THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Date of Notice: August 21, 2015
CORRECTED
PUBLIC NOTICE OF A
DRAFT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
Internal Order No.: 21003586

The City of San Diego Planning Department has prepared a draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the following project and is inviting your comments regarding the adequacy of the document. The draft MND has been placed on the City of San Diego Planning Department website under the heading "Draft CEQA Documents" and can be accessed using the following link:

http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/ceqa/index.shtml

The DMND public notice has also been placed on the City Clerk website at:
http://www.sandiego.gov/city-clerk/officialdocs/notices/index.shtml

Your comments must be received by September 21, 2015 to be included in the final document considered by the decision-making authorities. Please send your written comments to the following address**: Myra Herrmann, Environmental Planner, City of San Diego Planning Department, 1222 First Avenue, MS 501, San Diego, CA 92101 or e-mail your comments to DSDEAS@sandiego.gov with the Project Name and Number in the subject line.**

General Project Information:
- Project Name: **STORM WATER STANDARDS MANUAL UPDATE**
- Project No. **435930 /** SCH No. ***Pending***
- Community Plan Area: **Citywide**
- Council Districts: **All City Council Districts**

APPLICANT: City of San Diego Transportation & Storm Water Department – Storm Water Division

SUBJECT: **CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE STORM WATER STANDARDS MANUAL UPDATE** to update the City's storm water-related requirements for land development and construction activities in accordance with the 2013 Municipal Permit (Municipal Permit).

In accordance with the federal Clean Water Act, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues Municipal Storm Water National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits (Municipal Permit) to municipalities that own and operate a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) that discharges into waters of the U.S. within the San Diego region. The RWQCB issued the first Municipal Permit to the City of San Diego and twenty (20) other municipalities (Co-permittees) in the region in 1990, and has renewed it four

times thereafter. In May 2013, the RWQCB adopted the most recent Municipal Permit, Order No. R9-2013-0001, as subsequently amended by Order No. R9-2015-0001.
The Municipal Permit requires all development projects, regardless of size, to implement source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) and site design Low Impact Development (LID) practices to minimize the generation of pollutants. While all development projects are required to implement source control and site design practices, the Municipal Permit has additional requirements for development projects that exceed size thresholds and/or fit under specific land use categories. These projects, referred to as Priority Development Projects (PDPs), are required to incorporate structural BMPs into the project plan to reduce the discharge of pollutants, and address potential hydromodification impacts from changes in flow and sediment supply. Projects that are not classified as PDPs are referred to as Standard Projects.

The Municipal Permit requires the City to implement storm water standards to address storm water pollution associated with private and public development projects during construction and post construction. The City of San Diego developed the first Storm Water Standards Manual in 2002, and updated it in 2008 and 2012 to comply with new requirements in subsequent Municipal Permits. The 2013 Municipal Permit requires the City to update its Storm Water Standards Manual (Manual Update) to incorporate additional requirements.

The Manual Update provides design concepts and methodologies to guide applicants in meeting the requirements of the 2013 Municipal Permit, Provision E.3.

The Manual Update, Part 1, addresses expanded and updated post-construction storm water requirements for Standard Projects and PDPs, and provides updated procedures for planning, selecting, and designing structural storm water BMPs based on the performance standards and requirements in the Municipal Permit.

Structural BMPs are engineered facilities that are designed to retain, detains, filters, removes, or prevents the release of pollutants to surface waters from development projects in perpetuity, after construction of a project is completed. Structural BMPs are a type of Low Impact Design that aims to mimic the natural hydrology to manage storm water pollutant on site. Structural BMPs utilize biological, chemical and physical processes to remove pollutants from storm water runoff before it's discharged to water ways. Examples of structural BMPs are bioretention basins, infiltration trenches, rain gardens, vegetated swales, biofiltration basins, and planter boxes.

The Municipal Permit requires all Priority Development Projects (PDP) to implement structural BMPs to retain onsite pollutants contained in the volume of storm water runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event (referred to as Design Capture Volume, or DCV). If it is not technically feasible to implement retention BMPs for the full DCV onsite for a PDP, then the PDP is required to utilize biofiltration BMPs for the remaining volume not reliably retained. If biofiltration BMPs are not technically feasible, then the PDP is required to utilize flow-thru treatment control BMPs to treat runoff leaving the site and participate in alternative compliance to mitigate for the pollutants from the DCV not reliably retained onsite.

The Manual Update categorizes structural BMPs in three categories based on the unit processes utilized in the BMP design. The BMP selection from these categories is largely based on the site conditions.

Infiltration BMPs: BMPs that are designed to retain the full design capture volume. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Infiltration BMPs typically consist of an earthen basin with a flat bottom constructed in naturally pervious soils. Infiltration BMPs capture, store, and infiltrate storm water runoff into native soils.
- Bioretention BMP facilities are vegetated surface water systems that filter water through vegetation and soil, or engineered media prior to infiltrating into native soils.
- Permeable pavement BMPs allow for percolation through void spaces in the pavement surface into subsurface layers. The subsurface layers are designed to provide storage of storm water runoff so that outflows, primarily via infiltration into subgrade soils or release to the downstream conveyance system, can be at controlled rates.

Partial Infiltration BMPs: Infiltration of a significant portion of the DCV may be possible, but site factors may indicate that infiltration of the full DCV is either infeasible or not desirable. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Biofiltration with partial retention BMPs are shallow basins filled with treatment media and drainage rock that manage storm water runoff through infiltration, evapotranspiration, and biofiltration. These BMPs typically have an infiltration storage layer. The volume of biofiltered water above the infiltration storage layer is discharged via underdrain. Other components include a media layer and associated filtration rates, drainage layer with associated in-situ soil infiltration rates, and vegetation.

No Infiltration BMPs: Infiltration of any appreciable volume of the DCV should be avoided. Some incidental volume losses may be possible, but any appreciable quantity of infiltration would introduce undesirable conditions. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Harvest and use BMPs capture and store storm water runoff for later use. Uses of captured water may include irrigation demand, indoor non-potable demand, industrial process water demand, or other demands. Uses of captured water shall not result in runoff to storm drains or receiving waters.
- Biofiltration BMPs are shallow basins filled with treatment media and drainage rock that treat storm water runoff by capturing and detaining inflows prior to controlled release through incidental infiltration, evapotranspiration, or discharge via underdrain or surface outlet structure. Biofiltration BMPs include impermeable liners located at the bottom of the BMP to prevent infiltration.
- Flow-thru treatment control BMPs (vegetated swales, media filters, sand filters, dry extended detention basin, proprietary flow-thru treatment control) are structural, engineered facilities that are designed to remove pollutants from storm water runoff using treatment process that do not incorporate significant biological methods.

Detailed descriptions of the structural BMPs are included in Chapter 5 of the Manual Update. Fact sheets for sizing and designing BMPs are located in Appendix E of the Manual Update. In addition to satisfying pollutant control requirements, PDPs subject to hydromodification management requirements must provide flow control for post-project runoff to meet the flow control performance standard. Flow control for hydromodification management is typically accomplished using structural BMPs that may include any combination of infiltration basins; bioretention, biofiltration with partial retention, or biofiltration basins; or detention basins. Both

storm water pollutant control and flow control for hydromodification management can be achieved within the same structural BMP(s) or by a series of structural BMP(s). Guidance on how to design these structural BMPs to satisfy both pollutant control and hydromodification management requirements is provided in Chapter 6 of the Manual Update.

Notable changes required by the Municipal Permit related to development planning requirements that have been incorporated in the Manual Update, Part 1 include:

- Priority Development Projects Category: The size threshold for PDP categories has been reduced from 1 acre to 10,000 square feet of impervious area for commercial, industrial, mixed-use, and public development projects. Additionally, the size threshold for residential PDPs has been reduced from 10 dwelling units to 10,000 square feet of impervious area.
- The RWQCB has announced that it intends to make further amendments to the 2013 Municipal Permit in November 2015 to change the PDP categories. The proposed amendments would increase the number of projects considered to be PDPs by including: (1) new and redevelopment projects that create <u>and/or replace</u> 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface; and (2) new development projects <u>or redevelopment projects that create and/or replace 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface</u>, that support automotive repair shops or retail gasoline outlets.
- Pollutant Control Requirements: PDPs are required to implement structural BMPs to retain the 85th percentile storm event. For situations where on-site retention of the 85th percentile storm volume is not feasible, bio-filtration must be provided to satisfy specific performance standards.
- Priority Development Project Exemption: Projects that either (1) redevelop existing paved alleys, streets, or roads OR (2) develop or retrofit paved sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or trails may be exempted from being required to meet PDP requirements if they include green infrastructure design elements in accordance with the USEPA document "*Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure – Municipal Handbook*". The Manual Update provides further guidance on green streets design requirements for PDP exemptions. New or retrofit paved sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or trails may also be exempt if they are designed and constructed to direct storm water runoff to non-erodible permeable areas or are hydraulically disconnected from paved streets or roads.
- Hydromodification Management BMP Requirements: The Manual Update continues to require the current Hydromodification Management criteria on PDPs with the following changes based on new requirements in the 2013 Municipal Permit: (a) exemptions from this requirement will be allowed in fewer cases, and exemptions for highly urbanized areas and for a portion of major river reaches are removed; (b) calculations for the increase of runoff volume from impervious surfaces must compare post-project runoff to runoff from a "pre-developed" condition, meaning the condition before existing impervious surfaces were added; and (c) sites that meet criteria for providing a natural source of coarse sediment that is critical for stream sediment replenishment need to either restrict development on those source areas or follow the project specific onsite measures as described in the Manual Update.
- Alternative Compliance Option: The Municipal Permit provides off-site Alternative Compliance as an option for PDPs in lieu of implementing on-site structural BMPs to comply with pollutant control and hydromodification management requirements. The off-site alternative compliance may include off-site mitigation options in the following categories:

- Stream or riparian area rehabilitation
- Retrofit of existing infrastructure
- Regional BMPs
- Groundwater recharge
- Water supply augmentation
- Land purchase to preserve floodplain functions

The City intends to implement the alternative compliance program in two phases:

1) Phase I: Applicant Implemented Alternative Compliance Projects where the applicant is fully responsible for the project's design, construction, operation, and long-term maintenance. Phase I is included in the Manual Update; however it will be utilized only if the Water Quality Equivalency (WQE) study is approved by the RWQCB executive officer. Once the RWQCB approves the WQE, the City has the discretion to allow PDP projects to utilize Phase I.
2) Phase II: Independent Alternative Compliance Projects which includes other options such as in lieu fee or a credit trading system. This phase is in the initial planning stage and is therefore not part of the project being analyzed in this mitigated negative declaration.

Additionally, Manual Update, Part 2, includes construction management requirements in accordance with the Municipal Permit. It provides guidance regarding required temporary storm water management controls during construction phase of development projects. There are no notable changes related to the construction management provisions in the Municipal Permit with the exception of deletion of the maximum grading limitation and the advanced treatment requirements. However the Construction BMP Standards, Part 2 of the Manual Update has been reformatted and updated to reflect City specific processes. The Manual Update provides more detailed guidance on required BMPs during the construction phase, inspection and documentation requirements, and includes storm water pollution control plan templates.

Recommended Finding: The recommended finding that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment is based on an Initial Study and project revisions/conditions which now mitigate potentially significant environmental impacts in the following area(s): **HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY), HISTORICAL RESOURCES (BUILT ENVIRONMENT), BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, GEOLOGY, PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES, LAND USE (MULTIPLE SPECIES CONSERVATION PROGRAM [MSCP]/MULTI-HABITAT PLANNING AREA [MHPA]).**

Availability in Alternative Format: To request this Notice, the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, Initial Study, and/or supporting documents in alternative format, call the Planning Department at (619) 235-5200 or (800) 735-2929 (TEXT TELEPHONE).

Additional Information: For environmental review information, contact Myra Herrmann at (619) 446-5372. The draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and supporting documents may be reviewed, or purchased for the cost of reproduction, at the Fifth floor of the Development Services Center. If you are interested in obtaining a hard-copy of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration, it can be purchased for an additional cost. For additional information regarding the public meetings/hearings on this project, contact Sumer Hasenin, at 858-541-4330 or syhasenin@sandiego.gov.

The Storm Water Division is also soliciting public input and comments on the draft Storm Water Standards Manual covered in this draft Mitigated Negative Declaration. This document can be reviewed on the Storm Water Division website at: http://www.sandiego.gov/stormwater/regulations/index.shtml

This notice was published in the SAN DIEGO DAILY TRANSCRIPT and distributed on **August 21, 2015.**

Tom Tomlinson
Interim Director
Planning Department

City of San Diego
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Environmental & Resource Analysis Division
619-235-5200

DRAFT
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Project No. 435930
SCH# *PENDING*

SUBJECT: **CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE STORM WATER STANDARDS MANUAL UPDATE** to update the City's storm water-related requirements for land development and construction activities in accordance with the 2013 Municipal Permit (Municipal Permit).

APPLICANT: City of San Diego Transportation & Storm Water Department – Storm Water Division

In accordance with the federal Clean Water Act, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) issues Municipal Storm Water National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits (Municipal Permit) to municipalities that own and operate a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) that discharges into waters of the U.S. within the San Diego region. The RWQCB issued the first Municipal Permit to the City of San Diego and twenty (20) other municipalities (Co-permittees) in the region in 1990, and has renewed it four times thereafter. In May 2013, the RWQCB adopted the most recent Municipal Permit, Order No. R9-2013-0001, as subsequently amended by Order No. R9-2015-0001.

The Municipal Permit requires all development projects, regardless of size, to implement source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) and site design Low Impact Development (LID) practices to minimize the generation of pollutants. While all development projects are required to implement source control and site design practices, the Municipal Permit has additional requirements for development projects that exceed size thresholds and/or fit under specific land use categories. These projects, referred to as Priority Development Projects (PDPs), are required to incorporate structural BMPs into the project plan to reduce the discharge of pollutants, and address potential hydromodification impacts from changes in flow and sediment supply. Projects that are not classified as PDPs are referred to as Standard Projects.

The Municipal Permit requires the City to implement storm water standards to address storm water pollution associated with private and public development projects during construction and post construction. The City of San Diego developed the first Storm Water Standards Manual in 2002, and updated it in 2008 and 2012 to comply with new requirements in subsequent Municipal Permits. The 2013 Municipal Permit requires the City to update its Storm Water Standards Manual (Manual Update) to incorporate additional requirements.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Manual Update provides design concepts and methodologies to guide applicants in meeting the requirements of the 2013 Municipal Permit, Provision E.3.

The Manual Update, Part 1, addresses expanded and updated post-construction storm water requirements for Standard Projects and PDPs, and provides updated procedures for planning, selecting, and designing structural storm water BMPs based on the performance standards and requirements in the Municipal Permit.

Structural BMPs are engineered facilities that are designed to retain, detain, filter, remove, or prevent the release of pollutants to surface waters from development projects in perpetuity, after construction of a project is completed. Structural BMPs are a type of Low Impact Design that aims to mimic the natural hydrology to manage storm water pollutant on site. Structural BMPs utilize biological, chemical and physical processes to remove pollutants from storm water runoff before it's discharged to water ways. Examples of structural BMPs are bioretention basins, infiltration trenches, rain gardens, vegetated swales, biofiltration basins, and planter boxes.

The Municipal Permit requires all Priority Development Projects (PDP) to implement structural BMPs to retain onsite pollutants contained in the volume of storm water runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event (referred to as Design Capture Volume, or DCV). If it is not technically feasible to implement retention BMPs for the full DCV onsite for a PDP, then the PDP is required to utilize biofiltration BMPs for the remaining volume not reliably retained. If biofiltration BMPs are not technically feasible, then the PDP is required to utilize flow-thru treatment control BMPs to treat runoff leaving the site and participate in alternative compliance to mitigate for the pollutants from the DCV not reliably retained onsite.

