

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

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

Date: November 15, 2013

Name of Preparer: Anne Jarque

Phone Number: 619-527-3131

Email: ajarque@sandiego.gov

ACTIVITY INFORMATION**Master Program**

Map #(s): 58 & 58a

City Equipment #(s): 8800155

Creek Name: Murphy Canyon Channel

Watershed(s): San Diego

Location: Between the Qualcomm Stadium parking lot to the west and Interstate 15 to the east, and north of Interstate 8

DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION PACKAGE

Included	NA	Document
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Maintenance Plan (IMP) – Appendix A
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Biological Assessment (IBA) – Appendix B, including Stadium Wetland Preserve – Conceptual Wetlands Mitigation Plan and Amendment Memo as IBA Attachment 6
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Historical Assessment (IHA) – Appendix C
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Hydrologic and Hydraulic Assessment (IHHA) – Appendix D
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Water Quality Assessment (IWQA) – Appendix E
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual Noise Assessment (INA) – Appendix F
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) – Appendix G

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program			
General Mitigation			
1	Have mitigation measures for impacts to biological resources, historical resources, land use, and paleontological resources, as appropriate, been included in entirety on the submitted maintenance documents and contract specifications, under the heading, "Environmental Mitigation Requirements"? (General Mitigation Measure 1)	Y	<p>See the following SCR Appendices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual Maintenance Plan (IMP) – Appendix A – Sheets 5-11. • Biological Resources, see IBA – Appendix B, Attachment 4 – Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures. • Historical Resources, see IHA - Appendix C, Attachment 5 – Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures. • Land Use, see IBA – Appendix B (Mitigation section and Attachment 4) and see INA – Appendix F (Mitigation section and Attachment 1). • Paleontological Resources. N/A. The proposed maintenance area would involve grading/dredging at maximum depth of seven inches within an improved earthen-bottom channel and a maximum depth of four inches in a concrete-lined channel. The likelihood maintenance activities would excavate within formational soils to discover significant paleontological resources would be considered low since the accumulated material to be removed/dredged has been deposited from upstream sources. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
General Mitigation (cont)			
2	Is a Pre-maintenance Meeting required, including, as appropriate, the Mitigation Monitoring Coordinator (MMC), Storm Water Division (SWD) Project Manager, Biological Monitor, Historical Monitor, Paleontological Monitor, and Maintenance Contractor (MC), and other parties of interest? (General Mitigation Measure 2)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A. See IBA – Appendix B, Attachment 4. See IHA – Appendix C, Attachment 5: 4.4.3.2, B and 4.4.3.5, A, 1.
3	Is there documented evidence of compliance with other permitting authorities (e.g., copies of permits issued, letters of resolution issued by the Responsible Agency documenting compliance, or other evidence documenting compliance and deemed acceptable by the Assistant Deputy Director [ADD] Environmental Designee), as applicable? (General Mitigation Measure 3)	Y	For this project, the following permits and other approvals have been issued: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master Maintenance Program (MMP) • Master Maintenance Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) Project No. 42891/SCH No. 2004101032 • Site Development Permit No. 1134892 for Master Maintenance Program • Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) 401 Water Quality Certification, File No. R9-2013-0124 (Pending) • Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Provisional Nationwide Permit No. 31 • California Dept. of Fish and Game (CDFG) 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement No. 1600-2010-0269-R5 (modified draft)

