diego County Fire Chief's Association.
- 4. The draft EIR/EA should discuss the potential impacts from, and propose mitigation for, the construction of access roads, if any, that might be necessary to reach the expanded areas of Zone II.
- 5. The City Manager's Report alludes to revisions to the building code to promote fire resistant construction (e.g., Class "A" roofs, boxed eaves) of buildings adjacent to areas of high risk for wildfires. One of the alternatives the City's letter identifies for the draft EIR/EA to consider in a detailed alternatives analysis is an "alternative where revisions to the building code would provide the level of protection equal to that provided by this project." We support that approach to reduce the potential impact on the MHPA, and recommend that, structural and material

alternatives be the first line of defense against fire, rather than brush management. That is, structural designs and materials that reduce the need for brush management, particularly within the MHPA, should be employed first and then brush management requirements determined. For new construction, structural and material alternatives should be required, and not considered optional. As to existing structures, the building code should be revised to require that certain features of structures at the urban wildland interface be upgraded to meet the revised building codes (e.g., flammable siding or roofing on houses upgraded to less flammable or inflammable materials). These revisions to the building code would reduce the City's brush management operational costs in Zone II. The draft EIR/EA should thoroughly address the issue of concurrent and commensurate levels of effort to revise the City's brush management regulations and building code to achieve protection from fire at the urban wildland interface.

- 6. The draft EIR/EA should discuss the loss of habitat within the MHPA from the implementation of the revised brush management regulations. This discussion should (a) thoroughly address the assumptions that were made regarding the protection of MSCP-covered species, (b) include full consideration of a reduction of impacts from brush management afforded by revisions to the building code, and (c) describe how the City would compensate for the loss of sensitive habitats within the MHPA, the net loss of acreage within the MHPA, and the potential impacts on MSCP covered-species.
- 7. Another alternative the City's letter identifies for the draft EIR/EA to consider is an "alternative that addresses weed control once the brush is thinned within Brush Management Zone 2." Weed control in areas where brush management has occurred should not be considered an alternative, particularly within or adjacent to the MHPA. As the City's letter notes, potential weed invasion would affect habitats and sensitive wildlife where brush management occurs. We recommend that weed control be automatically required as part of the brush management activities.
- 8. A third alternative the City's letter identifies for the draft EIR/EA to consider is an "controlled burn analyze the effectiveness of controlled burn to thin brush outside of brush management zone 2." It appears from this that draft EIR/EA would not consider controlled burns within Zone II. The draft EIR/EA should explain why. The discussion should include examples of controlled burns that have worked well and others that have not and thoroughly explain why they succeeded or failed. The discussion should also address the recovery of the habitat after controlled burns.
- 9. The documents we reviewed do not seem to contemplate situations in which all or a portion of Zones I and/or Zone II are within wetlands or riparian habitats. These habitats present less of a fire hazard than do upland communities. The draft EIR/EA should discuss whether brush management requirements in these habitats would differ from the requirements for upland habitats, and if so, how.
- 10. The draft EIR/EA should address any planned use of hydroseeding to stabilize soils exposed by brush management activities, and should prohibit the use of hydroseeding preparations that include invasive species.

I.

i

17
Ms. Laura Krebs April 8, 2004

1

ĺ

i

:

1

i

:

i

The Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on this NOP. The Department finds that the implementation of the revised brush management regulations would not be de minimis in its effects on fish and wildlife per section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code. Please contact Libby Lucas at (858) 467-4230 if you have any questions or comments concerning this letter.

Sincerely,

William E. Egato

William E. Tippets Deputy Regional Manager

cc: City of San Diego (Keith Greer, Ann Hix)
 State Clearinghouse
 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Susan Wynn)

. . . . .

## APPENDIX B

# BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES REPORT

<u>\_</u>---

.

.

.

.

· .

2010

City of San Diego Brush Management Evaluation Biological Technical Report

March 2004

Holly Cheong Environmental Biologist City of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program . . . . . .

#### Introduction

ł

i

Brush Management Zones were established in the City of San Diego Land Development Code to protect habitable structures from potential fire dangers and provide thinning of native vegetation to reduce the amount of fuel for a potential fire and allow for access to vegetation for fire personnel. Each year San Diego Fire-Rescue responds to over 800 vegetation fires. During certain times of the year, native vegetation can pose a wildfire tisk and requires proper management of the urban wildland interface. The City has a total of approximately 22,600 acres of open space managed by Park and Recreation Department which creates approximately 220 linear miles of urban wildland interface. Over 16,000 acres of City open space presents a moderate to severe fire threat to communities through out the City, not including the thousands of privately owned interface properties.

The current brush management regulations in the Land Development Code (LDC) were developed in conjunction with the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP). The regulations were approved by City Council in November 1997 and by the California Coastal Commission in November of 1999. They were made effective with the entire Land Development Code on January 3, 2000.

The primary focus of the 1997 changes was to simplify regulations, to improve predictability, to make them more enforceable, and to coordinate brush management requirements with the City's goal to preserve environmentally sensitive habitat. Changes to the regulations included replacement of the complex three zone system of brush management of varying widths (50' to 110') based upon classifications of fire severity with a two zone system based upon the location of the property's location west or east of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real. 'The dividing line of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real was selected based upon analysis of historical fire data in and outside areas of climatic coastal influence. Analysis of the Cedar Fire indicates that if the Santa Ana winds had continued, it is likely that the fire could have burned all the way to the ocean. The climatic coastal influence would not have been a factor in this event. This has prompted the Fire-Rescue Department to re-evaluate the current distinction and propose a single citywide brush management system.

In light of the size and severity of the Cedar fire, and other wildfires in October of 2003, the Fire Chief is recommending a City wide 100 foot brush management area consisting of 35 feet of Zone One and 65 feet of Zone Two. In addition, it is proposed that Zone Two would be expanded accordingly to achieve 100 feet of brush management where Zone One is less than 35 feet from existing structures. A standard 100 foot brush management zone would allow for a greater defensible space against impending fire.

The project would involve increasing the width of the current Brush Management Zones. The project is located within the limits of City of San Diego, and includes the City of San Diego Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), City of San Diego Open Space Lands, private property, and lands within the California Coastal Commission jurisdiction. An increase in the width of current Brush Management Zone 2 may result in an additional impact to biological resources not previously analyzed with the adoption of the current brush management regulations. The purpose of this brush management evaluation and biological technical report is to evaluate the current impacts associated with Brush Management Zone 2. Specific impacts analyzed include exotic plant invasion and soil erosion. By evaluating the current impacts associated with brush management, impacts associated with an increase in Zone 2 can then be extrapolated.

ł

÷

i

i

#### Methodology

This evaluation included brush management conducted by the City of San Diego, homeowner's associations, and private property owners. A total of 25 brush management areas were evaluated as part of this project. Of all the brush management areas evaluated, 13 were thinned by the City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department, 11 were thinned by private landowners, and 1 brush management area was thinned by a homeowner's association.

For purpose of comparison, adjacent areas that were not brush managed were also evaluated, if available. These areas are referred to as controls. However, it was difficult to find comparable control areas. Most brush management is conducted in a comprehensive manner so it was difficult to find comparable areas that had not been brush managed. Only two control areas have been evaluated as part of this effort.

A variety of brush management areas throughout the City were selected. Park and Recreation staff, David Monroe and Josh Woods, selected 13 areas where brush management was conducted by Park and Recreation staff. Areas selected by Park and Recreation varied in size and date of brush management conducted. For example, some of the brush management areas had been thinned as recontly as February 2004 whereas others selected have not been thinned for over 5 years. This variety in brush management as well as the immediate impacts.

Planning Department staff, Khalil Martinez, selected an additional 12 areas where brush management was conducted by either the homeowner or the homeowner's association. Since there was no information available on the date of brush management for these sites, Mr. Martinez selected 4 brush management areas within 3 different canyons: Peñasquitos Canyon, San Clemente Canyon, and Tecolote Canyon. Areas were selected throughout the canyons to give a good evaluation of the different kinds of private brush management conducted.