The Manual Update categorizes structural BMPs in three categories based on the unit processes utilized in the BMP design. The BMP selection from these categories is largely based on the site conditions.

Infiltration BMPs: BMPs that are designed to retain the full design capture volume. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Infiltration BMPs typically consist of an earthen basin with a flat bottom constructed in naturally pervious soils. Infiltration BMPs capture, store, and infiltrate storm water runoff into native soils.
- Bioretention BMP facilities are vegetated surface water systems that filter water through vegetation and soil, or engineered media prior to infiltrating into native soils.
- Permeable pavement BMPs allow for percolation through void spaces in the pavement surface into subsurface layers. The subsurface layers are designed to provide storage of storm water runoff so that outflows, primarily via infiltration into subgrade soils or release to the downstream conveyance system, can be at controlled rates.

Partial Infiltration BMPs: Infiltration of a significant portion of the DCV may be possible, but site factors may indicate that infiltration of the full DCV is either infeasible or not desirable. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Biofiltration with partial retention BMPs are shallow basins filled with treatment media and drainage rock that manage storm water runoff through infiltration, evapotranspiration, and biofiltration. These BMPs typically have an infiltration storage layer. The volume of biofiltered water above the infiltration storage layer is discharged via underdrain. Other components include a media layer and associated filtration rates, drainage layer with associated in-situ soil infiltration rates, and vegetation.

No Infiltration BMPs: Infiltration of any appreciable volume of the DCV should be avoided. Some incidental volume losses may be possible, but any appreciable quantity of infiltration would introduce undesirable conditions. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Harvest and use BMPs capture and store storm water runoff for later use. Uses of captured water may include irrigation demand, indoor non-potable demand, industrial process water demand, or other demands. Uses of captured water shall not result in runoff to storm drains or receiving waters.
- Biofiltration BMPs are shallow basins filled with treatment media and drainage rock that treat storm water runoff by capturing and detaining inflows prior to controlled release through incidental infiltration, evapotranspiration, or discharge via underdrain or surface outlet structure. Biofiltration BMPs include impermeable liners located at the bottom of the BMP to prevent infiltration.
- Flow-thru treatment control BMPs (vegetated swales, media filters, sand filters, dry extended detention basin, proprietary flow-thru treatment control) are structural, engineered facilities that are designed to remove pollutants from storm water runoff using treatment process that do not incorporate significant biological methods.

Detailed descriptions of the structural BMPs are included in Chapter 5 of the Manual Update. Fact sheets for sizing and designing BMPs are included in Appendix E of the Manual Update. In addition to satisfying pollutant control requirements, PDPs subject to hydromodification management requirements must provide flow control for post-project runoff to meet the flow control performance standard. Flow control for hydromodification management is typically accomplished using structural BMPs that may include any combination of infiltration basins; bioretention, biofiltration with partial retention, or biofiltration basins; or detention basins. Both storm water pollutant control and flow control for hydromodification management can be achieved within the same structural BMP(s) or by a series of structural BMP(s). Guidance on how to design these structural BMPs to satisfy both pollutant control and hydromodification management requirements is provided in Chapter 6 of the Manual Update.

Notable changes required by the Municipal Permit related to development planning requirements that have been incorporated in the Manual Update, Part 1 include:

- Priority Development Projects Category: The size threshold for PDP categories has been reduced from 1 acre to 10,000 square feet of impervious area for commercial, industrial, mixed-use, and public development projects. Additionally, the size threshold for residential PDPs has been reduced from 10 dwelling units to 10,000 square feet of impervious area.
- The RWQCB has announced that it intends to make further amendments to the 2013 Municipal Permit in November 2015 to change the PDP categories. The proposed amendments would increase the number of projects considered to be PDPs by including: (1) new and redevelopment projects that create <u>and/or replace</u> 5,000 square feet or more

of impervious surface; and (2) new development projects <u>or redevelopment projects that create and/or replace 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface</u>, that support automotive repair shops or retail gasoline outlets.

- Pollutant Control Requirements: PDPs are required to implement structural BMPs to retain the 85th percentile storm event. For situations where on-site retention of the 85th percentile storm volume is not feasible, bio-filtration must be provided to satisfy specific performance standards.
- Priority Development Project Exemption: Projects that either (1) redevelop existing paved alleys, streets, or roads OR (2) develop or retrofit paved sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or trails may be exempted from being required to meet PDP requirements if they include green infrastructure design elements in accordance with the USEPA document "*Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure – Municipal Handbook*". The Manual Update provides further guidance on green streets design requirements for PDP exemptions. New or retrofit paved sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or trails may also be exempt if they are designed and constructed to direct storm water runoff to non-erodible permeable areas or are hydraulically disconnected from paved streets or roads.
- Hydromodification Management BMP Requirements: The Manual Update continues to require the current Hydromodification Management criteria on PDPs with the following changes based on new requirements in the 2015 Municipal Permit: (a) exemptions from this requirement will be allowed in fewer cases, and exemptions for highly urbanized areas and for a portion of major river reaches are removed; (b) calculations for the increase of runoff volume from impervious surfaces must compare post-project runoff to runoff from a "pre-developed" condition, meaning the condition before existing impervious surfaces were added; and (c) sites that meet criteria for providing a natural source of coarse sediment that is critical for stream sediment replenishment need to either restrict development on those source areas or follow the project specific onsite measures as described in the Manual Update.
- Alternative Compliance Option: The Municipal Permit provides off-site Alternative Compliance as an option for PDPs in lieu of implementing on-site structural BMPs to comply with pollutant control and hydromodification management requirements. The off-site alternative compliance may include off-site mitigation options in the following categories:

    - Stream or riparian area rehabilitation
    - Retrofit of existing infrastructure
    - Regional BMPs
    - Groundwater recharge
    - Water supply augmentation
    - Land purchase to preserve floodplain functions

The City intends to implement the alternative compliance program in two phases:

1) Phase I: Applicant Implemented Alternative Compliance Projects where the applicant is fully responsible for the project's design, construction, operation, and long-term maintenance. Phase I is included in the Manual Update; however it will be utilized only if the Water Quality Equivalency (WQE) study is approved by the RWQCB executive officer. Once the RWQCB approves the WQE, the City has the discretion to allow PDP projects to utilize Phase I.

2) Phase II: Independent Alternative Compliance Projects which includes other options such as in lieu fee or a credit trading system. This phase is in the initial planning stage and is therefore not part of the project being analyzed in this mitigated negative declaration.

II. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See attached Initial Study.

III. DETERMINATION:

The City of San Diego conducted an Initial Study which determined that the proposed project could have a significant environmental effect in the following areas(s): LAND USE (MULTIPLE SPECIES CONSERVATION PROGRAM/MULTI-HABITAT PLANNING AREA), BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, GEOLOGY, HISTORICAL RESOURCES (ARCHAEOLOGY), HISTORICAL RESOURCES (BUILT ENVIRONMENT), AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES. The project proposal requires the implementation of specific mitigation identified in Section V of this Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND). The project as presented avoids or mitigates the potentially significant environmental effects identified, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would not be required.

Future public and private development projects required to comply with the Manual Update may require subsequent environmental review for potential impacts in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Where the subsequent initial study screening process indicates that a future project implementing the Manual Update requirements may have a significant impact on land use (MSCP/MHPA), biological resources, geology, historical resources (archaeology), historical resources (built environment), and/or paleontological resources because of its location, that project would be required to implement the Mitigation Framework in order to demonstrate consistency with this mitigated negative declaration, which would be further disclosed and analyzed in a project-level environmental document and Initial Study.

IV. DOCUMENTATION:

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

V. MITIGATION, MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM:

LAND USE (MSCP/MHPA, ESL REGULATIONS & HISTORICAL RESOURCES REGULATIONS)

Mitigation Framework (Compliance with Applicable Regulations)

LU-1a: Future projects implemented in accordance with the Project shall be subject to environmental review at the project-level in accordance with the Mitigation Framework HIST-1 (Historical Resources – Archaeology) and HIST-2 (Historical Resources – Built Environment).

Mitigation Framework - MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines

LU-2:
Future projects which are located adjacent to the MHPA shall be subject to environmental review at the project-level in accordance with the Mitigation Framework detailed below. Projects shall incorporate features that demonstrate compliance with the MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines to ensure avoidance or reduction of potential MHPA impacts.

Future projects which are located adjacent to the MHPA shall comply with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines of the MSCP in terms of land use, drainage, access, toxic substances in runoff, lighting, noise, invasive plant species, grading, and brush management requirements. Mitigation measures include, but are not limited to: sufficient buffers and design features, barriers (rocks, boulders, signage, fencing, and appropriate vegetation) where necessary, lighting directed away from the MHPA, and berms or walls adjacent to commercial or industrial areas and any other use that may introduce construction noise or noise from future development that could impact or interfere with wildlife utilization of the MHPA. The project biologist or City staff meeting the qualifications of a Biologist III would identify specific mitigation measures needed to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. Subsequent environmental review would be required to determine the significance of impacts and compliance with the Land Use Adjacency Guidelines of the MSCP. Prior to approval of any subsequent project within and/or adjacent to the MHPA, the City of San Diego shall identify specific conditions of approval in order to avoid or to reduce potential impacts to the MHPA.

Specific requirements, as applicable to future projects shall include:

- Prior to the issuance of any permits, development areas shall be permanently fenced where development is adjacent to the MHPA to deter the intrusion of people and/or pets into the MHPA open space areas. Signage may be installed as an additional deterrent to human intrusion as required by the City.

- The use of structural and nonstructural best management practices (BMPs), including sediment catchment devices, shall be required to reduce the potential indirect impacts associated with construction to drainage and water quality. Drainage shall be directed away from the MHPA or, if not possible, must not drain directly into the MHPA. Instead, runoff shall flow into sedimentation basins, grassy swales, or mechanical trapping devices prior to draining into the MHPA. Drainage shall be shown on the site plan and reviewed satisfactory to the City Engineer.

- All outdoor lighting adjacent to open space areas shall be shielded to prevent light over-spill off-site. Shielding shall consist of the installation of fixtures that physically direct light away from the outer edges of the road or landscaping, berms, or other barriers at the edge of development that prevent light over spill.

- The landscape plan for the project shall contain no exotic plant/invasive species and shall include an appropriate mix of native species which shall be used adjacent to the MHPA.

- All manufactured slopes must be included within the development footprint and outside the MHPA.

- All brush management areas shall be shown on the site plan and reviewed and approved by the Environmental Designee. Zone 1 brush management areas shall be included within the development footprint and outside the MHPA. Brush management Zone 2 may be permitted within the MHPA (considered impact neutral) but cannot be used as mitigation. Vegetation clearing shall be done consistent with City standards and shall avoid/minimize impacts to covered species to the maximum extent possible. For all new development, regardless of the

ownership, the brush management in the Zone 2 area shall be the responsibility of a homeowners association or other private party.

- Access to the MHPA, if any, shall be directed to minimize impacts and shall be shown on the site plan and reviewed and approved by the Environmental Designee.

Land uses, such as recreation and agriculture, that use chemicals or generate by-products such as manure, that are potentially toxic or impactive to wildlife, sensitive species, habitat, or water quality need to incorporate measures to reduce impacts caused by the application and/or drainage of such materials into the MHPA. Such measures shall include drainage/detention basins, swales, or holding areas with non-invasive grasses or wetland-type native vegetation to filter out the toxic materials. Regular maintenance should be provided. Where applicable, this requirement shall be incorporated into leases on publicly owned property as leases come up for renewal.

Mitigation Framework for Short-term Impacts to Sensitive Species from Project Construction

Measures necessary for reducing potential construction-related noise impacts during nesting/breeding season to the coastal California gnatcatcher (March 1 and August 15), least Bell's vireo (March 15 and August 15), southwestern willow Flycatcher (May 1 and September 1), the California cactus wren or the burrowing owl shall be incorporated into project-level construction documents to minimize direct impacts on wildlife movement, nesting or foraging activities and shall be addressed in a Biology Letter report submitted for review at the project level. The Biology Letter report shall include recommendations for preconstruction protocol surveys to be conducted during established breeding seasons, construction noise monitoring and implementation of any species specific mitigation plans in order to comply with the FESA, MBTA, Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, State Fish and Game Code, and/or the ESL Regulations.

In addition, future project sites may contain trees and shrubs that could support nesting sites for bird species protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). Impacts to nesting birds could occur if vegetation clearing were to take place during the avian breeding season (generally February 1 to August 31). The following design measure shall be incorporated into the construction plans to ensure that nesting activities of birds covered by the MBTA would not be significantly impacted by construction-related activities during the nesting season:

> Vegetation clearing shall take place outside of the general avian breeding season (February 1-August 31), when feasible. If vegetation clearing must occur during the avian breeding season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for nesting birds no more than three days prior to vegetation clearing. Active nests shall be avoided until the young have fledged or the nest is otherwise abandoned. If no active nests are found, clearing can proceed. The results of the pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be reported to the City in a brief memorandum. If no nesting birds have been detected during the preconstruction surveys, then no further measures shall be required.

<u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u>

Mitigation Framework for Biological Resources

BIO-1: Prior to issuance of any discretionary permit for a future development project implemented in accordance with the Manual Update all projects which could have potentially significant

impacts resulting in a reduction in the number of unique, rare, endangered, sensitive, or fully protected species of plants or animals shall be analyzed in accordance with the CEQA Significance Thresholds, which require that site-specific biological resources surveys be conducted in accordance with City of San Diego Biology Guidelines (2012) and MSCP Subarea Plan. Where sensitive biological resources are known or suspected on or adjacent to a proposed project site, a biological assessment shall be performed for that project. Based on available habitat within a future project area, focused presence/absence surveys shall be conducted in accordance with the Biology Guidelines and applicable resource agency survey protocols. Engineering design specifications based on project-level grading and site plans shall be incorporated into the design of future projects to minimize or eliminate direct impacts on sensitive plant and wildlife species consistent with the FESA, MBTA, CESA, MSCP Subarea Plan, and ESL Regulations.

Mitigation Framework for Impacts on Sensitive Upland Habitats

Future projects which have a potential to result in impacts on sensitive upland Tier I, II, IIIA, or IIIB habitats shall implement avoidance and minimization measures consistent with the City Biology Guidelines and MSCP Subarea Plan and provide suitable mitigation in accordance with Table 3 in the City's Biology Guidelines (see Table 1 below) and MSCP Subarea Plan. Future project-level grading and site plans shall incorporate project design features to minimize direct impacts on sensitive vegetation communities including but not limited to riparian habitats, wetlands, maritime succulent scrub, coastal sage scrub, and grasslands consistent with federal, state, and City guidelines. Any required mitigation for impacts on sensitive vegetation communities shall be outlined in a conceptual mitigation plan following the outline provided in the City Biology Guidelines.

Mitigation for impacts on sensitive vegetation communities shall be implemented at the time future development projects are proposed. Project-level analysis shall determine whether the impacts are within or outside the MHPA. Any MHPA boundary adjustments shall be processed by the individual project applicants through the City and Wildlife Agencies during the early project planning stage.

Mitigation for impacts on sensitive upland habitats shall occur in accordance with the MSCP mitigation ratios as specified within the City's Biology Guidelines (City of San Diego 2012). These mitigation ratios are based on the tier level of the vegetation community, the location of the impact, and the location of the mitigation site(s). For example, impacts on lands inside the MHPA and mitigated outside the MHPA would have the highest mitigation ratio, whereas impacts on lands outside the MHPA and mitigated inside the MHPA would have the lowest mitigation ratio.

Mitigation Framework for Impacts to Wetlands

Please refer to Mitigation Framework BIO-2.

Mitigation Framework for Short-term Impacts on Sensitive Species from Project Construction

For future projects adjacent to or within the MHPA, construction noise that exceeds the maximum levels allowed shall be avoided during the breeding seasons for protected avian species such as: coastal California gnatcatcher (March 1-August 15); least Bell's vireo (March 15-September 15); and coastal cactus wren (February 15-August 15). If construction is proposed during the breeding season for these species, USFWS protocol surveys shall be required in order to determine species presence/absence. When applicable, adequate noise reduction measures shall be incorporated.