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
General Mitigation (cont.)			
4	Is there documented evidence of compliance with Section 1602 of the State of California Fish & Game Code (e.g., copies of permits issued, letters of resolution issued by the Responsible Agency documenting compliance, or other evidence documenting compliance and deemed acceptable by the ADD Environmental Designee), as applicable? (General Mitigation Measure 4)	Y	CDFW issued a draft Streambed Alteration Agreement 1600-2010-0269-R5 for the proposed maintenance in Murphy Canyon in 2010, but was not signed by both parties. A letter was sent to CDFW in July 2013, to modify the draft agreement based on the updated work plan, correction in bird breeding dates, revised mitigation strategy and agreement term. The modified agreement is still pending CDFW approval. T&SWD will provide evidence of final authorization to comply with Section 1602 of the State of California Fish & Game Code to permitting authorities prior to a Notice to Proceed or Commencement.
Biological Resources			
5	Has a qualified biologist prepared an IBA for each area proposed to be maintained in accordance with the specifications included in the Master Program? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.1)	Y	Dudek biologist, Thomas Liddicoat, (with 8 years of experience) is the qualified Biologist who conducted the field investigation and prepared the IBA. Senior oversight and review of the field work and the IBA was performed by Vipul Joshi (Senior Ecologist, 14 years of experience). Additionally, QA/QC review of the IBA was performed by Pat Mock, Ph.D (Principal Biologist, 30 years of experience). The IBA discusses the proposed maintenance and describes conformance with the specifications in the Master Program.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Biological Resources (cont)			
6	Have the IMPs and IBAs for maintenance activities within a proposed annual maintenance program been approved by the City's Assistant Deputy Director (ADD) Environmental Designee and state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over maintenance activities? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.2)	Y (in progress)	Through this SCR submittal, appropriate staff will review the IMP and IBA for the City's ADD Environmental Designee approval prior to initiation of any proposed annual maintenance activity (i.e. Notice to Proceed or Commencement). Applicable State and Federal Resource Agencies (i.e., ACOE, RWQCB, CDFW) are also currently reviewing the proposed project for issuance of regulatory permits to authorize impacts to jurisdictional wetlands/waters.
7	Has an IBA been prepared by a qualified biologist for each proposed maintenance activity, including the required contents? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.3)	Y	Please see response to No. 5 above.
8	Has a mitigation account been established to provide sufficient funds to implement all biological mitigation associated with the proposed maintenance act? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.4)	N/A	The mitigation efforts related to the proposed maintenance will be funded by the City of San Diego Transportation & Storm Water Department (T&SWD) annual budget. A Departmental Internal Order (I/O) number/account has been set up to track mitigation costs to allocate appropriate funding to implement associated biological mitigation projects.
9	Has evidence been provided documenting approval of the proposed maintenance by permitting authorities? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.5)	Y (partial)	T&SWD will provide final authorization to comply with permitting authorities prior to final approval. Note, T&SWD has already submitted additional information for the proposed maintenance project to RWQCB, and CDFW, but final authorizations are still pending at this time. ACOE has issued their authorization under a provisional NWP 31. See Response to No. 3, above.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Biological Resources (cont)			
10	Does the IMP call for a pre-maintenance meeting, if identified in the associated IBA? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.6)	Y	Appropriate notes requiring a pre-maintenance (i.e. pre-construction) meeting are included on the IMP, Sheets 5 & 6, as recommend in the IBA.
11	Does the IBA for each proposed maintenance activity identify appropriate wetland mitigation measures according to the ratios identified in Table 4.3-10? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.9)	Y	See IBA – Appendix B, Table 5 (page 23) and Attachment 5, Mitigation Measure 4.3.9 (pages 2 and 3), which includes Table 4.3-10. The IBA presents and describes mitigation ratios in accordance with the ratios identified in Table 4.3-10 of the Final PEIR (PEIR page 11-4).
12	Have wetland mitigation plans and enhancement and/or restoration plans been prepared and submitted to the DSD pursuant to the requirements described in Mitigation Measure 4.3.10? Are they consistent with Appendix H of the Biological Technical Report (BTR) contained in Appendix D.3 of the PEIR? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.10)	Y	See IBA – Appendix B, Attachment 6 – Stadium Wetland Preserve - Conceptual Wetlands Mitigation Plan and Amendment Memo to Stadium Wetland Preserve (Helix 2012 and URS 2013). The proposed maintenance will require mitigation to compensate for approximately 0.07 acre of impacts to areas regulated under City jurisdiction only. Mitigation for proposed maintenance impacts freshwater marsh would be required at a 4:1 ratio and is proposed within the Stadium Wetland Preserve. These mitigation plans have been prepared consistent with the PEIR's BTR Conceptual Mitigation Plan (Appendix H) requirements. Projected impacts associated with this project, as well as other City of San Diego projects, would be mitigated at the proposed site. Mitigation is proposed within the same watershed as the project impacts and located directly downstream and conjunctive to the project within the San Diego River corridor.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Biological Resources (cont)			