Each site was visited during the daylight hours by Holly Cheong, Environmental Biologist for the MSCP. Sites were each visited once on either March 1, 2004, March 4, 2004, or March 9, 2004. The surrounding vegetation communities were surveyed to determine habitat type. Habitat type was considered disturbed if 50% or more of species cover within the habitat were exotic plant species. Undisturbed native habitat contained less than 50% exotic cover. Native habitats observed included coastal sage scrub, mixed chaparral, chamise chaparral and oak woodland. Areas were considered ornamental if over 90% cover was attributed to exotic plant species. Eucalyptus woodland, which could also be considered an ornamental area, is identified specifically where observed. The percent cover of exotic and native species were estimated within each brush management area. Any dominant exotic and native species were noted. Plant regrowth within the brush management areas was evaluated and the height of vegetation within the brush management areas was estimated. Slope gradient and aspect were noted as well as any on-site irrigation. Soil type was also determined by visual observation. If it could be determined, it was noted whether the brush management area was on a manufactured or natural slope. Soil erosion was noted if present and the source and extent of erosion was noted if present. If wetlands were within the brush management area, this was also noted. Finally, digital photographs were taken of each brush management area, the surrounding habitat and any erosion.

The date that brush management was first performed and the last date brush managed was performed was noted for each site if that information was available. The size of the brush management area was also noted. For Park and Recreation sites, this was based on the information provided by them for each site. For homeowner and homeowner's association sites, the size of the brush management area was estimated from the SANGIS parcel layer assuming that the brush management area would correspond to the area outside of the development area on the site. The date that brush management was conducted was not available for homeowner and homeowner's association brush management sites.

It should be noted that the evaluation of 25 slopes cannot yield a scientifically significant result on the impacts associated with Zone 2 brush management. Due to the time constraints associated with the project, additional brush management areas could not be evaluated. Given the wide variety of brush management conducted throughout the City of San Diego, it would be difficult to yield a scientifically significant result. Although the information from this report should be treated as purely anecdotal, evaluation of these 25 slopes can help the City of San Diego determine the general impacts associated with brush management.

#### Results

I

ļ

ł

:

1

i

I

1

ļ

Exotic species cover within brush management areas varied from 0-100%. Native species cover also varied from 0-100%. Table 1 lists the exotic species observed within brush management areas. Table 2 lists the native species observed within brush management areas.

ID #	% Exotics	Surrounding Habitat	Dominant Exotics	City/Owner/HOA
1		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Eucalyptus sp.,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	50-75%	Eucalyptus woodland	Carpobrotus sp.	City
2			Centaurea melitensis,	· · · · ·
	50-75%	Coastal sage scrub	Salsola tragus	City
3			Eucalyptus sp.,	
		F	Carpobrotus sp., Salsola	
	11-25%	Mixed chaparral	tragus	City
4		Coastal sage scrub	Brassica nigra, Centaurea	
	11-25%	/mixed chaparral	melitensis, Eucalyptus sp.	City
5			Eucalyptus sp.,	
	50-75%	Eucalyptus woodland	Carpobrotus sp.	City
6			Eucalyptus sp.,	
	11-25%	Eucalyptus woodland	Hypochoeris glabra	City
7	1-10%	Eucalyptus woodland	Schinus molle	City
8			Phoenix canariensis,	
			Cortaderia sp.,	
	1-10%	Coastal sage scrub	Carpobrotus sp.	City
9	11-25%	Eucalyptus woodland	Eucalyptus sp.	City
10			Eucalyptus sp.,	
	26-50%	Coastal sage scrub	Pennisetum setaceum	City
11		Coastal sage scrub,		
	1-10%	ornamental	Eucalyptus sp.	City
12	1-10%	Ornamental	Gazania linearis	City
13	1-10%	Chamise chaparral	Brassica nigra	City
14			Nicotiana glauca,	
	1-10%	Mixed chaparral	Eucalyptus sp.	Owner
15	· · ·		Pinus sp., Malva sp.,	
	11-25%	Mixed chaparral	Rosa sp.	Owner
16			Phoenix canariensis,	
	1-10%	Chamise chaparral	Carpobrotus sp.	Owner
17	1-10%	Chamise chaparral	Avena sp.	HOA
81		Disturbed coastal sage		
	0%	scrub	n/a	Owner
19	75-100%	Coastal sage scrub	Carpobrotus sp.	Owner
20		Disturbed coastal sage		
	75-100%	scrub	Carpobrotus sp.	Owner
2ł	11-25%	Coastal sage scrub	Carpobrotus sp.	Owner
22		Disturbed oak	Carpobrotus sp., Ricinus	
	75-100%	woodland	communis	Owner
23	75-100%	Omamental	Carpobrotus sp.	Owner
24		Oak woodland, coastal	Carpobrotus sp.	
	1-10%	sage scrub	<u>]</u>	Owner
25	75-100%	Mixed chaparral	Carpobrotus sp.	Owner

Table I:	Exotic	Plant S	pecies	Within	Brush	Management A	Areas
----------	--------	---------	--------	--------	-------	--------------	-------

ID#	% Natives	Surrounding Habitat	Dominant Natives	City/Owner/HOA
1	1-10%	Eucalyptus woodland	Erlogonum fasciculatum	City
2			Opuntia prolifera, Rhus	
-	1-10%	Coastal sage scrub	integrifolia	City
3	0%	Mixed chaparral	n/a	City
4			Salvia apiana, Opuntia	
-			littoralis, Erlogonum	F
		Coastal sage scrub	fasciculatum, Ferocactus	
	11-25%	/mixed chaparral	viridescens	City
5	1-10%	Eucalyptus woodland	Rhus integrifolia	City
6	0%	Eucalyptus woodland	n/a	City
7	0%	Eucalyptus woodland	n/a	City
8			Eriogonum fasciculatum,	
	75-100%	Coastal sage scrub	Baccharis sarothroides	City
9	1-10%	Eucalyptus woodland	Opuntia littoralis	City
10	1-10%	Coastal sage scrub	Baccharis sarothroides	City
11		Coastal sage scrub,	Baccharls sarothroides,	
	1-10%	omamental	Salvia apiana	City
12			Adenostoma fasciculatum,	
	11-25%	Ornamental	Eriogonum fasciculatum	City
13			Adenostoma fasciculatum,	
	11-25%	Chamise chaparral	Eriogonum fasciculatum	City
14			Encelia californica, Rhus	
			integrifolia, Adenostoma	
	26-50%	Mixed chaparral	fasciculatum	Owner
15			Baccharls sarothroides,	
	1-10%	Mixed chaparral	Viguiera californica	Owner
16	44.05%		Malosma laurina,	· ·
	11-25%	Chamise chaparral	Ceanothus verrucosus	Owner
17	11.050		Baccharis sarothroides,	
	11-25%	Chamise chaparral	Adenostoma fasciculatum	HOA
18	44.059/	Disturbed coastal sage	Onumetra littanatia	0
10	11-25%	scrub	Opuntia littoralis	Owner
19 ,	1-10%	Coastal sage scrub	Artemisia californica	Owner
20	1-10%	Disturbed coastal sage scrub	Eriopopum laggiculatum	Owner
21	11-25%		Eriogonum fasciculatum	Owner
	11-20%	Coastal sage scrub Disturbed oak	Rhus integrifolia	Owner
22	0%	woodland	<b>n</b> /n	Owner
22	0%		n/a	Owner
23	070	Ornamental Ook woodlood, constel	n/a Malaama laurina, Quaraun	Owner
24	50-75%	Oak woodland, coastal	Malosma laurina, Quercus	Owner
25	··· ·	sage scrub	dumosa	Owner
25	0%	Mixed chaparral	n/a	Owner

#### Table 2: Native Plant Species Within Brush Management Areas

96% of the slopes evaluated contained some sort of exotic plant invasion within the brush management area. This exotics invasion could not always be attributed to a high percentage of exotics in the adjacent habitat. Five brush management areas (20%) were estimated to have 75-100% cover of exotic plant species. Of those areas, one brush management area abutted non-native ornamental areas, two were adjacent to disturbed native habitats, and two were adjacent to undisturbed native habitats. Three brush management areas (12%) were estimated to have 50-75% cover of exotic plant species.

Of those areas, two were adjacent to eucalyptus woodland and one was adjacent to undisturbed native habitat. One brush management area (4%) was estimated to have 26-50% cover of exotic plant species. This area was adjacent to undisturbed native habitat. Six brush management areas (24%) were estimated to have 11-25% cover of exotic plant species. Of those areas, four of them were adjacent to undisturbed native habitat and 2 were adjacent to eucalyptus woodland. Eight brush management areas (32%) were estimated to have 1-10% cover of exotic plant species. Of those areas, five of them are adjacent to undisturbed native habitat, one area was adjacent to an area split between undisturbed native habitat and ornamental, and two are adjacent to eucalyptus woodland/ornamental. Only one brush management area (4%) did not contain exotic plant species. That area is located adjacent to disturbed native habitat.