Additional specific measures necessary for reducing potential indirect impacts on sensitive bird species, including coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo, and coastal cactus wren, are further detailed in Mitigation Framework LU-2 and BIO-3.

Table 1: Mitigation Ratios for Impacts on Upland Vegetation Communities and Land Cover Types

Tier	*Habitat Type*	*Mitigation Ratios*			
TIER I (rare uplands)	Southern Foredunes Torrey Pines Forest Coastal Bluff Scrub Maritime Succulent Scrub Maritime Chaparral Scrub Oak Chaparral Native Grassland Oak Woodlands			Location of Preservation	
				Inside	Outside
		Location of Impact	Inside	2:1	3:1
			Outside	1:1	2:1
TIER II (uncommon uplands)	Diegan Coastal Sage Scrub (CSS) CSS/Chaparral			Location of Preservation	
				Inside	Outside
		Location of Impact	Inside*	1:1	2:1
			Outside	1:1	1.5:1
TIER IIIA (common uplands)	Chamise Chaparral Southern Mixed Chaparral			Location of Preservation	
				Inside	Outside
		Location of Impact	Inside*	2:1	3:1
			Outside	1:1	2:1
TIER IIIB (common uplands)	Non-native Grassland			Location of Preservation	
				Inside	Outside
		Location of Impact	Inside*	1:1	1.5:1
			Outside	0.5:1	1:1

Notes:

For all Tier I impacts, the mitigation could (1) occur within the MHPA portion of Tier I or (2) occur outside of the MHPA within the affected habitat type (in-kind).

For impacts on Tier II, IIIA, and IIIB habitats, the mitigation could (1) occur within the MHPA portion of Tiers I – III (out-of-kind) or (2) occur outside of the MHPA within the affected habitat type (in-kind). Project-specific mitigation will be subject to applicable mitigation ratios at the time of project submittal.

Mitigation Framework for Wetlands

Future projects which cannot demonstrate avoidance of impacts on wetlands/jurisdictional resources shall be required to implement the following Mitigation Framework:

BIO-2: To reduce potential direct impacts on City, state, and federally regulated wetlands, all subsequent projects developed in accordance with the Manual Update shall be required to comply with ACOE CWA Section 404 requirements and special conditions, RWQCB in accordance with Section 401 of the CWA, CDFW Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement requirements and special conditions, and the City of San Diego ESL Regulations for minimizing impacts on wetlands. Achieving consistency with these regulations for impacts on wetlands and special aquatic sites would reduce potential impacts on regulated wetlands and provide compensatory mitigation (as required) to ensure no net loss of wetland habitats. In addition, the USFWS would be involved under Section 7 of the FESA during consultation initiated by the ACOE during the 404 permit process if federal listed species are present. If there is no federal nexus to jurisdictional waters, then a Section 10(A) authorization from USFWS would be required to cover any potential effects on federal listed species.

Prior to obtaining discretionary permits for future actions that are subject to the ESL Regulations, and/or where the CEQA review has determined that there may be a significant impact on other biological resources considered sensitive under CEQA, a site-specific biological resources survey shall be completed in accordance with City of San Diego Biology Guidelines. In addition, a preliminary or final jurisdictional waters/wetlands delineation of the project site shall be completed following the methods outlined in the ACOE's 1987 *Wetlands Delineation Manual*, the 2008 *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Delineation Manual for the Arid West Region*, and any required updated or additional standards. A determination of the presence/absence and boundaries of any waters of the U.S. and waters of the state shall also be completed following the appropriate ACOE guidance documents for determining the OHWM boundaries. The limits of any riparian habitats on-site under the sole jurisdiction of CDFW shall also be delineated, as well as any special aquatic sites (excluding vernal pools) that may not meet federal jurisdictional criteria but are regulated by the RWQCB. Engineering design specifications based on project-level grading and site plans shall be incorporated into the project design to minimize direct impacts to wetlands, jurisdictional waters, riparian habitats, and vernal pools consistent with federal, state, and City guidelines. Any required mitigation for proposed impacts shall be outlined in a conceptual wetland mitigation plan prepared in accordance with the City's Biology Guidelines (2012).

Additionally, any impacts on wetlands in the City of San Diego would require a deviation from the ESL wetland regulations. Under the wetland deviation process, development proposals that have wetland impacts shall be considered only pursuant to one of three options: Essential Public Project, Economic Viability Option, or Biologically Superior Option. ESL Regulations require that impacts on wetlands be avoided. Unavoidable impacts on wetlands shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable and mitigated as follows:

- As part of the project-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA, all unavoidable wetland impacts shall be analyzed, and mitigation shall be required in accordance with ratios shown in Tables 2a and 2b below. Mitigation shall be based on the impacted type of wetland and project design. Mitigation shall prevent any net loss of wetland functions and values of the impacted wetland.

- For the Biologically Superior Option, the project shall include avoidance, minimization, and compensatory measures, which would result in a biologically superior net gain in overall function and values of (a) the type of wetland resource being impacted and/or (b) the biological resources to be conserved. The Biologically Superior Option mitigation shall include either (1) standard mitigation per Table 2a, including wetland creation or restoration of the same type of wetland resource that is being impacted that results in high quality wetlands; and a biologically superior project design whose avoided area(s) (i) is in a configuration or alignment that optimizes the potential long-term biological viability of the on-site sensitive biological resources, and/or (ii) conserves the rarest and highest quality on-site biological resources; or (2) for a project not considered consistent with "1" above, extraordinary mitigation per Table 2b is required.

Table 2a: City of San Diego Wetland Mitigation Ratios (With Biologically Superior Design)

Vegetation Community	*Mitigation Ratio*
Riparian	2:1 to 3:1
Vernal pool[1]	2:1 to 4:1
Basin with fairy shrimp[1]	2:1 to 4:1
Freshwater marsh	2:1

Notes:

[1]The City does not have "take" authority for vernal pool species. A draft vernal pool HCP is currently being prepared by the City in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies. If adopted, the City would have "take" authority for the vernal pool species occurring within the vernal pool HCP areas.

Table 2b: City of San Diego Wetland Mitigation Ratios (Without Biologically Superior Design Outside the Coastal Zone)

Vegetation Community	*Mitigation Ratio*
Riparian	4:1 to 6:1
Vernal pool[1]	4:1 to 8:1
Basin with fairy shrimp[1]	4:1 to 8:1
Freshwater marsh	4:1

Notes:

[1]The City does not have "take" authority for vernal pool species. A draft vernal pool HCP is currently being prepared by the City in coordination with the Wildlife Agencies. If adopted, the City would have "take" authority for the vernal pool species occurring within the vernal pool HCP areas.

As part of any future project-specific environmental review pursuant to CEQA, all unavoidable wetlands impacts (both temporary and permanent) shall be analyzed and mitigation required in accordance with the City Biology Guidelines; mitigation shall be based on the impacted type of wetland habitat. Mitigation shall prevent any net loss of wetland functions and values of the impacted wetland. Operational definitions of the four types of activities that constitute wetland mitigation under the ESL Regulations are as follows:

- Wetland creation is an activity that results in the formation of new wetlands in an upland area. An example is excavation of uplands adjacent to existing wetlands and the establishment of native wetland vegetation.

- Wetland restoration is an activity that re-establishes the habitat functions of a former wetland. An example is the excavation of agricultural fill from historic wetlands and the re-establishment of native wetland vegetation.

- Wetland enhancement is an activity that improves the self-sustaining habitat functions of an existing wetland. An example is removal of exotic species from existing riparian habitat.

- Wetland acquisition may be considered in combination with any of the three mitigation activities above.

Wetland enhancement and wetland acquisition focus on the preservation or the improvement of existing wetland habitat and function and do not result in an increase in wetland area; therefore, a net loss of wetland may result. As such, acquisition and/or enhancement of existing wetlands shall be considered as partial mitigation only for any balance of the remaining mitigation requirement after restoration or creation if wetland acreage is provided at a minimum of a 1:1 ratio.

For permanent wetland impacts that are unavoidable and minimized to the maximum extent feasible, mitigation shall consist of creation of new in-kind habitat to the fullest extent possible and at the appropriate ratios. If on-site mitigation is not feasible, then at least a portion of the mitigation must occur within the same watershed. The City's Biology Guidelines and MSCP Subarea Plan require that impacts on wetlands, including vernal pools, shall be avoided, and that a sufficient wetland buffer shall be maintained, as appropriate, to protect resource functions/values. The project specific biology report shall include an analysis of on-site wetlands (including City, state, and federal jurisdiction analysis) and, if present, include project alternatives that fully/substantially avoid wetland impacts. Detailed evidence supporting why there is no feasible less environmentally damaging location or alternative to avoid any impacts must be provided for City staff review, as well as a mitigation plan that specifically identifies how the project is to compensate for any unavoidable impacts. A conceptual wetland mitigation plan (which includes identification of the mitigation site) shall be approved by City staff prior to the release of the draft environmental document. Avoidance shall be the first requirement; mitigation shall only be used for impacts clearly demonstrated to be unavoidable.

Prior to the commencement of any construction-related activities on-site for projects impacting wetland habitat (including earthwork and fencing), the applicant shall provide evidence of the following to the Mayor-appointed Environmental Designee prior to any construction activity:

- Compliance with ACOE Section 404 nationwide permit;
- Compliance with the RWQCB Section 401 Water Quality Certification; and
- Compliance with the CDFW Section 1601/1603 Streambed Alteration Agreement.

Mitigation Framework for Migratory Wildlife

BIO-3: Mitigation for future projects to reduce potentially significant impacts that would interfere with the nesting, foraging, or movement of wildlife species shall be identified in a site-specific biological resources report prepared in accordance with City of San Diego Biology Guidelines, as further detailed in BIO-1 during the discretionary review process. The biology report shall include results of protocol surveys and recommendations for additional measures to be implemented during construction-related activities; shall identify the limits of any identified local-scale wildlife corridors or habitat linkages and analyze potential impacts in relation to local fauna, and the effects of conversion of vegetation communities to minimize direct impacts on sensitive wildlife species and to provide for continued wildlife movement through the corridor.

Measures that shall be incorporated into project-level construction documents to minimize direct impacts on wildlife movement, nesting, or foraging activities shall be addressed in the biology report and shall include recommendations for preconstruction protocol surveys to be conducted during established breeding seasons, construction noise monitoring and implementation of any species-specific mitigation plans in order to comply with the FESA, MBTA, State Fish and Game Code, and/or the ESL Regulations.

GEOLOGY

Mitigation Framework for Geology

GEO-1: Future development projects implemented in accordance with the Manual Update, including projects involving infiltration of runoff into the ground through pervious/porous materials shall be required to prepare a geotechnical evaluation for review and approval by the City Engineer. Submittal of site specific geotechnical evaluations shall be completed in accordance with the City's Municipal Code requirements. Geotechnical evaluations of all potential project sites shall be required in order to determine the feasibility of the sites for infiltration in accordance with the Manual Update.

HISTORICAL RESOURCES

Mitigation Framework for Historical Resources (Archaeology)

Future projects which have the potential to impact Historical Resources (Archaeology) shall be subject to review in accordance with the Mitigation Framework detailed below. For future projects which are not within a recorded archaeological site requiring further analysis, but have a potential to impact unknown resources, only monitoring shall be required. In those cases, the archaeological monitoring program included after STEP 5 of the evaluation program shall be implemented.

HIST-1: Future projects implemented in accordance with the Project that could directly affect an archaeological resource, shall be subject to environmental review at the project-level in accordance with the Mitigation Framework to determine: (1) the presence of archaeological resources and (2) the appropriate mitigation for any significant resources which may be impacted by a development activity. Sites may include, but are not limited to, residential and commercial properties, privies, trash pits, building foundations, and industrial features representing the contributions of people from diverse socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds. Sites may also include resources associated with pre-historic Native American activities.

INITIAL DETERMINATION

The environmental analyst will determine the likelihood for the project site to contain historical resources by reviewing site photographs and existing historic information (e.g. Archaeological Sensitivity Maps, the Archaeological Map Book, and the City's "Historical Inventory of Important Architects, Structures, and People in San Diego") and conducting a site visit. If there is any evidence that the site contains archaeological resources, then a historic evaluation consistent with the City Guidelines would be required. All individuals conducting any phase of the archaeological evaluation program must meet professional qualifications in accordance with the City Guidelines.

STEP 1:

Based on the results of the Initial Determination, if there is evidence that the site contains historical resources, preparation of a historic evaluation is required. The evaluation report would generally include background research, field survey, archaeological testing and analysis. Before actual field reconnaissance would occur, background research is required which includes a record search at the SCIC at San Diego State University and the San Diego Museum of Man. A review of the Sacred Lands File maintained by the NAHC must also be conducted at this time. Information about existing archaeological collections should also be obtained from the San Diego Archaeological Center and any tribal repositories or museums.

In addition to the record searches mentioned above, background information may include, but is not limited to: examining primary sources of historical information (e.g., deeds and wills), secondary sources (e.g., local histories and genealogies), Sanborn Fire Maps, and historic cartographic and aerial photograph sources; reviewing previous archaeological research in similar areas, models that predict site distribution, and archaeological, architectural, and historical site inventory files; and conducting informant interviews. The results of the background information would be included in the evaluation report.

Once the background research is complete, a field reconnaissance must be conducted by individuals whose qualifications meet the standards outlined in the City Guidelines. Consultants are encouraged to employ innovative survey techniques when conducting enhanced reconnaissance, including, but not limited to, remote sensing, ground penetrating radar, and other soil resistivity techniques as determined on a case-by-case basis. Native American participation is required for field surveys when there is likelihood that the project site contains prehistoric archaeological resources or traditional cultural properties. If through background research and field surveys historical resources are identified, then an evaluation of significance must be performed by a qualified archaeologist.

STEP 2:

Once a historical resource has been identified, a significance determination must be made. It should be noted that tribal representatives and/or Native American monitors will be involved in making recommendations regarding the significance of prehistoric archaeological sites during this phase of the process. The testing program may require reevaluation of the proposed project in consultation with the Native American representative which could result in a combination of project redesign to avoid and/or preserve significant resources as well as mitigation in the form of data recovery and monitoring (as recommended by the qualified archaeologist and Native American representative). An archaeological testing program will be required which includes evaluating the horizontal and vertical dimensions of a site, the chronological placement, site function, artifact/ecofact density and variability, presence/absence of subsurface features, and research potential. A thorough discussion of testing methodologies, including surface and subsurface investigations, can be found in the City Guidelines.

The results from the testing program will be evaluated against the Significance Thresholds found in the Guidelines. If significant historical resources are identified within the Area of Potential Effect, the site may be eligible for local designation. At this time, the final testing report must be submitted to Historical Resources Board staff for eligibility determination and possible designation. An agreement on the appropriate form of mitigation is required prior to distribution of a draft environmental document. If no significant resources are found, and site conditions are such that there is no potential for further discoveries, then no further action is required. Resources found to be non-significant as a result of a survey and/or assessment will require no further work beyond documentation of the resources on the appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) site forms and inclusion of results in the survey and/or assessment report. If no significant resources are found, but results of the initial evaluation and testing phase indicates there is still a potential for resources to be present in portions of the property that could not be tested, then mitigation monitoring is required.

STEP 3:
Preferred mitigation for historical resources is to avoid the resource through project redesign. If the resource cannot be entirely avoided, all prudent and feasible measures to minimize harm shall be taken. For archaeological resources where preservation is not an option, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program is required, which includes a Collections Management Plan for review and approval. The data recovery program shall be based on a written research design and is subject to the provisions as outlined in CEQA, Section 21083.2. The data recovery program must be reviewed and approved by the City's Environmental Analyst prior to draft CEQA document distribution. Archaeological monitoring may be required during building demolition and/or construction grading when significant resources are known or suspected to be present on a site, but cannot be recovered prior to grading due to obstructions such as, but not limited to, existing development or dense vegetation.