13	Would upland impacts be compensated through payment into the City's Habitat Acquisition Fund, or through acquisition and/or preservation of land in accordance with the ratios and requirements identified in Table 4.3-11? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.11)	N/A	See IBA – Appendix B. Approximately 0.15 acres of disturbed/ruderal upland habitat (Tier IV) is mapped within the maintenance area. In accordance with the requirements in PEIR Table 4.3-11 and the City's Biological Resources Guidelines, no mitigation is required for Tier IV, upland habitat
14	If the maintenance activity would result in loss of habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher, is mitigation planned (i.e., through the acquisition of suitable habitat or mitigation credits within the MHPA at a ratio of 1:1, to be accomplished within six months of the date of maintenance completion? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.12)	N/A	The proposed project does not include impacts to native upland habitat (i.e. coastal sage scrub), including habitat for coastal California gnatcatcher. Impacts to uplands proposed as part of the project are to Disturbed Habitat (i.e., non-native vegetation), which is a Tier IV habitat type and does not require mitigation per the MSCP and PEIR. See IBA – Appendix B.
15	If sensitive biological resources may be impacted, would the monitoring biologist be able to verify that the following actions have been taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has fencing, flagging, signage, or other means to protect sensitive resources been implemented? • Are noise attenuation measures needed to protect sensitive wildlife in place and effective? • Have nesting raptors been identified and necessary maintenance setbacks have been established if maintenance is to occur between February 1 and August 1? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.13)	Y	See IBA – Appendix B and INA – Appendix F. The monitoring biologist will verify these actions have been taken before and during work. Note, work proposed outside of the avian breeding season would not result in a significant indirect noise impact and no noise mitigation is required. Avian (i.e raptor) nesting surveys and applicable presence/absence surveys may be required if work is proposed during the breeding season. Applicable mitigation measures, such as avoidance or biological monitoring will be implemented in conformance with the Master Program and PEIR.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Biological Resources (cont)			
16	Have off-site mitigation areas been reviewed to determine if the mitigation would have a significant impact on biological resources located within the disturbance area of the mitigation? If so, have appropriate mitigation measures been proposed to reduce these impacts to below a level of significance? (Mitigation Measures 4.3.14)	Y	Proposed mitigation is within the San Diego River corridor. Protocol-level least Bell's vireo (vireo) surveys have been conducted within the mitigation area and have determined that the species is absent.
17	Does the IBA discuss appropriate actions to offset impacts to listed or endemic sensitive plant species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.15)	N/A	See IBA - Appendix B. No impacts to sensitive plant species are anticipated.
18	Would maintenance activities meet setback requirements for sensitive species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.16)	Y	See IBA – Appendix B. The maintenance activities would meet the setback requirements for sensitive species. These setbacks and limitations are discussed in the IBA, and IBA Attachment 4 – Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures.
19	Would clearing, grubbing, or grading (inside and outside the MHPA) be restricted during the breeding season of the listed species? Have protocol surveys been conducted for other potentially occurring sensitive species? If observed, have adequate mitigation measures been identified in the IBA? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.17)	Y(in progress)	See IBA – Appendix B and IBA Attachment 4- Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures. Yes, clearing, grubbing, and grading would be restricted during the breeding season of listed species. Protocol surveys for vireo have been conducted and vireo were not detected.
20	Has evidence been submitted to document that protocol surveys have been conducted for potentially occurring sensitive bird species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.18)	Y(in progress)	See IBA – Appendix B. Also see response to No. 16 above.
21	Has the IBA included appropriate mitigation measures when the potential exists for a sensitive bird species to occur near a proposed maintenance area and no protocol surveys have been conducted? (Mitigation Measures 4.3.19, 20 and 21)	Y	See IBA – Appendix B which describes avoidance of sensitive bird breeding seasons. In addition, see response to No. 15 above in reference to noise attenuation measures for sensitive wildlife.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Biological Resources (cont)			
22	Would removal of any eucalyptus trees or other trees used by raptors for nesting be proposed within the maintenance area? If yes, would maintenance include appropriate setbacks and limitations? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.22)	Y	See IBA – Appendix B and IBA Attachment 3- Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures. The IBA discusses trees suitable for raptor nesting within Reach 1 of the proposed project. Although there is limited potential for tree removal to occur as part of the channel maintenance, applicable raptor nesting avoidance measures are included in IBA – Attachment 4.
23	Would maintenance activities occur at known localities for listed fish species? If yes, would maintenance include appropriate mitigation? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.23)	N	See IBA – Appendix B. There are no known listed fish species occurring within the project area.