Native species were observed within 76% of the brush management areas evaluated. 90% of the brush management areas with native species have 50% or less cover from native species.

For the brush management areas where controls were available (8, 11 and 12), less exotic species were observed within the control areas than the brush management areas. Please note brush management areas 11 and 12 were assigned the same control. Photos of each brush management area, the control areas, and the surrounding habitat are on file in the offices of Land Development Review.

Only two brush management areas had erosion within the site. Both sites with erosion were brush managed by homeowners. The source of the erosion could not be determined in either case. Brush management area 13 had minor erosion on-site. The slope was manufactured and the soil appeared to be sandy. No irrigation was observed on-site. Brush management area 24 had moderate erosion on-site. The slope was also manufactured and the soil appeared to be sandy. No irrigation was observed on-site. Photos are on file in the offices of Land Development review. All data collected is given in the table at the end of this report.

#### Conclusion

As noted in the introduction to this report, the number of brush management areas evaluated cannot yield a scientific result. Therefore, all conclusions are anecdotal in nature.

Invasion of exotic plant species into brush management areas appears to be the biggest impact associated with biological resources and performing brush management. As stated above, 96% of the twenty-five slopes evaluated contained some level of exotic plant invasion. Exotic invasion could not be directly attributed to the quality of the adjacent habitat. 13 of the 24 brush management areas (54%) with exotic plant invasion were adjacent to undisturbed native habitat. Exotic plant invasion may also be associated with what was planted within the brush management areas during the time of construction of the housing developments or what was installed by the owners or homeowner's association after construction. In many cases, this encroachment may be

ł

considered out of compliance with the City of San Diego Municipal Code and would not be included in the evaluation of impacts associated with the implementation of brush management as allowed by the City of San Diego Municipal Code.

The two control areas evaluated also had less exotics invasion than the adjacent brush management areas, further indicating that exotic invasion may be an issue with brush management. However, additional evaluation would be necessary in order to determine if this trend is significant.

Soil erosion was only observed on two slopes that had been brush managed. The erosion within the brush management areas can be attributed to the sandy soils on the slope and, in the case of brush management area 24, the way the slope was constructed. Brush management area 24 was cut quite steep in order to accommodate a utility access road. The sandy soils have moderate erosion due to this steep cut. In both cases, there is no clear association between brush management and the erosion on-site.

In conclusion, exotic plant invasion appears to be an issue with brush management areas as indicated by the 25 site visits conducted. Soil erosion did not appear to be an issue on the 25 sites evaluated. While 25 sites were visited, additional sites would need to be evaluated to conclusively determine the effects of exotic invasion and soil erosion on areas where brush management has been conducted.