A Native American observer must be retained for all subsurface investigations, including geotechnical testing and other ground-disturbing activities, whenever a Native American Traditional Cultural Property or any archaeological site located on City property or within the Area of Potential Effect of a City project would be impacted. In the event that human remains are encountered during data recovery and/or a monitoring program, the provisions of Public Resources Code Section 5097 must be followed. These provisions are outlined in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) included in the environmental document. The Native American monitor shall be consulted during the preparation of the written report, at which time they may express concerns about the treatment of sensitive resources. If the Native American community

requests participation of an observer for subsurface investigations on private property, the request shall be honored.

STEP 4:
Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared by qualified professionals as determined by the criteria set forth in Appendix B of the Guidelines. The discipline shall be tailored to the resource under evaluation. In cases involving complex resources, such as traditional cultural properties, rural landscape districts, sites involving a combination of prehistoric and historic archaeology, or historic districts, a team of experts will be necessary for a complete evaluation.

Specific types of historical resource reports are required to document the methods (see Section III of the Guidelines) used to determine the presence or absence of historical resources; to identify the potential impacts from proposed development and evaluate the significance of any identified historical resources; to document the appropriate curation of archaeological collections (e.g. collected materials and the associated records); in the case of potentially significant impacts to historical resources, to recommend appropriate mitigation measures that would reduce the impacts to below a level of significance; and to document the results of mitigation and monitoring programs, if required.

Archaeological Resource Management reports shall be prepared in conformance with the California Office of Historic Preservation "Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format" (see Appendix C of the Guidelines), which will be used by Environmental Analysis Section staff in the review of archaeological resource reports. Consultants must ensure that archaeological resource reports are prepared consistent with this checklist. This requirement will standardize the content and format of all archaeological technical reports submitted to the City. A confidential appendix must be submitted (under separate cover) along with historical resources reports for archaeological sites and traditional cultural properties containing the confidential resource maps and records search information gathered during the background study. In addition, a Collections Management Plan shall be prepared for projects which result in a substantial collection of artifacts and must address the management and research goals of the project and the types of materials to be collected and curated based on a sampling strategy that is acceptable to the City. Appendix D (Historical Resources Report Form) may be used when no archaeological resources were identified within the project boundaries.

STEP 5:
For Archaeological Resources: All cultural materials, including original maps, field notes, non-burial related artifacts, catalog information, and final reports recovered during public and/or private development projects must be permanently curated with an appropriate institution, one which has the proper facilities and staffing for insuring research access to the collections consistent with state and federal standards. In the event that a prehistoric and/or historic deposit is encountered during construction monitoring, a Collections Management Plan would be required in accordance with the project MMRP. The disposition of human remains and burial related artifacts that cannot be avoided or are inadvertently discovered is governed by state (i.e., Assembly Bill 2641 and California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001) and federal (i.e., Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) law, and must be treated in a dignified and culturally appropriate manner with respect for the deceased individual(s) and their descendants. Any human bones and associated grave goods of Native American origin shall be turned over to the appropriate Native American group for repatriation.

Arrangements for long-term curation must be established between the applicant/property owner and the consultant prior to the initiation of the field reconnaissance, and must be included in the archaeological survey, testing, and/or data recovery report submitted to the City for review and approval. Curation must be accomplished in accordance with the California State Historic Resources Commission's Guidelines for the Curation of Archaeological Collection (dated May 7, 1993) and, if federal funding is involved, 36 Code of Federal Regulations 79 of the Federal Register. Additional information regarding curation is provided in Section II of the Guidelines.

Historical Resources (Archeological Monitoring Program)

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

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

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

II. Prior to Start of Construction

A. Verification of Records Search
   1. The PI shall provide verification to MMC that a site specific records search (1/4 mile radius) has been completed. Verification includes, but is not limited to a copy of a confirmation letter from South Coastal Information Center, or, if the search was in-house, a letter of verification from the PI stating that the search was completed.
   2. The letter shall introduce any pertinent information concerning expectations and probabilities of discovery during trenching and/or grading activities.
   3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC requesting a reduction to the ¼ mile radius.

B. PI Shall Attend Precon Meetings
   1. Prior to beginning any work that requires monitoring; the Applicant shall arrange a Precon Meeting that shall include the PI, Native American consultant/monitor (where Native American resources may be impacted), Construction Manager (CM) and/or Grading Contractor, Resident Engineer (RE), Building Inspector (BI), if appropriate, and MMC. The qualified Archaeologist and Native American Monitor shall attend any grading/excavation related Precon Meetings to make comments and/or suggestions concerning the Archaeological Monitoring program with the Construction Manager and/or Grading Contractor.

a. If the PI is unable to attend the Precon Meeting, the Applicant shall schedule a focused Precon Meeting with MMC, the PI, RE, CM or BI, if appropriate, prior to the start of any work that requires monitoring.

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

III. During Construction

A. Monitor Shall be Present During Grading/Excavation/Trenching
   1. The Archaeological Monitor shall be present full-time during all soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources as identified on the AME. **The Construction Manager is responsible for notifying the RE, PI, and MMC of changes to any construction activities such as in the case of a potential safety concern within the area being monitored. In certain circumstances OSHA safety requirements may necessitate modification of the AME.**
   2. The Native American consultant/monitor shall determine the extent of their presence during soil disturbing and grading/excavation/trenching activities based on the AME and provide that information to the PI and MMC. If prehistoric resources are encountered during the Native American consultant/monitor's absence, work shall stop and the Discovery Notification Process detailed in Section III.B-C and IV.A-D shall commence.
   3. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program when a field condition such as modern disturbance post-dating the previous grading/trenching activities, presence of fossil formations, or when native soils are encountered <u>that</u> may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

4. The archaeological and Native American consultant/monitor shall document field activity via the Consultant Site Visit Record (CSVR). The CSVR's shall be faxed by the CM to the RE the first day of monitoring, the last day of monitoring, monthly (**Notification of Monitoring Completion)**, and in the case of ANY discoveries. The RE shall forward copies to MMC.

B. Discovery Notification Process
   1. In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert all soil disturbing activities, including but not limited to digging, trenching, excavating or grading activities in the area of discovery and in the area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent resources and immediately notify the RE or BI, as appropriate.
   2. The Monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless Monitor is the PI) of the discovery.
   3. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone of the discovery, and shall also submit written documentation to MMC within 24 hours by fax or email with photos of the resource in context, if possible.
   4. No soil shall be exported off-site until a determination can be made regarding the significance of the resource specifically if Native American resources are encountered.

C. Determination of Significance
   1. The PI and Native American consultant/monitor, where Native American resources are discovered shall evaluate the significance of the resource. If Human Remains are involved, follow protocol in Section IV below.
      a. The PI shall immediately notify MMC by phone to discuss significance determination and shall also submit a letter to MMC indicating whether additional mitigation is required.
      b. If the resource is significant, the PI shall submit an Archaeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP) and obtain written approval of the program from MMC, CM and RE. ADRP and any mitigation must be approved by MMC, RE and/or CM before ground disturbing activities in the area of discovery will be allowed to resume. **Note: If a unique archaeological site is also an historical resource as defined in CEQA Section 15064.5, then the limits on the amount(s) that a project applicant may be required to pay to cover mitigation costs as indicated in CEQA Section 21083.2 shall not apply.**
         (1). Note: For pipeline trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, the PI shall implement the Discovery Process for Pipeline Trenching projects identified below under "D."
      c. If the resource is not significant, the PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that artifacts will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that that no further work is required.
         (1). Note: For Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if the deposit is limited in size, both in length and depth; the information value is limited and is not associated with any other resource; and there are no unique features/artifacts associated with the deposit, the discovery should be considered not significant.
         (2). Note, for Pipeline Trenching and other linear projects in the public Right-of-Way, if significance can not be determined, the Final Monitoring Report and Site Record (DPR Form 523A/B) shall identify the discovery as Potentially Significant.

D. Discovery Process for Significant Resources - Pipeline Trenching and other Linear Projects in the Public Right-of-Way

The following procedure constitutes adequate mitigation of a significant discovery encountered during pipeline trenching activities or for other linear project types within the Public Right-of-Way including but not limited to excavation for jacking pits, receiving pits, laterals, and manholes to reduce impacts to below a level of significance:

1. Procedures for documentation, curation and reporting
   a. One hundred percent of the artifacts within the trench alignment and width shall be documented in-situ, to include photographic records, plan view of the trench and profiles of side walls, recovered, photographed after cleaning and analyzed and curated. The remainder of the deposit within the limits of excavation (trench walls) shall be left intact.
   b. The PI shall prepare a Draft Monitoring Report and submit to MMC via the RE as indicated in Section VI-A.
   c. The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate State of California Department of Park and Recreation forms-DPR 523 A/B) the resource(s) encountered during the Archaeological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Historical Resources Guidelines. The DPR forms shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center for either a Primary Record or SDI Number and included in the Final Monitoring Report.
   d. The Final Monitoring Report shall include a recommendation for monitoring of any future work in the vicinity of the resource.

IV. Discovery of Human Remains

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

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

B. Isolate discovery site
   1. Work shall be directed away from the location of the discovery and any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlay adjacent human remains until a determination can be made by the Medical Examiner in consultation with the PI concerning the provenience of the remains.
   2. The Medical Examiner, in consultation with the PI, will determine the need for a field examination to determine the provenience.
   3. If a field examination is not warranted, the Medical Examiner will determine with input from the PI, if the remains are or are most likely to be of Native American origin.

C. If Human Remains **ARE** determined to be Native American
   1. The Medical Examiner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) within 24 hours. By law, **ONLY** the Medical Examiner can make this call.
   2. NAHC will immediately identify the person or persons determined to be the Most Likely Descendent (MLD) and provide contact information.

3. The MLD will contact the PI within 24 hours or sooner after the Medical Examiner has completed coordination, to begin the consultation process in accordance with CEQA Section 15064.5(e), the California Public Resources and Health & Safety Codes.
4. The MLD will have 48 hours to make recommendations to the property owner or representative, for the treatment or disposition with proper dignity, of the human remains and associated grave goods.
5. Disposition of Native American Human Remains will be determined between the MLD and the PI, and, if:
   a. The NAHC is unable to identify the MLD, OR the MLD failed to make a recommendation within 48 hours after being notified by the Commission, OR;
   b. The landowner or authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the MLD and mediation in accordance with PRC 5097.94 (k) by the NAHC fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner, THEN
   c. To protect these sites, the landowner shall do one or more of the following:
      (1) Record the site with the NAHC;
      (2) Record an open space or conservation easement; or
      (3) Record a document with the County.
   d. Upon the discovery of multiple Native American human remains during a ground disturbing land development activity, the landowner may agree that additional conferral with descendants is necessary to consider culturally appropriate treatment of multiple Native American human remains. Culturally appropriate treatment of such a discovery may be ascertained from review of the site utilizing cultural and archaeological standards. Where the parties are unable to agree on the appropriate treatment measures the human remains and items associated and buried with Native American human remains shall be reinterred with appropriate dignity, pursuant to Section 5.c., above.

D. If Human Remains are **NOT** Native American
1. The PI shall contact the Medical Examiner and notify them of the historic era context of the burial.
2. The Medical Examiner will determine the appropriate course of action with the PI and City staff (PRC 5097.98).
3. If the remains are of historic origin, they shall be appropriately removed and conveyed to the San Diego Museum of Man for analysis. The decision for internment of the human remains shall be made in consultation with MMC, EAS, the applicant/landowner, any known descendant group, and the San Diego Museum of Man.

V. Night and/or Weekend Work

A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract
1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.
2. The following procedures shall be followed.
   a. No Discoveries
      In the event that no discoveries were encountered during night and/or weekend work, the PI shall record the information on the CSVR and submit to MMC via fax by 8AM of the next business day.
   b. Discoveries
      All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction, and IV – Discovery of Human Remains. Discovery of human remains shall always be treated as a significant discovery.

c. Potentially Significant Discoveries
If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction and IV-Discovery of Human Remains shall be followed.

d. The PI shall immediately contact the RE and MMC, or by 8AM of the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.

B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.

C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

VI. Post Construction

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

B. Handling of Artifacts
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all cultural remains collected are cleaned and catalogued
2. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts are analyzed to identify function and chronology as they relate to the history of the area; that faunal material is identified as to species; and that specialty studies are completed, as appropriate.

C. Curation of artifacts: Accession Agreement and Acceptance Verification

1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all artifacts associated with the survey, testing and/or data recovery for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution. This shall be completed in consultation with MMC and the Native American representative, as applicable.
2. When applicable to the situation, the PI shall include written verification from the Native American consultant/monitor indicating that Native American resources were treated in accordance with state law and/or applicable agreements. If the resources were reinterred, verification shall be provided to show what protective measures were taken to ensure no further disturbance occurs in accordance with Section IV – Discovery of Human Remains, Subsection C.
3. The PI shall submit the Accession Agreement and catalogue record(s) to the RE or BI, as appropriate for donor signature with a copy submitted to MMC.
4. The RE or BI, as appropriate shall obtain signature on the Accession Agreement and shall return to PI with copy submitted to MMC.
5. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.

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

Mitigation Framework for Historical Resources (Built Environment)

Future projects which result in, or have the potential to impact Historical Resources (Built Environment) shall be subject to review in accordance with the Mitigation Framework detailed below.

HIST-2: Consultation with Historical Resources Staff shall be required when a future Project, located within the public right-of-way is within a Historic District and requires implementation of this mitigation measure. The future project shall be reviewed for compliance with the Historical Resources Guidelines and Regulations. Subsequent to project review and as directed by Historical Resources Staff, the following paragraph shall be included in the subsequent environmental document and include the Historic District name, boundary and district guidelines, if applicable shall be inserted as noted below in [brackets]:

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

A. Prior to beginning any work at the site, a Pre Construction meeting that includes Historic Resources and MMC staff shall be held at the project site to review these mitigation measures and requirements within the District boundary.

B. A Historic Sidewalk Stamp Inventory prepared by a qualified historic consultant or archaeologist and approved by HRB staff is required prior to the Pre-Construction (Pre-Con) meeting. The Inventory shall include photo documentation of all existing stamps within the project area keyed to a project site plan.

C. Existing sidewalk stamps shall be preserved in place. Where existing sidewalk stamps must be impacted to accommodate right-of-way improvements, the following actions are required:

   1. A mold of the sidewalk stamp will be made to allow reconstruction of the stamp if destroyed during relocation.

   2. The sidewalk stamp shall be saw-cut to preserve the stamp in its entirety; relocated as near as possible to the original location; and set in the same orientation.

   3. If the sidewalk stamp is destroyed during relocation, a new sidewalk stamp shall be made from the mold taken and relocated as near as possible to the original location and set in the same orientation.

D. No new sidewalk stamps shall be added by any contactor working on the project.

E. Existing historic sidewalk, parkway and street widths shall be maintained. Any work that requires alteration of these widths shall be approved by Historic Resources staff.

F. Existing historic curb heights and appearance shall be maintained. Any work that requires alteration of the existing height or appearance shall be approved by Historic Resources staff.

G. Sections of sidewalk which may be impacted by the project shall be replaced in-kind to match the historic color, texture and scoring pattern of the original sidewalks. If the original color, scoring pattern or texture is not present at the location of the impact, the historically appropriate color, texture and scoring pattern found throughout the district shall be used.

H. When new or replacement truncated domes are required at corner curb ramps the preferred replacement color shall be dark gray unless a color consultation has been conducted with Historical Resources Staff demonstrating compliance with the Standards and which shall not adversely affect the historic district.

I. Existing historic lighting, such as acorn lighting shall remain. New lighting shall be consistent with existing lighting fixtures, or fixtures specified in any applicable District Design Guidelines.