• •

1       Instruct native regrowth       60.925       geuth       year       gendratived point         2       Iversity, chofiel looks good       (1) 528%       southesst       no       sandclay       manufactured point         4       Struct south       10       sandclay       manufactured point       sandclay       manufactured point         5       Innestly excl6, lemonade barry small       10       sandclay       manufactured point         7       Inality excl6, lemonade barry small       10       sandclay       manufactured point         7       Inality excl6, lemonade barry small       10       sandclay       manufactured point         7       Inality excl6, lemonade barry small       10       sandclay       manufactured point         7       Inality excl6, lemonade barry small       10       sandclay       manufactured point         7       Inality excl6, lemonade barry small       10       sandclay       manufactured point         7       Inality excl6, lemonade barry small       10       sandclay       manufactured point         8       temps       10       sandclay       manufactured point       sandclay       manufactured point         10       gending and point       sandclay       manufactured point <t< th=""><th></th><th></th></t<>		
1       Initied rative regrowth       C0-263       southeast       oil sand/clay       rear/datured no         3       Ive non-native plant growth       c1       5.25%       southeast       no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         4       Growthy south       sand/clay       rear/datured no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         5       mostly south       total sand/clay       rear/datured no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         5       mostly south       total sand/clay       rear/datured no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         6       mostly south       total sand/clay       rear/datured no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         7       fait of deport treas out down, no regrowth yet       c1       5.25%       south       to       sand/clay       rear/datured no         9       how growthg souths       c1       5.25%       southwest no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         10       sand/clay       near/datured no       faith       sand/clay       near/datured no         10       southeast no       sand/clay       near/datured no       southwest no       sand/clay       near/datured no         10       southeast no       sand/clay       near/datured no		
1       Initied rative regrowth       C0-263       southeast       oil sand/clay       rear/datured no         3       Ive non-native plant growth       c1       5.25%       southeast       no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         4       Growthy south       sand/clay       rear/datured no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         5       mostly south       total sand/clay       rear/datured no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         5       mostly south       total sand/clay       rear/datured no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         6       mostly south       total sand/clay       rear/datured no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         7       fait of deport treas out down, no regrowth yet       c1       5.25%       south       to       sand/clay       rear/datured no         9       how growthg souths       c1       5.25%       southwest no       sand/clay       rear/datured no         10       sand/clay       near/datured no       faith       sand/clay       near/datured no         10       southeast no       sand/clay       near/datured no       southwest no       sand/clay       near/datured no         10       southeast no       sand/clay       near/datured no		
2 weedy, chola tools good       15 24%       southeest       no       sandclay       tetural       no         3 low non-anxie pint growing back, large shrubs, growing back well, no crown resprouting       10 25%       south       to       sandclay       manufactured no         6 mostly costs, stonade borry snall       12 52%       south       to       sandclay       narufactured no         6 low growing exotics       1 5-25%       south       no       sandclay       narufactured no         7 haid forgorwing exotics       1 5-25%       south       no       sandclay       narufactured no         9 low growing exotics       1 forget 10 52%       south       sandclay       narufactured no         10 locadits tow growing under gueatypitus trees       2 (trees=20 1) for 25%       south no       sandclay       marufactured no         11 grant plents       2 (trees=20 1) for 25%       southeest       no       sandclay       marufactured no         12 small plents       2 (trees=20 1) for 25%       southeest       no       sandclay       marufactured no         13 small plents       2 be25%       east       yee       sandclay       marufactured no         13 small plents       2 be25%       southeest       no       sandclay       marufactured no <td></td> <td>SOURCE_EROSION_WETLANDS</td>		SOURCE_EROSION_WETLANDS
3 Jow non-native plant growth;		n/a no
4 Serie Brude singli in size hit growing back, kinge sinuls growing back well, no crowin resprouting     1 863%     6outh     No     sand/clay, naturalitatived (no       6 how growing exolids     1 863%     6outh     No     sand/clay, naturalitatived (no       7 hald of paper tress cut down, no regrowing yet     1 863%     6outh     no     sand/clay, naturalitatived (no       9 how growing exolids     1 865%     6outh     no     sand/clay, naturalitatived (no       9 how growing scoles     1 105245%     vest     no     sand/clay, naturalitatived (no       10 exolits four growing under eucalyptus trees     2 frees=20115     525%     south no     sand/clay, manufactured (no       11 great jacing     2 frees=20115     525%     south no     sand/clay, manufactured (no       13 great jacing     1     25%     south nest     sand/clay, manufactured (no       13 great jacing     1     25%     south nest     sand/clay, manufactured (no       14 great fight, no crown resprouting     5 frees=30     226%     sand/clay, manufactured (no       14 jacing fight, no crown resprouting     5 frees=30     226%     sand/clay, manufactured (no       13 great jacing     5 frees=30     226%     sand/clay, manufactured (no       14 jacof negrt, no crown resprouting     5 frees=30     525%     sand/clay, manufactured (no    <		n/a no
Sincelly exotis, lemonade bory small       30.26%       vest       no       sand/day       natural       no         That of peper trees all down, no regrowth yet       15.26%       south       no       sand/day       natural/burled no         Strengtston high, not all in a while       5.25%       south       no       sand/day       nanufactured no         Strengtston high, not all in a while       5.25%       south       no       sand/day       manufactured no         Strengtston high, not all in a while       2.25%       south       no       sand/day       manufactured no         Strengtston high, not all in a while       2.25%       south       no       sand/day       manufactured no         Strengtston high, not all in a while       2.26%       south as       no       sand/day       manufactured no         Strengtston high, not all in a while       2.26%       south as       no       sand/day       manufactured no         Strengtston high, not all in a while       2.26%       south as       no       sand/day       manufactured no         Strengtston high, not all in a while       2.26%       south as       no       sand/day       manufactured no         Strengtston high, not all in all in all in all in all in all in all in all in all in all in all in all in all in all in a		n/a no
6 low growing socials       <1		n/a no
That of paper trees out down, no regrowth yet     15     25%     south a while     0     samdday manufactured no       9 low growing motics     -1 (trees-40)     5-25%, west     no     samdday manufactured no       10 excites     2 (trees-20)     5-25%, south est     samdday manufactured no       11 panell plans     2 (trees-20)     5-25%, south est     yee (sandday manufactured no       12 panell plans     2 (trees-20)     5-25%, southwest     yee (sandday manufactured no       12 panell plans     2 25%, southwest     yee (sandday manufactured no       13 panell plans     2 25%, southwest     yee (sandday manufactured no       14 pool height, no crown resprouting     1 225%, southwest     yee (sandday manufactured no       15 plant look its containers     5 (trees-30)     25%, west     yee (sandday manufactured no       16 plant look its containers     5 (trees-30)     25%, west     yee (sandday manufactured no       17 manuf plants     1 225%, west     yee (sandday manufactured no     no       18 hother plants besides cactus     1 225%, west     yee (sandday manufactured no       19 hother plants besides cactus     1 225%, west     no data cactus     naturell no       19 hother plants besides cactus     1 225%, west     no (sandday manufactured no       19 hother plants besides cactus     1 225%, west     no <t< td=""><td></td><td>n/a no</td></t<>		n/a no
Byegetation high, not cull in a while       55:25%. West the sand/clay manufactured no sand/clay manufacture		n/a no
9 low growing works       <1 (trees=20 ):5:25%		n/a n/e no n/a n/a no
10 lexotics low growing under eucelyptus trees       2 frees=20 ft/s 25%       southwest in o       sand/clay inautifactured ino         11 smaß plants       2 525%       east       per sand/clay inautifactured ino         12 smaß plants       -1 525%       east       per sand/clay inautifactured ino         13 smaß plants       -2 525%       east       per sand/clay inautifactured ino         14 good height, no crown resprouting       -2 525%       is sand/clay inautifactured ino         15 glants look like containers       5 (trees=20) 525%       ivest       yes       sand/clay inautifactured ino         16 good nerview resprouting       -6 525%       ivest       yes       sand/clay inautifactured ino         16 good nerview resprouting       -6 525%       ivest       yes       sand/clay inautifactured ino         17 small plants       -1 525%       jointh in o       sand/clay inautifactured ino         18 ino other plants besides cactus       -1 525%       jointh in o       sand/clay inautifactured ino         19 notifier plants besides cactus       -1 525%       south west       no       sand/clay inautifactured ino         19 notifier plants       -1 525%       south ino       sand/clay inautifactured ino       jointhatis         19 notifier plants       -1 525%       south west       no <td></td> <td>n/a no no no no no no no na na no no na na no na no na no na no no no no no no no no no no no no no</td>		n/a no no no no no no no na na no no na na no na no na no na no no no no no no no no no no no no no
11 small plants       26 525%       east       yes       sand/clay. Innaufactured ino         12 small plants       2 25%       southeast       no       sand/clay. Innaufactured ino         13 small plants       2 25%       southeast       no       sand/clay. Innaufactured ino         14 good height, no crown resprouting       5 25%       west       yes       sand/clay. Innaufactured ino         15 plants look like containers       5 0 (rese_30)       225%       west       yes       sand/clay. Innaufactured ino         16 some crown resprouting       5 0 (rese_30)       225%       west       no       sand/clay. Innaufactured ino         17 small plants       6 2.55%       west       no       sand/clay. Innaufactured ino         18 no cher plants besides cactus       4 25%       south       no       sand/clay. Innaufactured ino         20 natives limited to holes in looplant       <1		n/a n/a no
12 small plents       41       25%       east       no       sand/day       manufactured (regional field)         13 small plents       2       225%       southeast       no       sand/day       manufactured (regional field)         14 good height, no crown resprouting       5 (treas=30)       225%       west       yes       sand/day       manufactured (regional field)         15 plants lock like containers       5 (treas=30)       225%       west       yes       sand/day       manufactured (regional field)         16 some crown resprouting       6       6       6       sand/day       manufactured (regional field)       no       sand/day       manufactured (regional field)         17 small plants       1       225%       south       no       sand/day       manufactured (regional field)         18 no other plants baside factus       1       225%       south       no       sand/day       manufactured (regional field)         20 natives limited to holes in looplant       <1		n/a n/a no
13 small plants       2 >25%       southeast       no       sand/clay       manufactured over manufactured no         16 joant look like containers       5 (trees-30)       >25%       west       yes       sand/clay       manufactured no         16 joant cover resprouting       6 >25%       west       ho       sand/clay       manufactured no         17 small plants       6 >25%       west       ho       sand/clay       manufactured no         18 no other plants besides cactus       1 >25%       south       ho       sand/clay       manufactured no         19 nother plants besides cactus       1 >25%       south       ho       sand/clay       manufactured no         20 nothers limited to holes in loopiant       4 1       50%       west       ho       sand/clay       natural       no         21 large strubs       2 >25%       south       ho       sand/clay       natural       no         22 no natives       no thres       <1		n/a no
14 good height, no crown resprouting     55-25%     west     yes     sand/clay     manufactured no       15 plants look like containers     5 (treses-30) >25%     west     yes     sand/clay     manufactured no       16 some crown resprouting     6-22%     west     no     sand/clay     manufactured no       17 small plants     1     26%     west     no     sand/clay     manufactured no       18 no cher plants besides cactus     4     25%     south     no     sand/clay     manufactured no       19 natives limited to holes in looplant     <1		unknown minor no
16       some crown resprouting       6 > 25%       west       no       sand/sky       manufactured no         17       small plants       1 > 25%       north       no       sand/sky       manufactured no         18       no other plants besides caotris       1 > 25%       location       sand/sky       naturelanufactured no         19       natives limited to holes in locpiant       <1		n/a n/a no
17       small plants       1       25%       north       ho       sand/Glay       matufactured no         18       hatives limited to holes in logpiant       <1	n/a n/a	n/a n/e no
18 no other plants besides cactus       4257%       south       no       sandy       natural       no         19 natives limited to holes in beplant       <1		n/a n/a no
10       natives limited to holes in bogiant       <1		n/a n/a no
20       natives in keeplant       <1		
21     large strubs     21/25%     south     no     sand/clay     manufactured     no       22     no natives     <1		
22 no natives       <1		
23 no natives     <1		
24 no apparent brush management, shrubs quite large     5 >25%     northeast     no     sandstone     natural     yes       25 no natives     <1		
25 no natives     <1		n/a n/a no unknown moderate no
26 n/a     5 5:25%     west     no     sand/clay     manufactured     no       27 n/a     <1		
27 in/a  <1  5-25%  east ino (sand/olay  manufactured no		n/a n/a no
	n/a n/a	n/a no
		· · ·
		-
		ند
	·	

.

BM ID NOTES		CÖNTE
1 has drainage ditch in middle	City	no
2 old irrigation on site	City	Ino
3 drainage ditch down middle of site	City	no
4 dralnage ditch on west side of slope	City	กอ
5	City	no
6 old irrigation on site	City	no
7 cement trail within brush management area	City	no
8 drainage ditch in middle of slope, old irrigation on site	City	yes .
9 old Irrigation on site	City	no
10 drainage	City	no
	City	yes
12	City	yes
13	City	no
14 trall in middle of slope, cut vegetation tossed down slope	Owner	no
15 cement trail fronts brush management area	Owner	no
16	Owner	no
17	HOĀ	по
18	Owner	no
19	Owner	no
20	<u> Owner</u>	ino
21	Owner	rio .
22	Öwner	no
23	Owner	no
24 powerlines in BM area	Owner	no
25	Owner	no
26 drainage ditch running north/south bisecting slope, old irrigation on site, control for 8	City	n/a
27 control for 11 & 12	City	n/a

. .

· · · · · · ·

.

•

.

;

.. 2

.

. \* .

.

. .

.

.

. .

. . .

.

## APPENDIX C

## DRAFT ORDINANCE AMENDING THE BRUSH MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS

· · · · ·

#### STRIKEOUT ORDINANCE

#### OLD LANGUAGE: Strikeout NEW LANGUAGE: <u>Underlinc</u>

(O-2005-)

ORDINANCE NUMBER O-\_\_\_\_\_ (New Series)

ADOPTED ON

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 14, ARTICLE 2, DIVISION 4, OF THE SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL CODE BY AMENDING SECTIONS 142.0402; 142.0403 AND 142.0412, ALL RELATING TO BRUSH MANAGEMENT REGULATIONS.