J. Existing mature street trees shall remain. New street trees shall be consistent with the prevalent mature species in the District and/or species specified in any applicable District Design Guidelines.

K. Any walls located within the right-of-way or on private property are considered historic and may not be impacted without prior review and approval by Historic Resources staff.

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Mitigation Framework for Paleontological Resources

Future projects implemented in accordance with the Project which result in, or have the potential to impact Paleontological Resources shall be subject to review in accordance with the Mitigation Framework for Paleontological Resources further detailed below.

PALEO-1: Prior to the approval of subsequent projects, the City shall determine the potential for impacts to paleontological resources based on review of the project and recommendations of a project-level analysis completed in accordance with the steps presented below. Future projects shall be sited and designed to minimize impacts on paleontological resources in accordance with the City's Paleontological Resources Guidelines and CEQA Significance Thresholds. The requirement for monitoring to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources shall be identified the project-level for future subsequent projects that are subject to environmental. In those cases, the paleontological monitoring program provided at the at the end of STEP 1.B. shall be implemented during construction activities.

I. Prior to Project Approval

A. The environmental analyst shall complete a project-level analysis of potential impacts on paleontological resources. The analysis shall include a review of the applicable USGS Quad maps to identify the underlying geologic formations, and shall determine if construction of a project would:

- Require over 1,000 cubic yards of excavation and/or a 10-foot, or greater, depth in a high resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit.

- Require over 2,000 cubic yards of excavation and/or a 10-foot, or greater, depth in a moderate resource potential geologic deposit/formation/rock unit.

- Require construction within a known fossil location or fossil recovery site. Resource potential within a formation is based on the Paleontological Monitoring Determination Matrix.

B. If construction of a project would occur within a formation with a moderate to high resource potential, monitoring during construction would be required.

- Monitoring is always required when grading on a fossil recovery site or a known fossil location.

- Monitoring may also be needed at shallower depths if fossil resources are present or likely to be present after review of source materials or consultation with an expert in fossil resources (e.g., the San Diego Natural History Museum).

- Monitoring may be required for shallow grading (<10 feet) when a site has previously been graded and/or unweathered geologic deposits/formations/ rock units are present at the surface.

Monitoring is not required when grading documented artificial fill. When it has been determined that a future project has the potential to impact a geologic formation with a high or moderate fossil sensitivity rating a Paleontological MMRP shall be implemented during construction grading activities.

Paleontological Resources Monitoring Program

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

A. Entitlements Plan Check

1. Prior to permit issuance or Bid Opening/Bid Award, whichever is applicable, the Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental designee shall verify that the requirements for Paleontological Monitoring have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.

B. Letters of Qualification have been submitted to ADD
   1. Prior to Bid Award, the applicant shall submit a letter of verification to Mitigation Monitoring Coordination (MMC) identifying the Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring program, as defined in the City of San Diego Paleontology Guidelines.
   2. MMC will provide a letter to the applicant confirming the qualifications of the PI and all persons involved in the paleontological monitoring of the project.
   3. Prior to the start of work, the applicant shall obtain approval from MMC for any personnel changes associated with the monitoring program.

II. Prior to Start of Construction

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

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

a. Prior to the start of any work, the PI shall also submit a construction schedule to MMC through the RE indicating when and where monitoring will occur.
b. The PI may submit a detailed letter to MMC prior to the start of work or during construction requesting a modification to the monitoring program. This request shall be based on relevant information such as review of final construction documents which indicate conditions such as depth of excavation and/or site graded to bedrock, presence or absence of fossil resources, etc., which may reduce or increase the potential for resources to be present.

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

III. During Construction

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

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

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

(1). Note: For pipeline trenching projects only, the PI shall implement the Discovery Process for Pipeline Trenching projects identified below under "D."

c. If resource is not significant (e.g., small pieces of broken common shell fragments or other scattered common fossils) the PI shall notify the RE, or BI as appropriate, that a non-significant discovery has been made. The Paleontologist shall continue to monitor the area without notification to MMC unless a significant resource is encountered.

d. The PI shall submit a letter to MMC indicating that fossil resources will be collected, curated, and documented in the Final Monitoring Report. The letter shall also indicate that no further work is required.

(1). Note: For Pipeline Trenching Projects Only. If the fossil discovery is limited in size, both in length and depth; the information value is limited and there are no unique fossil features associated with the discovery area, then the discovery should be considered not significant.

(2). Note, for Pipeline Trenching Projects Only: If significance can not be determined, the Final Monitoring Report and Site Record shall identify the discovery as Potentially Significant.

D. Discovery Process for Significant Resources - Pipeline Trenching Projects
The following procedure constitutes adequate mitigation of a significant discovery encountered during pipeline trenching activities including but not limited to excavation for jacking pits, receiving pits, laterals, and manholes to reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

1. Procedures for documentation, curation and reporting

a. One hundred percent of the fossil resources within the trench alignment and width shall be documented in-situ photographically, drawn in plan view (trench and profiles of side walls), recovered from the trench and photographed after cleaning, then analyzed and curated consistent with Society of Invertebrate Paleontology Standards. The remainder of the deposit within the limits of excavation (trench walls) shall be left intact and so documented.

b. The PI shall prepare a Draft Monitoring Report and submit to MMC via the RE as indicated in Section VI-A.

c. The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms for the San Diego Natural History Museum) the resource(s) encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines. The forms shall be submitted to the San Diego Natural History Museum and included in the Final Monitoring Report.

d. The Final Monitoring Report shall include a recommendation for monitoring of any future work in the vicinity of the resource.

IV. Night and/or Weekend Work

A. If night and/or weekend work is included in the contract

1. When night and/or weekend work is included in the contract package, the extent and timing shall be presented and discussed at the precon meeting.

2. The following procedures shall be followed.

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

b. Discoveries

All discoveries shall be processed and documented using the existing procedures detailed in Sections III - During Construction.

c. Potentially Significant Discoveries
If the PI determines that a potentially significant discovery has been made, the procedures detailed under Section III - During Construction shall be followed.

d. The PI shall immediately contact the RE and MMC, or by 8AM on the next business day to report and discuss the findings as indicated in Section III-B, unless other specific arrangements have been made.

B. If night and/or weekend work becomes necessary during the course of construction
1. The Construction Manager shall notify the RE, or BI, as appropriate, a minimum of 24 hours before the work is to begin.
2. The RE, or BI, as appropriate, shall notify MMC immediately.

C. All other procedures described above shall apply, as appropriate.

V. Post Construction

A. Preparation and Submittal of Draft Monitoring Report
1. The PI shall submit two copies of the Draft Monitoring Report (even if negative), prepared in accordance with the Paleontological Guidelines which describes the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Paleontological Monitoring Program (with appropriate graphics) to MMC via the RE for review and approval within 90 days following the completion of monitoring,
   a. For significant paleontological resources encountered during monitoring, the Paleontological Recovery Program or Pipeline Trenching Discovery Process shall be included in the Draft Monitoring Report.
   b. Recording Sites with the San Diego Natural History Museum
   The PI shall be responsible for recording (on the appropriate forms) any significant or potentially significant fossil resources encountered during the Paleontological Monitoring Program in accordance with the City's Paleontological Guidelines, and submittal of such forms to the San Diego Natural History Museum with the Final Monitoring Report.
2. MMC shall return the Draft Monitoring Report to the PI via the RE for revision or, for preparation of the Final Report.
3. The PI shall submit revised Draft Monitoring Report to MMC via the RE for approval.
4. MMC shall provide written verification to the PI of the approved report.
5. MMC shall notify the RE or BI, as appropriate, of receipt of all Draft Monitoring Report submittals and approvals.

B. Handling of Fossil Remains
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains collected are cleaned and catalogued.

C. Curation of artifacts: Deed of Gift and Acceptance Verification
1. The PI shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossil remains associated with the monitoring for this project are permanently curated with an appropriate institution.
2. The PI shall submit the Deed of Gift and catalogue record(s) to the RE or BI, as appropriate for donor signature with a copy submitted to MMC.
3. The RE or BI, as appropriate shall obtain signature on the Deed of Gift and shall return to PI with copy submitted to MMC.
4. The PI shall include the Acceptance Verification from the curation institution in the Final Monitoring Report submitted to the RE or BI and MMC.

D. Final Monitoring Report(s)

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

VI. PUBLIC REVIEW DISTRIBUTION:

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

Federal Government
Naval Facilities Engineering Command, SW Division, Environmental Planning (12)
US Environmental Protection Agency (19)
US Fish and Wildlife Service (23)
US Army Corps of Engineers (26)

State of California
Caltrans, District 11 (31)
California Department of Fish and Wildlife (32)
Cal EPA (37A)
California Natural Resources Agency (43)
Regional Water Quality Control Board: Region 9 (44)
Department of Water Resources (45)
State Clearinghouse (46)
California Coastal Commission, San Diego District (47)
California Transportation Commission (51A)
State Water Resources Control Board (55)
Native American Heritage Commission (56)
Planning and Land Use (68)
Land & Water Quality Division (76)
State Parks – Southern Service Center (428)
State Parks – Tijuana River Natural Estuarine Reserve (229)
State Parks – Environmental Coordinator (229A)

County of San Diego
Air Pollution Control District (65)
Department of Planning and Land Use (68)
Department of Public Works (72)
County Water Authority (73)
Department of Environmental Health (75)
County Parks Department (232)

City of San Diego
Mayor's Office (11A/91)
Council President Lightner, District 1
Councilmember Zapf, District 2
Councilmember Gloria, District 3
Councilmember Cole, District 4
Councilmember Kersey, District 5

Councilmember Cate, District 6
Councilmember Sherman, District 7
Councilmember Alvarez, District 8
Council President Pro Tem Emerald, District 9

City Attorney's Office
Heather Stroud
Shannon Thomas

Storm Water Department (Applicant Department)
Sumer Hasenin (MS 1900)
Jonard Talamayan (MS 1900)

Planning Department
Myra Herrmann
Kristy Forburger
Jeff Harkness
Kelley Stanco/ Historical Resources Board

Development Services Department
Louis Shultz
Mehdi Rastakhiz, Water/Wastewater Review

Park and Recreation Department
Chris Zirkle
Paul Jacob

Environmental Services Department
Lisa Wood

General Services Department (MS 9B/92)

Public Utilities Department
Nicole McGinnis
Keli Balo

Public Works Department
Carrie Purcell

Real Estate Assets Department
Cybele Thompson

Wetland Advisory Board
Anita Eng
Housing Commission
Wendy Dewitt (MS 49N)

Sustainable Energy Advisory Board

All City Libraries (81A-81KK)
Balboa Branch (81B)
Beckwourth Branch (81C)
Benjamin Branch (81D)
Carmel Mountain Ranch Branch (81E)
Carmel Valley Ranch Branch (81F)
Central Library (81A)
City Heights/Weingart Branch (81G)
Clairemont Branch (81H)
College-Rolando Branch (81I)
Kensington-Normal Heights Branch (81K)
Library Department (81)
La Jolla/Riford Branch (81L)
Linda Vista Branch (81M)
Logan Heights Branch (81N)
Malcolm X Library & Performing Arts Center (81O)
Mira Mesa Branch (81P)
Mission Hills Branch (81Q)
Mission Valley Branch (81R)
North Clairemont Branch (81S)
North Park Branch (81T)
North University Branch (81JJJ)
Oak Park Branch (81U)
Ocean Beach Branch (81V)
Otay Mesa-Nestor Branch (81W)
Pacific Beach/Taylor Branch (81X)
Paradise Hills Branch (81Y)
Point Loma/Hervey Branch (81Z)
Rancho Bernardo Branch (81AA)
Rancho Penasquitos Branch (81BB)
San Carlos Branch (81DD)
San Ysidro Branch (81EE)
Scripps Miramar Ranch Branch (81FF)
Serra Mesa Branch (81GG)
Skyline Hills Branch (81HH)
Tierrasanta Branch (81II)
University Community Branch (81JJ)
University Heights Branch (81KK)

Other Government Agencies
City of Chula Vista (94)
City of Coronado (95)
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)
SANDAG (108)
San Diego Unified Port District (109)
San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (110)
Metropolitan Transit System (112/115)
San Diego Gas and Electric (114)
San Dieguito River Park (116)
Civic San Diego (448)

Community Groups, Associations, Boards, and Committees

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

Southeastern San Diego Planning Committee (449)
Encanto Neighborhoods Community Planning Group (449A)
College Area Community Planning Board (456)
Tierrasanta Community Council (462)
Torrey Highlands – Subarea IV (467)
Torrey Pines Community Planning Board (469)
University City Community Planning Group (480)
Uptown Planners (498)

Town/Community Councils
Town Council Presidents Association (197)
Barrio Station, Inc. (241)
Downtown Community Council (243)
Harborview Community Council (245)
Clairemont Town Council (257)
Serra Mesa Community Council (264)
La Jolla Town Council (273)
Rolando Community Council (288)
Oak Park Community Council (298)
Darnell Community Council (306)
Mission Beach Town Council (326)
Mission Valley Community Council (328C)
San Carlos Area Council (338)
Carmel Mountain Ranch Community Council (344)
Ocean Beach Town Council, Inc. (367A)
Pacific Beach Town Council (374)
Rancho Penasquitos Town Council (383)
Rancho Bernardo Community Council, Inc. (398)
San Dieguito Planning Group (412)
United Border Community Town Council (434)
Murphy Canyon Community Council (463)

Historic and Archaeology Associations
Carmen Lucas (206)
South Coastal Information Center (210)
San Diego History Center (211)
San Diego Archaeological Center (212)
Save Our Heritage Organisation (214)
Ron Chrisman (215)
Clint Linton (215B)
Frank Brown - Inter-Tribal Cultural Resource Council (216)
Campo Band of Mission Indians (217)
San Diego County Archaeological Society Inc. (218)
Kuumeyaay Cultural Heritage Preservation (223)
Kuumeyaay Cultural Repatriation Committee (225)

Native American Distribution (Public Notice Only)
Barona Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (225A)
Campo Band of Mission Indians (225B)

Ewiiaapaayp Band of Mission Indians (225C)
Inaja Band of Mission Indians (225D)
Jamul Indian Village (225E)
La Posta Band of Mission Indians (225F)
Manzanita Band of Mission Indians (225G)
Sycuan Band of Mission Indians (225H)
Viejas Group of Capitan Grande Band of Mission Indians (225I)
Mesa Grande Band of Mission Indians (225J)
San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians (225K)
Ipai Nation of Santa Ysabel (225L)
La Jolla Band of Mission Indians (225M)
Pala Band of Mission Indians (225N)
Pauma Band of Mission Indians (225O)
Pechanga Band of Mission Indians (225P)
Rincon Band of Luiseno Indians (225Q)
San Luis Rey Band of Luiseno Indians (225R)
Los Coyotes Band of Mission Indians (225S)

Other Interested Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals

SDUSD, Tony Raso (125)
SDUSD, Director (132)
Daily Transcript (135)
Beach and Bay Press (137)
San Diego Union-Tribune City Desk (140)
Metro News (141)
La Jolla Light (142)
San Diego Chamber of Commerce (157)
Building Industry Association (158)
San Diego River Park Foundation (163)
San Diego River Coalition (164)
Sierra Club (165)
Neighborhood Canyon Creek & Park Groups (165A)
San Diego Natural History Museum (166)
Jim Peugh (167A)
San Diego Audubon Society (167)
San Diego River Conservancy (168)
Environmental Health Coalition (169)
California Native Plant Society (170)
San Diego Coastkeeper (173)
San Diego Council of Divers (177)
Citizens Coordinate for Century 3 (179)
Endangered Habitats League (182 & 182A)
Torrey Pines Association (186)
League of Women Voters (192)
National City Chamber of Commerce (200)
Downtown San Diego Partnership (237)
Gaslamp Quarter Council (239)
Balboa Avenue CAC (246)
Marion Bear Natural Park Recreation Council (253)

Tecolote Canyon CAC (254)
Friends of Tecolote Canyon (255)
Friends of Switzer Canyon (260)
Mary Johnson (263B/328B)
MCAS Miramar (263C)
La Jolla Shores Association (272)
La Jolla Shores PDO Advisory Board (279)
Willie Jones – Citylink (296)
Fairmount Park Neighborhood Association (303)
John Stump (304)
Friend of Penasquitos Preserve, Inc. (313)
Surfers Tired of Pollution (318)
Debby Knight – Friends of Rose Canyon (320)
Mission Bay Lessees (323)
Mission Hills Association (327)
Mission Valley Center Assn. (328)
Friars Village HOA (328A)
Friends of the Mission Valley Preserve (330B)
Mr. Gene Kemp, GM – Fashion Valley (332)
Lynn Mulholland (333)
River Valley Preservation Project (334)
Friends of Adobe Falls (335)
Mission Trails Regional Park CAC (341)
Pardee Construction (345)
City Attorney of Del Mar (346)
Rancho Santa Fe Assn. (347)
22nd District Agricultural Assn- Del Mar Fairgrounds (349)
Friends of Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve (357)
North Park Community Association (366)
Ocean Beach Merchants Association (367B)
Presidio Park Council (370)
Crown Point Association (376)
Rancho Penasquitos Community Council (378)
Torrey Pines Association (379)
Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve CAC (385)
Sunset Cliffs Natural Park Rec. Council (388)
Peninsula Chamber of Commerce (391)
Point Loma Nazarene College (392)
San Dieguito Lagoon Committee (409)
San Dieguito River Park CAC (415)
Friends of San Dieguito River Valley (419)
Fairbanks Ranch Association (424)
RVR PARC (423)
San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy (422)
San Dieguito River Park JPA (425A)
San Pasqual-Lake Hodges Planning Group (426)
Southeastern San Diego Organizing Project (447)
Educational/Cultural Complex (450)
Chollas Restoration Enhancement and Conservancy/John Stump (451)

Kathleen Harmon – Chair, Central Imperial PAC (452)
Voice News & Viewpoint (453)
W. Anthony Fulton, Director – SDSU Facilities & Mgmt. (455)
Malcolm A Love (457)
Mission Trails Regional Park – Dorothy Leonard (465)
Crest Canyon CAC (475)
University City Community Assn. (486)
Hillside Protection Assn. (501)
Banker's Hill Canyon Assn. (502)
Allen Canyon Committee (504)
S. Wayne Rosenbaum
Mark Rawlings
Bike San Diego
Building Owners and Managers Association
Coastal and Estuarine Research Federation
NAIOP San Diego
San Diego 350
San Diego Apartment Association
San Diego Association of Realtors
Pacific Corrugated
The Nature Conservancy
Urban Land Institute
Circulate San Diego
Weston Solutions, Inc.
Angela Deegan
Angie Mei
San Dieguito Engineering
Nasland Engineering
Bill Powers
Rick Engineering
Kimley-Horn
Pacific Corrugated
Shea Homes
RBF Consulting
PDC
Rick Engineering
Diane Coombs
Just Star Construction
Doug Smith
Dr. D. Bart Chadwick
Ed Kimura
Grace Van Thillo
Green Edge Technology
Greg Ponce – Shea Homes
Groundwork San Diego Chollas Creek
Industrial Environmental Association
Janina Moretti
Jerry Livingston
Nolte & Associates, Inc.

Adams Engineering
Shea Homes
Jim Varnadore
Joan Raphael
JP Engineering
Latitude 33
Landry Watson
Lyla Fadali
Masada Disenhouse
Mike Bullock
Mike Kimberlain, Kristar
Nicola Hedge
McMillin Land Development
Philip Petrie
Steven Scott
Tershia d'Elgin

VII. RESULTS OF PUBLIC REVIEW:

( ) No comments were received during the public input period.

( ) Comments were received but did not address the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration finding or the accuracy/completeness of the Initial Study. No response is necessary. The letters are attached.

( ) Comments addressing the findings of the draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and/or accuracy or completeness of the Initial Study were received during the public input period. The letters and responses follow.

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

Myra Hermann, Senior Planner
Planning Department

August 21, 2015
Date of Draft Report

Analyst: Herrmann

Date of Final Report

Attachment: Initial Study Checklist

Initial Study Checklist

1. Project title/Project number: **STORM WATER STANDARDS MANUAL UPDATE/PROJECT NO. 435930 (SCH NO. *PENDING*)**

2. Lead agency name and address:
   CITY OF SAN DIEGO – PLANNING DEPARTMENT
   1222 1ST AVENUE, MS 501
   SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

3. Contact person and phone number: Myra Herrmann, Senior Planner (619-446-5372)

4. Project location: City of San Diego jurisdiction in the following six watershed management areas (WMAs): San Dieguito River, Los Peñasquitos, Mission Bay, San Diego River, San Diego Bay, and Tijuana River.

5. Project Applicant/Sponsor's name and address:
   CITY OF SAN DIEGO
   TRANSPORTATION & STORM WATER DEPARTMENT
   STORM WATER DIVISION
   ATTN: SUMER HASENIN
   9370 CHESAPEAKE DRIVE, SUITE 100
   SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123
   (858) 541-4330

6. General/Community Plan designation: The project affects all General Plan and Community Plan land use designations.

7. Zoning: The San Diego Municipal Code and Land Development Code regulate the use and development of land within the area covered by the Storm Water Standards within the City of San Diego.

8. Description of project: **CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE STORM WATER STANDARDS MANUAL UPDATE** to update the City's storm water-related requirements for land development and construction activities in accordance with the 2013 Municipal Permit (Municipal Permit).

   The Manual Update provides design concepts and methodologies to guide applicants in meeting the requirements of the 2013 Municipal Permit, Provision E.3.

   The Manual Update, Part 1, addresses expanded and updated post-construction storm water requirements for Standard Projects and PDPs, and provides updated procedures for planning, selecting, and designing structural storm water BMPs based on the performance standards and requirements in the Municipal Permit.

   Structural BMPs are engineered facilities that are designed to retain, detain, filter, remove, or prevent the release of pollutants to surface waters from development projects in perpetuity,

after construction of a project is completed. Structural BMPs are a type of Low Impact Design that aims to mimic the natural hydrology to manage storm water pollutant on site. Structural BMPs utilize biological, chemical and physical processes to remove pollutants from storm water runoff before it's discharged to water ways. Examples of structural BMPs are bioretention basins, infiltration trenches, rain gardens, vegetated swales, biofiltration basins, and planter boxes.

The Municipal Permit requires all Priority Development Projects (PDP) to implement structural BMPs to retain onsite pollutants contained in the volume of storm water runoff produced from a 24-hour 85th percentile storm event (referred to as Design Capture Volume, or DCV). If it is not technically feasible to implement retention BMPs for the full DCV onsite for a PDP, then the PDP is required to utilize biofiltration BMPs for the remaining volume not reliably retained. If biofiltration BMPs are not technically feasible, then the PDP is required to utilize flow-thru treatment control BMPs to treat runoff leaving the site and participate in alternative compliance to mitigate for the pollutants from the DCV not reliably retained onsite.

The Manual Update categorizes structural BMPs in three categories based on the unit processes utilized in the BMP design. The BMP selection from these categories is largely based on the site conditions.

Infiltration BMPs: BMPs that are designed to retain the full design capture volume. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Infiltration BMPs typically consist of an earthen basin with a flat bottom constructed in naturally pervious soils. Infiltration BMPs capture, store, and infiltrate storm water runoff into native soils.
- Bioretention BMP facilities are vegetated surface water systems that filter water through vegetation and soil, or engineered media prior to infiltrating into native soils.
- Permeable pavement BMPs allow for percolation through void spaces in the pavement surface into subsurface layers. The subsurface layers are designed to provide storage of storm water runoff so that outflows, primarily via infiltration into subgrade soils or release to the downstream conveyance system, can be at controlled rates.

Partial Infiltration BMPs: Infiltration of a significant portion of the DCV may be possible, but site factors may indicate that infiltration of the full DCV is either infeasible or not desirable. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Biofiltration with partial retention BMPs are shallow basins filled with treatment media and drainage rock that manage storm water runoff through infiltration, evapotranspiration, and biofiltration. These BMPs typically have an infiltration storage layer. The volume of biofiltered water above the infiltration storage layer is discharged via underdrain. Other components include a media layer and associated filtration rates, drainage layer with associated in-situ soil infiltration rates, and vegetation.

No Infiltration BMPs: Infiltration of any appreciable volume of the DCV should be avoided. Some incidental volume losses may be possible, but any appreciable quantity of infiltration would introduce undesirable conditions. Structural BMPs in this category include the following:

- Harvest and use BMPs capture and store storm water runoff for later use. Uses of captured water may include irrigation demand, indoor non-potable demand, industrial process water demand, or other demands. Uses of captured water shall not result in runoff to storm drains or receiving waters.
- Biofiltration BMPs are shallow basins filled with treatment media and drainage rock that treat storm water runoff by capturing and detaining inflows prior to controlled release through incidental infiltration, evapotranspiration, or discharge via underdrain or surface outlet structure. Biofiltration BMPs include impermeable liners located at the bottom of the BMP to prevent infiltration.
- Flow-thru treatment control BMPs (vegetated swales, media filters, sand filters, dry extended detention basin, proprietary flow-thru treatment control) are structural, engineered facilities that are designed to remove pollutants from storm water runoff using treatment process that do not incorporate significant biological methods.

Detailed descriptions of the structural BMPs are included in Chapter 5 of the Manual Update. Fact sheets for sizing and designing BMPs are located in Appendix E of the Manual Update. In addition to satisfying pollutant control requirements, PDPs subject to hydromodification management requirements must provide flow control for post-project runoff to meet the flow control performance standard. Flow control for hydromodification management is typically accomplished using structural BMPs that may include any combination of infiltration basins; bioretention, biofiltration with partial retention, or biofiltration basins; or detention basins. Both storm water pollutant control and flow control for hydromodification management can be achieved within the same structural BMP(s) or by a series of structural BMP(s). Guidance on how to design these structural BMPs to satisfy both pollutant control and hydromodification management requirements is provided in Chapter 6 of the Manual Update.

Notable changes required by the Municipal Permit related to development planning requirements that have been incorporated in the Manual Update, Part 1 include:

- Priority Development Projects Category: The size threshold for PDP categories has been reduced from 1 acre to 10,000 square feet of impervious area for commercial, industrial, mixed-use, and public development projects. Additionally, the size threshold for residential PDPs has been reduced from 10 dwelling units to 10,000 square feet of impervious area.
- The RWQCB has announced that it intends to make further amendments to the 2013 Municipal Permit in November 2015 to change the PDP categories. The proposed amendments would increase the number of projects considered to be PDPs by including: (1) new and redevelopment projects that create <u>and/or replace</u> 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface; and (2) new development projects <u>or redevelopment projects that create and/or replace 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface</u>, that support automotive repair shops or retail gasoline outlets.

- Pollutant Control Requirements: PDPs are required to implement structural BMPs to retain the 85th percentile storm event. For situations where on-site retention of the 85th percentile storm volume is not feasible, bio-filtration must be provided to satisfy specific performance standards.
- Priority Development Project Exemption: Projects that either (1) redevelop existing paved alleys, streets, or roads OR (2) develop or retrofit paved sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or trails may be exempted from being required to meet PDP requirements if they include green infrastructure design elements in accordance with the USEPA document "*Managing Wet Weather with Green Infrastructure – Municipal Handbook*". The Manual Update provides further guidance on green streets design requirements for PDP exemptions. New or retrofit paved sidewalks, bicycle lanes, or trails may also be exempt if they are designed and constructed to direct storm water runoff to non-erodible permeable areas or are hydraulically disconnected from paved streets or roads.
- Hydromodification Management BMP Requirements: The Manual Update continues to require the current Hydromodification Management criteria on PDPs with the following changes based on new requirements in the 2015 Municipal Permit: (a) exemptions from this requirement will be allowed in fewer cases, and exemptions for highly urbanized areas and for a portion of major river reaches are removed; (b) calculations for the increase of runoff volume from impervious surfaces must compare post-project runoff to runoff from a "pre-developed" condition, meaning the condition before existing impervious surfaces were added; and (c) sites that meet criteria for providing a natural source of coarse sediment that is critical for stream sediment replenishment need to either restrict development on those source areas or follow the project specific onsite measures as described in the Manual Update.
- Alternative Compliance Option: The Municipal Permit provides off-site Alternative Compliance as an option for PDPs in lieu of implementing on-site structural BMPs to comply with pollutant control and hydromodification management requirements. The off-site alternative compliance may include off-site mitigation options in the following categories:

    - Stream or riparian area rehabilitation
    - Retrofit of existing infrastructure
    - Regional BMPs
    - Groundwater recharge
    - Water supply augmentation
    - Land purchase to preserve floodplain functions

The City intends to implement the alternative compliance program in two phases:

1) Phase I: Applicant Implemented Alternative Compliance Projects where the applicant is fully responsible for the project's design, construction, operation, and long-term maintenance. Phase I is included in the Manual Update; however it will be utilized only if the Water Quality Equivalency (WQE) study is approved by the RWQCB executive officer. Once the RWQCB approves the WQE, the City has the discretion to allow PDP projects to utilize Phase I.

2) Phase II: Independent Alternative Compliance Projects which includes other options such as in lieu fee or a credit trading system. This phase is in the inital planning stage and is therefore not part of the project being analyzed in this mitigated negative declaration.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Implementation of the Manual Update would occur within the six WMAs over which the City has jurisdiction, including San Dieguito River, Los Peñasquitos, Mission Bay, San Diego River, San Diego Bay, and Tijuana River. Surrounding uses and environmental setting would vary depending on the site of a specific development project subject to Manual Update.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): Not applicable

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Public Services
☐ Air Quality	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Recreation
☒ Biological Resources	☒ Land Use/Planning	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☒ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities/Service System
☒ Geology/Soils	☐ Noise	☒ Mandatory Findings Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by Lead Agency)
On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ The proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or (MITIGATED) NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I) AESTHETICS – Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒

A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

The Manual Update is a guidance document that provides strategies and direction on how to implement post-construction BMPs required by the Municipal Permit that are identified in the City's Jurisdictional Runoff Management Plan (JRMP) and other City storm water planning documents. The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality which would involve construction of physical structures or facilities; however, the features associated with structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) either would be below ground or would consist of low-profile visual elements that would not substantially obstruct scenic vistas. Therefore, the implementation of structural BMPs or off-site alternative compliance projects would not have an adverse effect on a scenic vista or visual resources.

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

A "state scenic highway" refers to any interstate, state, or county road that has been officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic and thereby requires special scenic conservation treatment. Generally, the area defined within a state scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Construction of required structural BMPs for purposes of water quality improvement, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other

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

off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) may be required within the vicinity of a state scenic highway. Such BMPs either would be below ground or would consist of low-profile visual elements. Therefore, the implementation of structural BMPs or off-site alternative compliance projects would not impact 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 and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed, and is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. It is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity, and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies on the basis of the exposure, sensitivity, and expectation of the viewers.

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would be designed to be below ground or would consist of low-profile visual elements for purposes of improving water quality. Restoration and rehabilitation projects associated with alternative compliance would enhance the visual character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, many of the actions are expected to be located within or adjacent to existing disturbed or developed areas and thus would not degrade the visual character and quality within the City.

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

The BMPs and/or alternative compliance projects would not involve the use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project would not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass, or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.

II) AGRICULTURAL AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. – Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project would not preclude the use of land for future agricultural use and would not result in the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site projects options implemented under an alternative compliance project would not preclude the use of land for future agricultural use and would not result in a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project would not result in rezoning of forest lands, timberlands, or timberland zoned timberland production.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project would not result in the loss of forest land to non-forest land use.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which,	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
because of their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or of forest land to non-forest use?				