#### §142.0402 When Landscape Regulations Apply

- (a) [No change.]
- (b) [No change to first paragraph.]

#### Table 142-04A

#### Landscape Regulations Applicability

Type of Development Proposal			Applicable Regulations	Required Permit Type/ Decision Process	
	Column A	Column B	Colunu <sub>i</sub> C		
1 - 8 (N	lo change.]				<b>_</b>
flamphi	<i>ectures</i> could be locate ble <del>area of nat</del> ive <del>or m</del>	<del>al on properties adjac</del> ent <del>to e</del>	than 10 geres in Contiguous	14 <del>2,0403,</del> 1 <del>42,0412,</del> and 1 <del>42,0413</del>	Huiking Perni(/ Process ()no
10,9	flammable native r	on properties that are adjace w naturalized vegetation <u>All</u> ace, park area, aud undevelo	existing or proposed links	142.0403, 142.0412, and 142.0413	No permit required by this division if
	containing native of	or naturalized vegetation and			work is performed in accordance with applicable reculations

#### §142.0403 General Planting and Irrigation Requirements

[No change to first paragraph.]

- (a) [No change,]
- (b) Plant Material Requirements
  - (1) through (9) [No changes.]
  - (10) Trees required by this division shall be maintained so that all branches over pedestrian walkways are 6 feet above the walkway grade and so that all branches over vehicular travel ways are 1416 feet above the grade of the travel way.
  - (11) through (14) [No changes.]
- (c) (d) [No changes.]

#### §142.0412 Brush Management

(a) Except as provided in Section 142.0412(i), brush management is required in all base zones for the types of development listed below when they are adjacent to any highly flammable area of native or naturalized vegetation that is greater than 10 acros as mapped by the City of San Diego, or adjacent to any area of native or naturalized vegetation that is greater than 50 acros, as shown in Table 142-04A. However, within the Coastal Overlay Zone, brush management is required for all coastal development within the MHPA and/or adjacent to steep hillsides containing sensitive biological resources where any open space, park area, and undeveloped public or private lands containing native or naturalized vegetation, and areas containing environmentally sensitive lands are within 100 feet of an

-PAGE 2 OF 9 -

existing or proposed *structure*, except that brush management is not permitted in *wetlands*. Where brush management in *wetlands* is deemed necessary by the Fire Chief pursuant to Section 142.0412 (i)(1), that brush management shall not qualify for the exemption from the Environmentally Sensitive Lands Regulations pursuant to Section 143.0110(c)(7). (1) through (4)

(b) Brush Management Zones. Where brush management is required, a comprehensive program shall be implemented that reduces fire hazards around *structures* by providing an effective fire break between all *structures* and contiguous areas of flammable <u>native or naturalized</u> vegetation. This fire break shall consist of two distinct brush management areas called "Zone One" and "Zone Two" as shown in Diagram 142-04D.

Diagram 142-04D



(1) [No change.]

- Brush management Zone Two is the area between Zone One and any area of native or naturalized vegetation and shall consist of thinned, native or naturalized non-irrigated vegetation.
- (c) Except as provided in Sections 142.0412(f), 142.0412(h) or 142.0412(i),
   the width of Zone One and Zone Two shall meet or exceed that shown in
   Table 142-04H. Where development is adjacent to slopes or vegetation
   that meets the criteria shown in the table, the required Zone One and Zone
   Two width shall be increased by the dimension shown. Both Zone One
   and Zone Two shall be provided on the subject property unless a recorded
   casement is granted by an adjacent property owner to the owner of the
   subject property to establish and maintain the required brush management
   zone(s) on the adjacent property in perpetuity. The total width of brush
   management Zone One and Zone Two shall not exceed 100 feet.

Criteria	Property Location		
	Zone Widths West of Interstate 805 and El-Camino Real	East of Interstate 805 and 44 Cami <del>no Real</del>	
Minumum Zone One Width (See Section 142.0412[d])	<del>20</del> <u>35</u> fl.		
Additional Zone One Width (See Section 142,0412(o)) Required when development is adjacent to sloper greater than 4:1 gradient that are 50 feet ar greater in vertical beight; ar adjacent to vegetation greater than 24 inches in height; or adjacent to the MTPA	<del>5 ft</del>	<u>5 n.</u>	
Zone One Willik Within the Coastal Overlay Zone for subdivisions comaining stoop hillskies with sensitive biological resources	30-ft-Min		
Minimum Zone Two Width (Sco-Scotion-142:04 <del>12(ff)</del>	<del>20</del> <u>65</u> ft.	40-A.	
Additional Zone-Two-Width Required-when-Zone-Two-is-on-slopes greater than 4:1 gradient that are 50 fact or greater in vertical height, or the vegetation in Zone Two is greater than 4% inches in height. This additional width is not required for Zone Two located within the MIPA	<del>ΙΟΑ.</del>	ት ትዑ.ዓ.	

 Table 142-04II

 Brush Management Zone Width Requirements

- (d) The width of brush management Zone One shall be increased by 10-feet for struchures that do not meet all of the following requirements;
  - (1) --- Roof material-shall be fire retardant. Wood shake shingles, whether fire retardant treated or untrouted, are not permitted.
  - (2) --- Walls, caves, and overhapgs shall be one-hour, fire resistive.
  - (3) --- Eave vents shall be covered with wire screen not to exceed 1/4inch-mesh.

No brush management Zone Two thinning or pruning shall be performed in the coastal sage scrub habitat between March 1 through August 15.

(e) Where additional Zone One width is required adjacent to the MHPA or within the Coastal Overlay Zone, any of the following modifications to development regulations of the Land Development Code or standards in the Land Development Manual are permitted to accommodate the increase in width:

(1) through (3) [No changes.]

- (f) The minimum Zone Two width may be decreased by 2 <u>1 ½</u> feet for each 1 foot of increase in Zone One width over <u>up to a maximum reduction of 30</u> feet of the Zone Two minimum width shown in Table 142-04H.
- (g) Zone One Requirements
  - (1) The required Zone One width shall be provided between flammable native and naturalized vegetation and any structure and shall be measured from the exterior of the structure to the vegetation.

-PAGE 5 OF 9 -

(2) Zone One shall contain no habitable *structures*, *structures* that are directly attached to habitable *structures*, or other combustible construction that provides a means for transmitting fire to the habitable *structures*. *Structures* such as *fences*, walls, <u>palapas</u>, <u>play structures</u> and nonhabitable gazebos that are located within brush management Zone One shall be of noncombustible construction.

(3) through (7) [No changes.]

- (h) Zone Two Requirements
  - The required Zone Two width shall be provided between Zone One and the undisturbed, flammable native or naturalized vegetation, and shall be measured from the edge of Zone One that is farthest from the habitable *structure*, to the edge of undisturbed vegetation.
  - (2) [No change.]
  - (3) Within Zone Two, 50 percent of the plants over 18 inches in height shall be cut and cleared <u>reduced</u> to a height of 6 inches. <u>Non-</u> <u>native plants shall be reduced in height first before native plants.</u>
  - Within Zone Two, all plants remaining after 50 percent are <del>cut and</del> eleared <u>reduced in height</u> shall be pruned to reduce fuel loading in accordance with the Landscape Standards in the Land Development Manual.
     <u>Non-native plants shall be pruned first</u> <u>before native plants</u>.

(5) The following standards shall be used where Zone Two area is in an area previously graded as part of a legal development activity and is proposed to be planted with new plant material instead of clearing existing native or naturalized vegetation:

ł

- (A) All new plant material for Zone Two shall be native or naturalized <u>non-irrigated</u>, low-fuel, and fire-resistive. No non-native plant material may be planted in Zone Two either inside the MHPA or in the Coastal Overlay Zone, adjacent to areas containing sensitive biological resources.
- (B) New plants shall be low-growing with a maximum height at maturity of 2-feet <u>24 inches</u>. Single specimens of fireresistant native trees <u>and tree form shrubs</u> may exceed this limitation if they are located to reduce the chance of transmitting fire from native or naturalized vegetation to habitable *structures* and if the vertical distance between the lowest branches of the trees and the top of adjacent plants are three times the beight of the adjacent plants to reduce the spread of fire through ladder fueling.
- (C) <u>All new Zone Two plannings shall be irrigated temporarity</u> <u>until established to the satisfaction of the City Manager.</u> <u>Permanent irrigation is not allowed in Zone Dwe.</u> <u>Only</u> <u>low-flow. low-gallonage spray heads may be used in Zone</u> <u>Two.</u> <u>Overspray and runoff from the irrigation shall not</u>

-PAGE 7 OF 9 -

drift or flow into adjacent areas of native or naturalized vegetation. Temporary irrigation systems shall be removed upon approved establishment of the plantings. Pennanent irrigation is not allowed in Zone Two.