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project would not involve other changes in the existing environment that would result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest land use.

III) AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make the following determinations – Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Actions associated with the Manual Update are intended to reduce storm water pollution and improve water quality in compliance with the Municipal Permit. Future projects implemented in accordance with the project would be required to comply with standard construction practices such as stockpile protection and daily sweeping of work areas to reduce dust or debris from leaving the site, ensuring that air quality standards are not violated. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As indicated in III.a, grading equipment and procedures would comply with Air Pollution Control District (APCD) regulations, and would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation due to standard

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

construction practices, such as regular maintenance of air filters on construction equipment and shut down of engines if idling is anticipated to be more than five minutes. The Manual Update includes both structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality.

Construction of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project could result in short-term impacts from the temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by soil disturbance, dust emissions, and combustion pollutants from onsite construction equipment, and from off-site trucks hauling construction materials to the site. However, emissions would be minimal, temporary, and localized. Dust control measures would be in place to minimize any impacts, including, but not limited to, street sweeping, application of soil stabilizers, high-wind dust control plan, and watering of exposed stock pile areas. In addition, standard construction practices would be implemented such as performing regular maintenance of air filters on construction equipment and following idling engine shutdown requirements. The operation of such structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project would be generally passive, and not require mechanical equipment which would generate air emissions. Therefore, the Manual Update would not violate any air quality standards.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality.

Construction of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project could result in short-term impacts from the temporary addition of pollutants to the local airshed caused by soil disturbance, dust emissions, and combustion pollutants from onsite construction equipment, and from offsite trucks hauling construction materials. As indicated in III.b, emissions would be minimal, temporary, and localized. Furthermore, standard practices would be implemented to reduce air emissions. Therefore, the Manual Update would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Odors could be generated from vehicles and/or equipment exhaust emissions during construction of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project. However, such odors would be temporary and localized. The operation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project would not result in any objectionable odors.

IV) BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) could result in impacts to sensitive species should they be proposed within or adjacent to habitat supporting sensitive animal species. As further described in Section IX.a. – Hydrology/Water Quality, the City is required to implement the Manual Update to ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. In order to accomplish this goal, structural BMP's such as infiltration BMPs, partial infiltration BMPs, no infiltration BMPs must be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Manual Update. As noted above, construction of any required BMP's could result in a secondary physical effect on biological resources, despite the fundamental intent of the BMP's to improve water quality. Coordination with the project biologist during design of project-level BMP's and implementation of the land use

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

and biological mitigation framework included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) contained in Section V of the MND is anticipated to reduce this program-level impact of the structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions for future projects to below a level of significance.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. However, these actions could indirectly impact wetlands by reducing existing levels of dry weather flow that occurs throughout the City from over irrigation and other sources. The diversion or reduction in unnatural flows (i.e., irrigation runoff) would be a beneficial impact on water quality, but may result in a less than significant impact to riparian habitat or other community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS and/or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. A less than significant impact would only occur to riparian areas that rely on unnatural flows as their primary source of water.

As further described in Section IX.a. – Hydrology/Water Quality and IV.a., the City is required to implement the Manual Update to ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. In order to accomplish this goal, structural BMP's such as infiltration BMPs, partial infiltration BMPs, no infiltration BMPs must be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Manual Update. As noted above, construction of any required BMP's could result in a secondary physical effect on biological resources, despite the fundamental intent of the BMP's to improve water quality. Coordination with the project biologist during design of project-level BMP's including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project would be required. These would generally consist of improvements to areas of existing City streets, municipal facilities, parks, parking lots, and/or storm drain systems areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. However, habitat located within or adjacent to proposed structural measures may occur in areas supporting riparian or other habitats identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS and/or federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Impacts to these habitats would be potentially significant. Implementation of the biological mitigation framework included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) contained in Section V of the

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

MND which includes the requirement for site-specific biological resources surveys and analysis is anticipated to reduce this program-level impact of the structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions for future projects to below a level of significance.

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

As discussed in response IV(a-b), structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions could impact wetlands. As such, subsequent environmental review will be required for future projects that cannot demonstrate avoidance of impacts on wetlands in accordance with CEQA and the Mitigation Framework included in this MND.

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

As discussed in response IV(a-c), implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would not be expected to result in significant obstacles to wildlife movement. In most cases, the BMPs would be constructed outside of drainage courses that typically function as wildlife corridors. Alternative compliance actions occurring within drainage courses would generally enhance the drainages and promote wildlife movement by improving the vegetative cover. Thus, structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions would not significantly impact wildlife movement. Implementation of the Land Use mitigation framework included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) contained in Section V of the MND which includes compliance with the ESL Regulations and MSCP/MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines would ensure that potential program-level impacts of the structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions for future projects would be reduced to below a level of significance.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such a as tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The City's Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) Subarea Plan was designed to address habitat conservation efforts within the City's boundaries. In association with management of MHPA lands, the Subarea Plan contains guidelines for minimizing impacts of urban development on upland and wetland ecosystems and water quality. The Manual Update helps carry out the goals of the City's MSCP by providing guidance to reduce urban runoff and improve water quality within the City.

Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement and would be designed to ensure conformance with the City's MSCP Subarea Plan. The MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines would be incorporated into projects as applicable to reduce any potential indirect impacts on the MHPA. As such, implementation of the Land Use mitigation framework included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) contained in Section V of the MND which includes compliance with the ESL Regulations and MSCP/MHPA Land Use Adjacency Guidelines would ensure that potential program-level impacts of the structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions for future projects would be reduced to below a level of significance.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

As indicated in IV(e), actions taken in accordance with the Manual Update would not significantly impact habitat conservation plans, most notably the City's MSCP Subarea Plan.

V) CULTURAL RESOURCES –
Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as defined in	☐	☒	☐	☐

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
§15064.5?				

The purpose and intent of the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Division 3, Article 2) is to protect, preserve and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. The regulations apply to all proposed development within the City when historical resources are present on the premises. CEQA requires that before approving discretionary projects, the Lead Agency must identify and examine the significant adverse environmental effects which may result from that project. A project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment (Sections 15064.5(b) and 21084). A substantial adverse change is defined as demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration activities, which would impair historical significance (Sections 15064.5(b)(1) and 5020.1). Any historical resource listed in or eligible to be listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, including paleontological resources, is considered to be historically or culturally significant. The California Register of Historical Resources regulations apply to all proposed development within the City when historical resources are present on the premises.

As further described in Section IX.a. – Hydrology/Water Quality, the City is required to implement the Manual Update to ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. In order to accomplish this goal, structural BMP's such as infiltration BMPs, partial infiltration BMPs, no infiltration BMPs must be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Manual Update. As noted above, construction of any required BMP's could result in a secondary physical effect on historical, archaeological, or tribal cultural resources, despite the fundamental intent of the BMP's to improve water quality. Coordination with the project archaeologist during design of project-level BMP's, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would be required. As no specific locations are known for the BMPs required to comply with the Manual Update, the potential for impact cannot be determined at this time. Implementation of the Land Use and Historical Resources mitigation framework included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) contained in Section V of the MND which includes compliance with the Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines would ensure that potential program-level historical (built-environment) impacts of the structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions for future projects would be reduced to below a level of significance.

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

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

As with historical resources discussed in V(a), implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements)could impact archaeological resources. As no specific locations are known for the BMPs required to comply with the Manual Update, the potential for impact cannot be determined at this time. Implementation of the Land Use and Historical Resources mitigation framework included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) contained in Section V of the MND which includes compliance with the Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines would ensure that potential program-level archaeological resources impacts of the structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions for future projects would be reduced to below a level of significance.

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

As further described in Section IX.a. – Hydrology/Water Quality, the City is required to implement the Manual Update to ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. In order to accomplish this goal, structural BMP's such as infiltration BMPs, partial infiltration BMPs, no infiltration BMPs must be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Manual Update. As noted above, construction of any required BMP's could result in a secondary physical effect on paleontological resources, despite the fundamental intent of the BMP's to improve water quality. Because important fossil bearing formations assigned "high" and "moderate" resource sensitivities as further described in the City's Significance Thresholds and Paleontology Guidelines (2002) may be located within a project site, review of applicable soils or geotechnical reports information would be required during design of project-level BMP's, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would be required. Implementation of the Paleontological Resources mitigation framework included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) contained in Section V of the MND which includes compliance with the Paleontological Resources Guidelines would ensure that potential program-level impacts of the structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions for future projects would be reduced to below a level of significance.

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

See V(a-c). The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction

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

with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) may be located in areas of where human remains may occur. Thus, significant impacts to human remains could occur. Implementation of the Historical Resources mitigation framework included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) contained in Section V of the MND which includes compliance with the Historical Resources Regulations and Historical Resources Guidelines, including the provisions of the California Public Resources Code and the Health and Safety Code would ensure that potential program-level impacts of the structural BMPs and alternative compliance actions for future projects would be reduced to below a level of significance.

VI) GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would be for the purposes of water quality improvement. No buildings or structures that could house people would be constructed as part of this project. Therefore, implementation of structural BMPs including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects from rupture of a known fault line, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure or landslides.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As indicated in response VI(a)(i), implementation of BMPs and/or alternative compliance actions would not expose people to seismic shaking. Thus, no seismic impact would occur.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As indicated in response VI(a)(i), implementation of BMPs and/or alternative compliance actions would not expose people to seismic-related events. Thus, no seismic impact would occur.

iv. Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Implementation of structural BMPs or alternative compliance actions would not expose people to a landslide risk. Thus, no impact would occur.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Construction of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) could require ground-disturbing activities that could result in temporary loss of topsoil or soil erosion at the construction site. Dust control measures would be in place to minimize any loss of topsoil, including, but not limited to, application of soil stabilizers, high-wind dust control plan, and watering of exposed stock pile and other disturbed areas. In addition, standard construction BMPs would be in place to minimize onsite soil erosion during construction, including, but not limited to, silt fencing, sand bag berms, and fiber rolls. Because of the nature of their purpose to improve water quality, structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would not result in the loss of topsoil or soil erosion during their operation.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Construction of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) could affect geologic units and/or soil. In particular, projects involving the infiltration of runoff into the ground through pervious/porous material have the potential to damage streets, sidewalks, and building improvements. Appendix C of the Manual Update provides methods for geotechnical and groundwater assessment applicable for screening at the planning level and design-level requirements and includes a technical feasibility form for retention BMPs. The technical feasibility considers site specific conditions related to soil type, geologic conditions, slope stability and existing facilities. Geotechnical evaluations of all potential project sites would be required in order to determine feasibility of the sites for infiltration. Infiltration would not be implemented on sites that are not feasible for infiltration. Such an evaluation would be necessary because the goal of infiltration projects is to reduce urban runoff flows as much as feasible by allowing flows to soak into the ground in a manner engineered as to not compromise the integrity of nearby structures. Implementation of the Mitigation Framework which requires a geotechnical evaluation for future infiltration project sites would reduce potential impacts to below a level of significance.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. Expansive soils may be identified at the proposed project sites. However, no buildings or habitable structures would be constructed as a part of this project and therefore no substantial risk to life or property would be created.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would not require construction of septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems.

VII) GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. Construction could result in minor amounts of greenhouse gas emissions; however, these emissions would be minimal and temporary in nature. No GHG emissions would generally be associated with operation of the BMPs or alternative compliance actions due to their passive nature. Thus, the Manual Update would not result in significant GHG emissions that could harm the environment.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. Construction of these structural components could generate greenhouse gas emissions; however, these emissions would be minimal and temporary in nature. Construction plans and mitigation measures would be made in compliance with all current policies and regulations. No GHG emissions would generally be associated with operation of the BMPs or alternative compliance actions due to their passive nature. Therefore, the Manual Update would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases to levels less than significant.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII) HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) are intended to reduce storm water pollution and are not designed to produce, handle, transport, or release hazardous materials and therefore would not create a significant hazard to the public.

i. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As indicated in response VIII(a), actions required to conform with the Manual Update would not create significant hazards to the public or environment related to a release of hazardous materials.

ii. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As indicated in response VIII(a), actions required to conform with the Manual Update would not create significant hazards to nearby schools related to a release of hazardous materials.

iii. Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. Known hazardous materials sites may be located near or adjacent to the locations of the proposed structural BMPs. Regulatory oversight for the handling, treatment or remediation is handled by the County of San Diego, Hazardous Materials Management Division (HMMD), which is closely regulated by the State of California. Project sites which are identified on the State Cortes list would be required to consult with County HMMD and submitted documentation to the City demonstrating compliance with County requirements. Furthermore, structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) are intended to improve water quality and prevent polluted storm water from entering the City's MS4. Compliance with all applicable local, state and federal requirements associated with hazardous materials sites would preclude the potential for affecting water quality and therefore, the project would not result in a significant hazard to the public and the impact would be less than significant.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement, including the two airports, Montgomery Field and Brown Field, operated by the City. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) at or within the airport land use plan of the City's two operated airports are intended to reduce storm water pollution and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Furthermore, as discussed in response I(a), the features associated with structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) either would be below ground or would consist of low-profile features that would not pose a hazard to nearby airports.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As discussed in response I(a), the features associated with structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) either would be below ground or would consist of low-profile features that would not pose a hazard to nearby airports.

c) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality by reducing storm water pollution. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would not impair the implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) to meet the City's goal of improving water quality by reducing storm water pollution. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

IX) HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

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

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

The Manual Update is specifically intended to improve water quality region-wide and limit certain waste discharges from new development and redevelopment projects from entering the MS4. Development or redevelopment of a site required to comply with the Manual Update could also correct existing drainage/flooding problems that currently exist. This would be further evaluated on a project-by-project basis to ensure that water quality standards or waste discharge requirements have not been violated. Furthermore, implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would reduce water quality impacts of new development and redevelopment. The City is required to implement the Manual Update to ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. In order to accomplish this goal, structural BMP's such as infiltration BMPs, partial infiltration BMPs, no infiltration BMPs must be designed and constructed which could result in a secondary physical effect on the environment, but are fundamentally intended to improve water quality. In addition, the Manual Update includes requirements applicable to construction activities to reduce potential water quality impacts to below a level of significance; therefore, the project would not create an impact to water quality or waste discharge requirements, but instead meets the requirements of the Municipal Permit.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality, as well as the protection of groundwater resources. Required structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) could be designed to treat runoff through filtration and infiltration before storm water leaves the site to recharge groundwater supplies and improve water quality. As noted above in IX.a, the City is required to implement the Manual Update to ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. In order to accomplish this goal, structural BMP's such as infiltration BMPs, partial infiltration BMPs, no infiltration BMPs must be designed and constructed which could result in a secondary physical effect on the environment, but are fundamentally intended to improve water quality. The Municipal Permit also includes performance requirements to maintain structural BMPs to ensure infiltration and groundwater protection. During the construction of structural BMPs, standard construction BMPs and practices would be required to avoid temporary impacts to resources and not adversely deplete groundwater supplies. Therefore, the Manual

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

Update would not create an impact to groundwater.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. As noted above in IX.a, the City is required to implement the Manual Update to ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. In order to accomplish this goal, structural BMP's such as infiltration BMPs, partial infiltration BMPs, no infiltration BMPs must be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Manual Update. Construction could result in a secondary physical effect on the environment; however, the BMP's are fundamentally intended to improve water quality. The structural BMPs required by the Manual Update are intended to mimic the natural hydrology of the watershed to minimize adverse impacts on drainage patterns. Additionally, projects subject to hydromodification management design are required to implement structural BMPs to control the runoff volume and velocity leaving a site to minimize the potential of erosion to downstream water bodies. The Manual Update incorporates the 2011 San Diego County Hydromodification Management Plan criteria adopted by the San Diego Water Board. The 2011 San Diego County Hydromodification Management Plan establishes the flow range from a fraction of Q2 to Q10 which represents the range of geomorphically significant flows. Chapter 6 of the Manual Update provides guidance on hydromodification management.