(D) [No changes.]

- (6) Zone Two shall be maintained on a regular basis by pruning and thinning plants, and controlling weeds, and maintaining any temporary-irrigation system.
- (7) Except as provided in Section 142.0412(i), on premises with existing structures where the required Zone One width shown in Table 142-04H cannot be provided, the required Zone Two width shall be increased by one foot for each foot of required Zone One width that cannot be provided.
- (i) [No change to the paragraph]
  - (1) In the opinion of the Fire Chief, the requirements of this section
     <u>fail to achieve the level of fire protection intended by the</u>
     <u>application of Zones One and Two: or</u>
  - (1)(2) The modification to the requirements shall achieve an equivalent level of fire protection as provided by this section, other regulations of the Land Development Code, and the minimum standards contained in the Land Development Manual; and

#### -PAGE 8 OF 9 -

- (2)(3) The modification to the requirements is not detrimental to the public health, safety, and welfare of persons residing or working in the area.
- (j) (k) [No changes.]
- Brush management for existing *structures* shall be performed by the owner of the property that contains the flammable <u>native and naturalized</u> vegetation. This requirement is independent of whether the *structure* being protected by brush management is owned by the property owner subject to these requirements or is on neighboring property.

MJL:cfq 08/06/04 Or.Dept: DSD O-2005-XXX

I

-PAGE 9 OF 9 -

. . . . . . .

## APPENDIX D

## MOU BETWEEN USFWS, CDFG, CDF, SD COUNTY FIRE CHIEF'S ASSOICATION AND THE FIRE DISTRICT'S ASSOCIATION OF SD COUNTY

. . . . . 

### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME, THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY, THE SAN DIEGO COUNTY FIRE CHIEF'S ASSOCIATION AND THE FIRE DISTRICT'S ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY

#### A. INTRODUCTION

Many species of plants and wildlife in the County of San Diego have been listed and continue to be listed as threatened or endangered by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the federal Endangered Species Act and by the California Fish and Game Commission pursuant to the California Endangered Species Act. Additionally, many listed and species that may be listed in the future are protected in certain areas by agreements among jurisdictions and the wildlife agencies, pursuant to the state of California's Natural Communities Conservation Planning (NCCP) program. In light of these listings, officials of the California Department of Forestry, and the members of the San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire Districts Association of San Diego County have expressed concerns regarding their ability to continue to require the abatement of flammable vegetation within their respective jurisdictions in order to protect life, property and the environment from the threat of fire.

#### **B. AUTHORITIES**

This Memorandum of Understanding is hereby made and entered into by and between the California Department of Forestry, hereinafter referred to as "CDF"; the San Diego County Fire Chief's Association, hereinafter referred to as the "Fire Chiefs"; the Fire District Association of San Diego County, hereinafter referred to as the "Districts"; the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States Department of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the "Service"; and the California Department of Fish and Game, hereinafter referred to as "Department" under the authority of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. Section 1531 et. seq.) the Fish and Game Code Section 702 and the California Endangered Species Act, as amended (Fish and Game Code Section 2050, et. seq.).

#### C. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Memorandum of Understanding is to establish guidelines by which the CDF, Fire Chiefs and the Districts can continue to protect lives and property from the threat of fire by requiring the abatement of flammable vegetation pursuant to State Law, County and District ordinances and Cities' municipal codes and to establish a cooperative mechanism whereby the Service and Department may assess, minimize, and help account for potential adverse impacts to sensitive species and habitats resulting from vegetation abatement activities.

# D. RECITALS

- 1. Fire Districts are responsible for assuring compliance with applicable provisions of their ordinances, the California Health and Safety Code and the California Public Resources Code sections 4290 & 4291 regarding the abatement of flammable vegetation.
- 2. Fire Departments of the Cities are responsible for assuring compliance with the Government Code and applicable provisions of their municipal codes regarding the abatement of flammable vegetation.
- 3. CDF is responsible for assuring compliance with applicable provisions of the California Public Resources Code sections 4290 & 4291 regarding the abatement of flammable vegetation.
- 4. The Service is responsible for enforcing the federal Endangered Species Act of 1973.
- 5. The Department is responsible for enforcing the California Endangered Species Act, and the Native Plant Protection Act. The Service and Department together administer the state NCCP program (NCCP Act of 1991.)
- 6. Areas immediately surrounding improvements to real property, whether such areas are undeveloped wildlands or are altered in some way, do not generally constitute core natural habitat areas, nor do they typically support sensitive species, by virtue of their proximity to human activities.
- 7. Uncontrolled wildfires pose a serious threat to human lives and property, but are generally part of the natural disturbance cycle of adjacent wildlands. The propensity of wildlands to carry fire to human developments usually necessitate the provision of fuelbreaks in order to reduce or eliminate the likelihood of damage to property.
- 8. Properly maintained fuel modification zones and fire breaks will reduce the incidence of non-Natural fires spreading from developed areas to natural land and lower the potential impacts of unseasonable and frequent wildfires to listed species and their habitats."

NOW THEREFORE, the parties hereto mutually agree as follows:

# Section I. General Terms and Conditions:

This MOU authorizes the take of species listed as threatened or endangered, or candidate species (under Chapter 1.5 of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code) for management purposes necessitated by or incidental to those certain fire protection measures described herein.

The management purposes for which this MOU is issued are:

 Mandatory fire protection measures in accordance with Section 4290 of the Public Resources Code, specifically: (a) Measures necessary to implement minimum fire safety standards related to defensible space which are applicable to state responsibility are lands under the authority of CDF.

(b) Measures necessary to implement minimum safety standards related to fuel breaks and greenbelts.

(c) Other measures required by Section 4290 as determined by the Director of CDF.\_\_

Mandatory fire protection measures in accordance with Section 4291 of the Public Resource Code, specifically:

(a) The maintenance around and adjacent to any building or structure in, upon, or adjoining any mountainous area or forest-covered lands, brush-covered lands, or grasscovered lands, or any land which is covered with flammable material, of a fire break made by removing and clearing away, for a distance of not less than 30 feet on each side of such building or structure or to the property line, whichever is nearer, all flammable vegetation or combustible growth.

(b) The maintenance around and adjacent to any building or structure such as is described in (a) above, additional fire protection or fire break made by removing all brush, flammable vegetation, or combustible growth which is located from 30 feet to 100 feet from such a building or structure or to the property line, whichever is nearer, as may be required by the Director of Forestry and Fire Prevention upon a finding that, because of extra hazardous conditions, a firebreak of only 30 feet around such building or structure is not sufficient to provide reasonable fire safety, and including the maintenance of grass and other vegetation more than 30 feet from such building or structure and less than 18 inches in height where necessary to stabilize the soil and prevent erosion.

- 3. Mandatory fire protection measures in accordance with Section 4296.5 of Public Resource Code, specifically, upon order of the Director of Forestry and Fire Protection or the agency having primary responsibility for the fire protection of the area, the destruction, removal, or modification so as not to be flammable, of any vegetation or other flammable material on any railroad right-of-way on forest-covered, brush-covered, or grass-covered land.
- 4. Any measures as deemed necessary by the Fire Chief and in accordance with the Guideline section of this MOU.

activities without further delay. Failure by landowners to provide adequate notification as described above may render landowners liable under State and Federal law.

# Section IV. BIOLOGICAL SURVEYS

Property owners, their lessees, CDF, fire districts and cities shall not be required to perform biological surveys as a condition precedent to performance of the fire protection activities established by the guidelines set forth in Section 1.

## Section.V. PROJECT OFFICERS

a. Project Officer for the CDE is:

Ken. Miller, Ranger in Charge California Department of Forestry 2249 Jamacha Rd. El Cajon, California 92019

b. Project Officer for the Fire Chiefs is:

Erwin L. Willis, Fire Chief Rancho Santa Fe Fire Protection District P.O. Box 410 Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

c. Project Officer for the Districts is:

Ralph Steinhoff
North County Fire Protection District
315 East Ivy Street
Fallbrook, CA 92028

d. Project Officer for Service is:

Gail Kobetich, Field Supervisor U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Carlsbad Field Office 2730 Loker Avenue West Carlsbad, California 92008

e. Project Officer for the Department is:

Jacqueline Schafer, Director Department of Fish and Game 1416 9th Street Sacramento, California 95814

 $7^{\circ}$
# ction VI. SPECIAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS

e CDF, fire districts, cities, the Service and the Department shall comply with the Reasonable d Prudent Measures and the Terms and Conditions identified in Biological Opinion issued by Service for this action. Take of listed species that is deliberate and results from an act tside the scope of the Project as defined in Section I is not authorized.

's understood by the parties that the Service authorizes incidental take of the following lerally listed threatened and endangered species: arroyo toad (Bufo microscaphys lifornicus), coastal California gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica), and Stephen's Kangaroo Rat ipodomys stephensi), which may be impacted by the fire protection activities established by guidelines set forth in Section I. Furthermore, it is understood by the parties that the partment authorizes the take of species listed as threatened species or endangered species, or adidate species (under Chapter 1.5 of Division 3 of the Fish and Game Code) which may be pacted by the fire protection activities established by the guidelines set forth in Section I.

iy person who becomes aware of the take of an individual of a candidate or listed species as a full of that person's engaging in the permitted activity shall report the take to the Department soon as practicable and shall make available the remains of any animal or plant taken to the spartment of fish and Game upon demand.

# ction VII. FINDINGS

## Department Findings:

rsuant to fish and Game Code Section 2081, the Department finds that implementation of the e control, abatement, and protection measures contemplated by this MOU is not likely to ult in jeopardy to the continued existence of the identified State listed or candidate species, if e terms and conditions of the MOU are fully implemented and adhered to. The Department ds, further, that by preventing or limiting the spread of fire to the identified species' habitat, s MOU will serve to protect the identified species from further degradation.

## ction VIII. AMENDMENTS

aendments to this MOU may be proposed by any of the parties and shall become effective on being reduced to a written instrument executed by all of the parties. It is anticipated and derstood by the parties that this MOU, specifically the arroyo toad (Bufo microscaphys ifornicus), coastal California gnatcatcher (Polioptila californica), and Stephen's Kangaroo Rat ipodomys stephensi), may be amended to include additional species that in the future are ed as threatened or endangered by the Secretary of the Interior or the California Fish and me Commission. In addition, it is understood that this MOU may be amended to include ditional parties.

# ection IX. TERM OF AGREEMENT

his MOU shall become effective upon the date it is executed by the parties (execution date) and tall remain in effect for an initial period of one (1) year. Thereafter, this MOU shall be nonatically extended from year to year on the aforementioned execution date unless the ervice or the Department objects to the extension, in writing, within thirty (30) days prior to the spiration of this MOU. Any written objection must state the reason for the objection to the xtension of this MOU. In the event a written objection is provided, the parties shall work ooperatively to resolve any problems so that the MOU may be extended. IN WIINESS WHEREOF, each party hereto has caused this MOU to be executed by an authorized official on the day and year set forth opposite his or her signature.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Date By: Title: Gail Kobetich, Field Supervisor SERVICE CONTRACT SUFFICIENCY REVIEW Date: By: Title: CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME Date⊦ ว 126.19 3y: Jacqueline Schafer, Director Title: ALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY, SAN DIEGO RANGER UNIT Date: 2-26-9 Y: Ken Miller, Ranger in Charge itle: AN DIEGO COUNTY FIRE CHIEF'S ASSOCIATION Date: 2 - 26 - 9) E Z. and γ. Erwin L. Willis, President tle: RE DISTRICT'S ASSOCIATION OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY Date: 2/26/97 am Stairy Wayne Strange, President :le:

# APPENDIX E

# METHODOLOGY FOR BIOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

. . . .

.

.

### METHODOLOGY FOR BIOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Existing and proposed brosh management impacts to the City of San Diego were determined by staff from the City's Planning Department and Information Technology & Communications (IT&C) Department using geographic information systems (GIS).

In order to determine brush management impacts, staff created an urban interface line. This was done by creating a boundary delineating vegetation from urban interface using 2003 color aerial orthophotos at a 1:3000 scale for the entire City. Next, staff determined the segments of the orban interface line that would be affected by new brush management guidelines. Parcels with structures that would require brush management were selected from the SanGIS parcel database. Staff then selected segments of the urban interface line that were adjacent to parcels with structures. The resulting segments were used for the analysis.

Buffers were applied to the applicable segments of the urban interface line to identify the impacts from brush management from both the existing regulations and the additional impacts from the proposed regulations. Buffer distances were determined using several variables pursuant to the existing Land Development Code (§142.0412). The first variable was the geographical zone of the City that brush management regulations currently apply to: (1) the coastal zone, (2) the non-coastal zone areas west of El Camino Real and Interstate 805, and (3) the areas east of El Camino Real and Interstate 805. The second variable was the adjacency of the parcei to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) for the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP).

The resulting buffers were analyzed to determine impacts to vegetation, the MHPA, the MSCP Core Biological and Linkage Areas and sensitive species. Impacts were also analyzed for impacts to City owned lands and non-City owned lands. No impacts to wetlands are allowed under the proposed brash management regulations and therefore wetlands were removed from the total impacts.

The proposed code allows for an increase in zone two brush management for existing structures where zone one brush management is less than 35 feet. Staff increased the accuracy of the analysis by creating an additional buffer for this increase in zone two. This was done by measuring the distance from the structure to the urban interface line on 600 random parcels (200 per geographical zone) at a maximum scale of 1:1,000 on the 2003 color aerial orthophotos. A buffer was created that was the average width from the structure to the urban interface line for each of the three zones. This buffer was used to increase the impacts for any additional zone two clearing due to zone one deficiency to achieve worst-case analysis.

The results of these impacts can be found in Sections V.A-Land Use and V.B-Biological Resources. ..

·

.

·

· · ·

#### METHODOLOGY FOR BIOLOGICAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

11

Existing and proposed brush management impacts to the City of San Diego were determined by staff from the City's Planning Department and Information Technology & Communications (IT&C) Department using geographic information systems (GIS).

In order to determine brush management impacts, staff created an urban interface line. This was done by creating a boundary delineating vegetation from urban interface using 2003 color aerial orthophotos at a 1:3000 scale for the entire City. Next, staff determined the segments of the urban interface line that would be affected by new brush management guidelines. Parcels with structures that would require brush management were selected from the SanGIS parcel database. Staff then selected segments of the urban interface line that were adjacent to parcels with structures. The resulting segments were used for the analysis.

Buffers were applied to the applicable segments of the urban interface line to identify the impacts from brush management from both the existing regulations and the additional impacts from the proposed regulations. Buffer distances were determined using several variables pursuant to the existing Land Development Code (§142.0412). The first variable was the geographical zone of the City that brush management regulations currently apply to: (1) the coastal zone, (2) the non-coastal zone areas west of El Camino Real and Interstate 805, and (3) the areas east of El Camino Real and Interstate 805. The second variable was the adjacency of the parcel to the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) for the City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP).

The resulting buffers were analyzed to determine impacts to vegetation, the MHPA, the MSCP Core Biological and Linkage Areas and sensitive species. Impacts were also analyzed for impacts to City owned lands and non-City owned lands. No impacts to wetlands are allowed under the proposed brush management regulations and therefore wetlands were removed from the total impacts.

The proposed code allows for an increase in zone two brush management for existing structures where zone one brush management is less than 35 feet. Staff increased the accuracy of the analysis by creating an additional buffer for this increase in zone two. This was done by measuring the distance from the structure to the urban interface line on 600 random parcels (200 per geographical zone) at a maximum scale of 1:1,000 on the 2003 color aerial orthophotos. A buffer was created that was the average width from the structure to the urban interface line for each of the three zones. This buffer was used to increase the impacts for any additional zone two clearing due to zone one deficiency to achieve worst-case analysis.

The results of these impacts can be found in Sections V.A-Land Use and V.B-Biological Resources.

. • . . . . .

.

.

The discretionary actions of the City of San Diego required for implementation of the Brush Management Revisions is the approval by City Council to implement the proposed brush management revisions.