Additionally, certain structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) may be designed to treat runoff through filtration and infiltration before storm water leaves the designed site to reduce the release of pollutants, including those from erosion or siltation. Development or redevelopment of a site could also improve existing erosion and siltation problems that currently exist. This would be assured through implementation of the requirements described in the Manual Update in consultation with City staff during subsequent project review. During this process, project proponents would be required to demonstrate that any alteration of existing drainage patterns would be for the purpose of improving water quality in order to reduce and/or prevent substantial erosion or siltation. Standard construction storm water BMPs would be implemented during construction of such structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements), to reduce temporary impacts that may result in

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

erosion or siltation on site or off site. Therefore, the project would not create a significant impact to drainage patterns that would result in erosion or siltation on site or off site.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding onsite or offsite?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) designed to treat runoff through filtration and infiltration before storm water leaves the designed site would reduce flooding by reducing the amount of runoff leaving the site. As such, development or redevelopment of a site that is required to comply with the Manual Update may also correct existing drainage/flooding problems that currently exist. As noted above in IX.a, the City is required to implement the Manual Update to ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. In order to accomplish this goal, structural BMP's such as infiltration BMPs, partial infiltration BMPs, no infiltration BMPs must be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the Manual Update. Construction could result in a secondary physical effect on the environment; however, the BMP's are fundamentally intended to improve water quality. Standard construction storm water BMPs would be implemented during construction of such structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements), to reduce any temporary impact that may result in flooding on site or off site. Therefore, the project would not create an impact to drainage patterns that would result in flooding on site or off site.

e) Create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☐	☒

See IX.a. & c. The Manual Update is specifically intended to reduce polluted runoff from new development and redevelopment projects. The Manual Update includes requirements that would reduce the amount of runoff leaving a site and reduce the amount of pollution in the runoff leaving the site. As such, implementation of the Manual Update would not create an impact to existing drainage systems and would reduce pollutant runoff to

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

improve water quality.

f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As discussed in response IX.a -e, implementation of the Manual Update would reduce urban runoff pollution from new development and redevelopment projects within its jurisdiction. Therefore, actions associated with its implementation would not degrade water quality but rather would improve it.

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

The Manual Update is proposed to ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and to improve water quality. The project does not propose the placement of housing within the 100-year flood hazard area. Thus, no impact would occur.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) could be proposed in a 100-year flood hazard area that may impede or redirect flood flows, but for the specific purpose of improving drainage patterns to treat runoff through filtration and infiltration before storm water leaves the site. Any structural BMP, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would be engineered to prevent substantial flooding on site or off site downstream. Chapter 3 of the Manual Update includes steps and procedures for preparing a comprehensive storm water management design. Detailed requirements for source control and site design BMP's are described in Chapter 4, including specific information regarding project compliance applicability. Strict compliance with the requirements in this chapter of the Manual Update would ensure that structural BMP's designed for new development or redevelopment projects would not impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area and the potential impact would be less than significant. Furthermore, standard practices for construction BMPs that are temporarily placed on-site require the removal of any BMP (e.g. check dams, fiber rolls, etc.) or structure that impedes storm

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

water flows prior to a rain event.

X) LAND USE AND PLANNING –
Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with the the Municipal Permit to improve water quality. It would not physically divide an established community.

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

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with the Municipal Permit issued by the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB) as well as the City's Storm Water Ordinance. Furthermore, the project is consistent with the City's "Urban Runoff Management" section contained in the Conservation Element of the General Plan, as well as the "Storm Water Infrastructure" section within the Public Facilities Element of the General Plan, which outlines water quality and watershed protection principles. Future projects which would result in impacts to biological resources would be required to comply with the Environmentally Sensitive Lands (ESL) Regulations of the City's Municipal Code and the Mitigation Framework included in this MND. Thus, the Manual Update would not conflict with applicable land use plans.

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

The Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) is a conservation program designed to facilitate the implementation of a regional habitat preserve while allowing "take" of endangered species or habitats at the individual project level (City of San Diego 1997). This habitat preserve is known as the Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) and lands within it have been designated for conservation. The MHPA was designed to conserve biological resources considered sensitive by the resource agencies and by the City of San Diego.

The MSCP Subarea Plan was designed to address habitat conservation efforts within the City's boundaries. In association with management of MHPA lands, the City MSCP Subarea Plan

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

contains guidelines for minimizing impacts of urban development on upland and wetland ecosystems and water quality. The Manual Update helps carry out the goals of the City's MSCP by providing guidance to reduce urban runoff and improve water quality within the City. Any structural components that would be implemented would be designed in conformance with the City's MSCP Subarea Program including the Land Use Adjacency guidelines.

Implementation of measures contained in the Manual Update could occur within or adjacent to the City of San Diego MSCP/MHPA. Therefore, in order to be consistent with current adopted MSCP Subarea Plan policies and Management Directives, future projects would be designed to incorporate the applicable MSCP Land Use Adjacency Guidelines and include provisions for barrier fencing and plantings for access control; lighting restrictions; drainage and toxins as indicated below, and would not conflict with habitat function, configuration, or long-term viability; usage of the MHPA by sensitive species including narrow endemics; established management directives for the subarea plan; or cause potentially adverse edge effects. Direct access to public open space would be prohibited during any future construction related activity in order to minimize impacts to sensitive lands and to promote the objectives of the MSCP Subarea Plan. Consistency with the provisions outlined in the Biology Guidelines and the Land Use (MSCP/MHPA) Mitigation Framework incorporated into Section V. of the MMRP would reduce any potential indirect impacts to below a level of significance.

XI) MINERAL RESOURCES –
Would the project:

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

The Manual Update would ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. It would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state.

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

The Manual Update would ensure compliance with the Municipal Permit. It would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region or the residents of the state.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII) NOISE – Would the project:				
a) Generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. Construction of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) may result in temporary noise impacts in the vicinity of the project site. Loud construction noise is permitted from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday, but not on Sundays or legal holidays. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would not generate operational noise.

b) Generate excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. Construction activities would not result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels. No operational noise would occur.

c) Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water

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

quality improvement. They would not generate operational noise and therefore, would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

d) Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. Construction could result in temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project. Loud construction noise is permitted from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., Monday through Saturday, but not on Sundays or legal holidays.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) may occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement, including the two airports operated by the City, Montgomery Field and Brown Field. Implementation of structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) at or within the airport land use plan of the City's two operated airports would not expose people residing or working in the area to excessive noise levels.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
excessive noise levels?				

See response XII(e).

XIII) POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not encourage population growth in the area through the construction of new homes or the extension of roads or other infrastructure.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit. It would not physically divide an established community and would not displace existing homes or people and therefore, would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

As discussed in response XIII(b), implementation of actions required by the Manual Update would not displace people.

XIV) PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provisions of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
i. Fire Protection	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not result in the need for new or altered fire protection facilities.

ii. Police Protection	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not result in the need for new or altered police protection facilities.

iii. Schools	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not result in the need for new or altered school facilities.

iv. Parks	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not result in the need for new or park altered facilities.

v. Other public facilities	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not result in the need for any other new or altered public facility.

XV) RECREATION – Would the project:

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not result in the increased use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreation facilities. Structural BMPs that may be constructed at City Parks are for the sole purpose of reducing polluted runoff and improving water quality.

b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not result in the increased use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreation facilities. Structural BMPs that may be constructed at City Parks are for the sole purpose of reducing polluted runoff and improving water quality.

XVI) TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

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

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?				

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement and would not generate traffic and therefore, would not result in long-term traffic increases. Construction of structural BMPs could generate short-term traffic in the vicinity of any given project site; future public and/or private development or redevelopment projects which involve work in the public right-of-way would be required to comply with the requirements described in the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction, and California Department of Transportation's Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones. A traffic control plan would be prepared and implemented in accordance with the City of San Diego Standard Drawings Manual of Traffic Control for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones. Thus, the Manual Update would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the City's circulation system.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement and would not generate traffic and therefore, would not result in long-term traffic increases that would result in changes to the level of service on existing City roadways. Construction of structural BMPs could generate short-term traffic in the vicinity of any given project site; future public and/or private development or redevelopment projects which involve work in the public right-of-way would be required to comply with the requirements described in the Standard Specifications for Public Works Construction, and California Department of Transportation's Manual of Traffic Controls for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones. A traffic control plan would be prepared and implemented in accordance with the City of San Diego Standard Drawings Manual of Traffic Control for Construction and Maintenance Work Zones to coordinate construction flows to minimize

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

impacts to local roadways. Thus, the Manual Update would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would not result changes to air traffic patterns.

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

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) would occur in areas for the purposes of water quality improvement and would not result the construction of roadway design features or result in the changes in uses of the City's roadways. Structural BMPs could be constructed within or adjacent to a City roadway and would be done so for purposes of treating runoff to reduce pollutant discharges to the City's MS4. These structural BMPs would not act as a hazard to City motorists or result in incompatible uses.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update includes structural BMPs to meet the City's goal of improving water quality. Implementation of structural BMPs would be improvements to areas of existing City streets, municipal facilities, parks, parking lots, and/or storm drain systems areas for the purposes of water quality improvement. Structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements), would not be located and/or constructed in such a way that would prevent emergency access to any site.

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and would not conflict with policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative means of transportation.

XVII) UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

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

The Manual Update would ensure the City's compliance with Municipal Permit and to improve water quality and reduce urban runoff pollution within its jurisdiction. It does not involve any use that would discharge wastewater to a sanitary sewer or off-site wastewater systems. Therefore, it would not exceed any wastewater treatment requirements.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update is intended to assist in the City's efforts to improve water quality and reduce urban runoff pollution within its jurisdiction. The City operates wastewater treatment plants and pump stations, potable water pump stations, water treatment plants, potable water reservoirs, potable water clear wells, raw water reservoirs, and groundwater basins. Chapters 4 and 5 of the Manual Update provide guidance on how to implement pollution prevention methods and minimum BMPs to be implemented (identified in other City storm water management planning documents such as the JRMP) at such City-owned facilities and during required maintenance activities. The Manual Update would not require or result in the construction of a new water or wastewater treatment facility.

c) Require or result in the	☐	☒	☐	☐

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				

Implementation of the Manual Update will result in on-site BMPs and alternative compliance actions including new storm water facilities and possibly regional detention basins. However, these facilities would be designed to minimize significant environmental effects by implementing the mitigation framework identified in this MND in order to assure that no significant impacts from structural water quality control features would occur.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update is intended to assist in the City's efforts to improve water quality and reduce urban runoff pollution within its jurisdiction and does not require water services from a water district.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update is intended to assist in the City's efforts to improve water quality and reduce urban runoff pollution within its jurisdiction and would not produce any wastewater that increase a providers service capacity.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
The Manual Update is intended to assist in the City's efforts to improve water quality and reduce urban runoff pollution within its jurisdiction and would not generate any solid waste.				
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒
The Manual Update is intended to assist in the City's efforts to improve water quality and reduce urban runoff pollution within its jurisdiction and would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.				
XVIII) MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE – Does the project:				
a) Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☒	☐	☐
Future projects implemented in accordance with the Manual Update would include improvements to existing streets, developed parks, parking lots, municipal facilities, and/or storm drain systems outside of biologically sensitive areas. The project does however have the potential to result in impacts to sensitive habitat and species should the actions be located within or adjacent to biological resources. Similarly, improvements located in areas supporting historical resources could also result in significant environmental impacts to those resources. Mitigation Framework measures have been incorporated into the MMRP which are expected to reduce impacts to land use (MSCP/MHPA), biological, historical and paleontological resources to below a level of significance.				

Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable futures projects)?	☐	☒	☐	☐

Implementation of future structural BMPs, including those in conjunction with an alternative compliance project, or other off-site mitigation options implemented under an alternative compliance project (that result in physical improvements) have the potential to result in impacts to land use (MSCP/MHPA), biological, historical and/or paleontological resources. However, implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the MMRP would reduce these impacts and avoid a significant contribution to cumulative impacts associated with other projects within the City. Furthermore, other jurisdictions are implementing similar structural components within the WMAs in their jurisdictions and will implement mitigation measures if they are required. Therefore, impacts associated with this project, combined with other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would not result in a cumulatively considerable incremental effect on land use (MSCP/MHPA), biological, historical or paleontological resources.

c) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☐	☒

The Manual Update is intended to assist in the City's efforts to improve water quality and reduce urban runoff pollution within its jurisdiction and would not directly or indirectly cause adverse effects on human beings.

INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

REFERENCES

I. Aesthetics / Neighborhood Character

X City of San Diego General Plan.

____ Community Plans:

____ Local Coastal Plan.

II. Agricultural Resources & Forest Resources

X City of San Diego General Plan

____ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey San Diego Area, California, Part I and II, 1973

____ California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997)

____ Site Specific Report

III. Air Quality

____ California Clean Air Act Guidelines (Indirect Source Control Programs) 1990

____ Regional Air Quality Strategies (RAQS) APCD

____ Site Specific Report

IV. Biology

X City of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Subarea Plan, 1997

X City of San Diego, MSCP, "Vegetation Communities with Sensitive Species and Vernal Pools" Maps, 1996

X City of San Diego, MSCP, "Multi-Habitat Planning Area" maps, 1997

____ Community Plan Resource Element

____ California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally listed Endangered, Threatened, and Rare Plants of California," January 2001

____ California Department of Fish & Game, California Natural Diversity Database, "State and Federally-listed Endangered and Threatened Animals of California, "January 2001

X City of San Diego Land Development Code Biology Guidelines

____ Site Specific Report

V. Cultural Resources (includes Historical Resources)

X City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines

____ City of San Diego Archaeology Library

____ Historical Resources Board List

____ Community Historical Survey:

____ Site Specific Report

VI. Geology/Soils

X City of San Diego Seismic Safety Study

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

____ Site Specific Report

VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

____ Site Specific Report

VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

____ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Environmental Assessment Listing

____ San Diego County Hazardous Materials Management Division

____ FAA Determination

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

____ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

____ Site Specific Report

IX. Hydrology/Water Quality

____ Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)

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

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

____ Site Specific Report

X. Land Use and Planning

____ City of San Diego General Plan

____ Community Plan

____ Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

____ City of San Diego Zoning Maps

____ FAA Determination

____ Other Plans

XI. Mineral Resources

____ California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Mineral Land Classification

____ Division of Mines and Geology, Special Report 153 Significant Resources Maps

____ Site Specific Report

XII. Noise

X City of San Diego General Plan

____ Community Plan

____ San Diego International Airport Lindbergh Field CNEL Maps

____ Brown Field Airport Master Plan CNEL Maps

____ Montgomery Field CNEL Maps

____ San Diego Association of Governments San Diego Regional Average Weekday Traffic Volumes

____ San Diego Metropolitan Area Average Weekday Traffic Volume Maps, SANDAG

____ Site Specific Report

XIII. Paleontological Resources

X City of San Diego Paleontological Guidelines

____ Deméré, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh, "Paleontological Resources City of San Diego," Department of Paleontology San Diego Natural History Museum, 1996

____ Kennedy, Michael P., and Gary L. Peterson, "Geology of the San Diego Metropolitan Area, California. Del Mar, La Jolla, Point Loma, La Mesa, Poway, and SW 1/4 Escondido 7 1/2 Minute Quadrangles," California Division of Mines and Geology Bulletin 200, Sacramento, 1975

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

____ Site Specific Report

XIV. Population / Housing

____ City of San Diego General Plan

____ Community Plan

____ Series 11/Series 12 Population Forecasts, SANDAG

____
____ Other

XV. Public Services

____ City of San Diego General Plan
____ Community Plan

XVI. Recreational Resources

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

XVII. Transportation / Circulation

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

XVIII. Utilities

____ Site Specific Report

XIX. Water Conservation

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