#### Conclusions of the SEIR

The Final SEIR evaluates the following environmental issues in relation to the project: land use, biological resources, hydrology/water quality/erosion, and neighborhood character/aesthetics. The Final SEIR also evaluates cumulative and growth-inducing impacts, as well as alternatives to the proposed project. The City of San Diego Development Services, located at 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101, is the custodian of the documents and other materials which constitute the entire record and the proceedings upon which the decision is based (Administrative Record).

The Final SEIR indicates that direct and indirect impacts associated with the brush management revisions for the following environmental issues would not result in significant impacts or contribute to significant cumulative impacts: land use, hydrology/water quality/crosion, and neighborhood character/aesthetics. The Final SEIR states that the brush management revisions could have significant unmitigated biological resources related to non-covered species outside the MHPA.

#### FINDINGS

The following findings are made pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 and Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, Sections 15091 and 15093 (State CEQA Guidelines).

#### A. Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a) Feasible Mitigation Measures

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a), the City of San Diego, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final SEIR for the project, the public record, and the administrative record, finds, pursuant to CEQA guidelines, that changes or alterations have been required in or incorporated into the project that mitigate, avoid, or substantially lessen the potentially significant direct and indirect environmental impacts as identified in the Final SEIR. No feasible mitigation measures are proposed with this project. However, changes to the proposed ordinance which have been proposed since public review of the Draft SEIR/EA started serve to reduce impacts.

#### **B.** Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a)(2)

The decision maker, having independently reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final SEIR for the project and the public record, finds that there are no changes or alterations to the project that avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental impacts that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency.

# C. Public Resources Code Section 21081 (a)(3) Infeasible Mitigation Measures and Alternatives

The decision maker, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and its appendices for the project and the public record, finds that specific economic, legal, technological, social, or other considerations and benefits make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR and its appendices, other than the proposed project, as set fort below.

# 1. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Significant Impacts (unmitigated): The Land Development Code EIR determined that a potentially significant impact on biological resources related to brush management outside the bounds of the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) where non-covered species are affected could occur. The current Subsequent EIR has made the same determination.

Per the City's Biology Guidelines (page 24), as adopted by City Council on June 19,2000, species specific analysis for sensitive species not covered by the MSCP may be required as part of the CEQA process. It is expected that the majority of CEQA sensitive species not covered by the MSCP will be adequately mitigated through the habitat based mitigation described in Sections B.1.a and B.1.b of the Biology Guidelines. However, a circumstance may arise, when mitigation specific to a particular species may be required. Therefore, while applying CEQA to new development projects would likely result in measures to mitigate these impacts (or at least afford the opportunity for future disclosure and mitigation of the impacts), impacts from brush management for existing development would remain significant because owners of existing development can undertake brush management activities without additional discretionary review by the City. In other words, there will be no subsequent regulatory process through which additional mitigation could be provided.

# Facts in support of Finding:

Implementation of mitigation identified for future project and existing structures would reduce biological impacts to below a level of significance. Per this mitigation measure, existing property owners would be required to hire a biological consultant and provide mitigation for any potential impacts to non-covered species. However, it has been determined that requiring such a measure for existing structures would be an undue hardship for existing landowners as such mitigation could potentially be quite costly. Existing homeowners may decide to forego implementation of the expansion of zone two brush management on their properties in order to avoid this additional expense. Thereby, creating an at-risk condition for fire fighters as they attempt to battle fires in many of the canyons areas where these structures are located. Lack of defensible space to fight brush fires creates a dangerous condition for fire-rescue services.

At this time, implementation of brush management zone 2 for existing structures is exempt from the City permitting process. Therefore, there is no City process in place to determine

which existing structures are located outside the MHPA in areas where potential significance impacts may occur to species not covered by the MSCP. To create such a process, would require a significant expense to the City and would be a multi-year process to complete. Additional city-wide biological surveys to identify the potential affected areas would be needed, along with the creation of a database for the new information and creation of a separate noticing and review process for these particular existing structures. This information would also not be valid for many species and resources soon after its development due to the dynamic nature of species development (i.e. species move from area to area). Finally, many of the areas which could benefit from these surveys occur on approximately 29,000 private properties which may not grant access to the City to conduct the surveys.

Given the considerable expanse to homeowners of existing structures and the City combined with the increased risk to the life and safety of our fire fighters, it has been determined such a mitigation measure for existing structures would be infeasible and may result in potential harm to life and existing structures. Therefore, the impact would be partially unitigated through the adoption of the mitigation measure for future projects and the adoption of the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the existing structures.

#### Alternatives

The EIR for the Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code examined four alternatives in addition to the proposed revisions.

#### Alternative I - No Project Alternative

#### Project Description

Under the no project alternative, the existing brush management zones would remain in effect. Current brush management regulation state that the width of zone one varies from twenty-five feet to thirty-five feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real, and thirty feet to forty-five feet on the east. Zone two currently varies from twenty feet to thirty feet west of Interstate 805 and El Camino Real and forty feet to fifty feet on the east.

#### <u>Findings</u>

The No Project Alternative would not provide an expansion of the brush management zones to a total of 100 feet (35 feet for zone one and 65 feet for zone two) or refine the existing regulations to provide an acceptable risk to fire personnel and structure from wildfires. Although impacts to biological resources as described in the SEIR would be avoided, increased safety to fire-rescue crews and existing structures would also not occur.

#### Alternative 2 - No Action Alternative

#### Project Description

NEPA requires that the No Action Alternative be described. The No Action Alternative assumes that there would be no federal funding available for the implementation of the

brush management revisions within City owned open space areas and as a result, no federal action to approve.

#### **Findings**

The proposed brush management revisions could still be implemented by the City; however, funding would need to be acquired from a different source(s). Since the City does not currently have an alternative source(s) of funding for the project it may take several years for the City to achieve the proposed brush management standards. Therefore, this alternative would not be able to implement the proposed refinements to the existing regulations to provide an acceptable risk to fire personnel and structure from wildfires in a timely manner.

### Alternative 3 - Clear and Re-plant Zone Two

#### Project Description

Under this alternative, complete clearing would occur in brush management zone two and afterwards, the area would be re-planted with low height native plants.

#### Findings

Upon review and consideration of the comment letter received from the Wildlife Agencies (See comment A49) on the SEIR, it was determined this alternative would <u>not</u> result in a reduction in impacts to biological resources. Therefore, this alternative has been moved to Section IX of the SEIR, Alternatives Considered but Rejected.

#### Alternative 4 – Increasing Building Regulations

#### Project Description

Under this alternative, certain revisious to the existing building regulations would need to occur in order to eliminate the need for the increased brush management zones. The additional building regulations would have to include requirements that would make the buildings "fire-proof".

#### **Findings**

"Fire-proofing" to the extent that the proposed addition to the brush management zones would no longer be necessary would require both new and existing structures to apply such techniques as cement or non-combustible walls with no windows openings and class A roofing on existing structures. The expense of such revisions would be beyond the financial ability of the average homeowner and unreasonable for the City to require.

Other measures, such as fire-rated windows and fire walls, while needed to increase the survivability of structures, would not eliminate the need for the proposed expansion of the brush management zones. This increase would still be necessary to provide additional defensible space to allow room for fire-rescue crews to contain the flame spread and safely perform rescues.

#### DRAFT

# Statement of Overriding Considerations Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development Code and Federal Grant from the Office of Emergency Services (OES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Project No. 31245 SCH No. 2004031041

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental effects when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered acceptable (§ 12093[a]). CEQA further requires that when the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record (§ 15093[c] of the CEQA Guidelines.

The San Diego City Council, pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21081 (b) and State CEQA Guidelines § 15093, has: (1) reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final Subsequent EIR; (2) has balanced the benefits of the proposed Brush Management Revisions to the Land Development code and Federal Grant from the Office of Emergency Services (OES), Federal Emergency Management Agency (I/EMA) as compared to its unavoidable environmental impacts to:

- Biological Impacts: to sensitive non-covered species located outside the MHPA

The proposed revisions to allow the 100-foot brush management zones (35 feet zone one and 65 feet zone two) would be consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, the California Department of Forestry, the San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association San Diego County. The City of San Diego is a member of the County Fire Chief's Association. Additionally, the proposal would be consistent with the MSCP Subregional Plan and MSCP Subarea Plan.

The determination of unnitigated, significant impacts to biological resources is based on the potential affects of the subsequent implementation of an expanded brush management by private homeowners as allowed by this proposed ordinance change. Consistent with City's conservative CEQA analysis, this determination is based on the maximum affect of this potential, indirect impact. It assumes 100% compliance (i.e. city-wide implementation of the brush management requirements immediately following adoption .

.

.

.