24	Would maintenance activities occur within areas supporting listed and/or narrow endemic plants? If yes, would maintenance proceed as described in Mitigation Measure 4.3.24?	N	See IBA – Appendix B. Listed/narrow endemic plants were not found and are not expected to occur within the proposed maintenance footprint.
25	If maintenance is proposed during the nesting season of avian species, including those species not covered by the MSCP, does the IBA require maintenance within or adjacent to avian nesting habitat occur outside of the avian breeding season (January 15 to August 31) unless postponing maintenance would result in a threat to human life or property? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.25)	Y	See IBA – Appendix B and IBA Attachment 4- Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures. The proposed maintenance could occur after January 15 th if the focused avian nesting surveys (raptor and general birds) result in no active nests. If active nests are detected, adequate setbacks and limitations will be implemented as indicated in IBA – Attachment 4.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Historical Resources			
26	Has a qualified archaeologist determined the potential for significant historical resources to occur in the maintenance area and prepared an IHA? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	URS qualified archaeologist and Principal Investigator (PI) Dimitra Zalarvis-Chase, RPA and Dudek qualified archaeologist and PI, Brad Comeau, MSc, RPA, have reviewed the resources in the area and determined that there is a low potential for resources to occur in the work area.
27	Has an Individual Historical Assessment (IHA) been prepared for the proposed maintenance? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	The designated PI has prepared a full IHA in compliance with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines.
28	If required, has a field survey of the maintenance activity APE been performed by a qualified archaeologist and a Native American monitor? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	An intensive field survey was completed by the URS PI and a Native American Monitor from Red Tail Monitoring and Research.
29	Has a record search been requested from the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC)? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	A full record search was conducted on April 1, 2013 at the South Coast Information Center, San Diego, CA.
30	Has an archaeological testing program been performed based on the City's Historical Resources Guidelines? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	N	Per the guidelines and lack of resources, testing is not required.
31	Have significant historical resources been identified within the proposed maintenance activity APE? If yes, address criteria numbers 36 through 42. If no, proceed to criteria number 43. (Mitigation Measures 4.4.1 and 4.4.2)	N	No significant resources are present within the APE.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Historical Resources (cont.)			
32	Has a Principal Investigator (PI) been selected and approved by the SWD and ADD Environmental Designee? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.1)	Y	An on-call qualified archaeological PI, Brad Comeau, MSc, RPA has been selected and previously approved by the SWD and ADD Environmental Designee, but archaeological monitoring would not be required for the proposed maintenance because no significant resources are present within the APE. Upon request, resumes and qualifications for the PI and monitoring staff will be provided to the ADD Environmental Designee prior to the first pre-construction meeting or initiating maintenance activities, if required by PEIR Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.1.
33	Have mitigation recommendations from the IHA been incorporated into the IMP to the satisfaction of the PI and the ADD Environmental Designee? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.2)	Y	Mitigation measures are included for inadvertent finds; by project design, all known resources are being avoided. Note, no mitigation or monitoring would be required for maintenance activities.
34	If impacts to significant historical resources cannot be avoided, has the PI prepared and implemented an Archaeological Research Design and Data Recovery Program (ARDDRP) for the affected resources, with input from a Native American consultant (approved by the ADD Environmental Designee? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.3)	NA	No significant resources are present within the APE.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Historical Resources (cont.)			
35	Has a pre-maintenance meeting been planned and/or conducted on site, including representatives from the PI, Native American consultant, SWD, MMC, Resident Engineer (RE), and MC? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.4)	Y	A pre-maintenance meeting will be planned prior to initiating maintenance activities. However, the proposed maintenance would not result in significant impacts to historical resources since the potential is low; therefore a PI or Native American consultant would not be required at the pre-maintenance meeting.
36	If human remains have been discovered in the course of conducting the ARDDRP, would the procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) be implemented? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.5)	Y	If human remains are discovered, maintenance will stop and the on-call PI would be notified to implement the required procedures under MMRP Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.5.
37	Will the PI and Archaeologist assume required responsibilities? (Mitigation Measures 4.4.2.6, 4.4.2.7, and 4.4.2.8)	Y	If resources are discovered during project maintenance these mitigation measures will be implemented.
38	If the IHA identifies a moderate to high potential for the occurrence of significant historical resources within the APE, would mitigation measures be implemented? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.3)	Y	The potential for the occurrence of resources in the APE is considered low; at this time there are no known significant resources present within the APE.
Land Use			
39	Has the ADD Environmental Designee verified that all MHPA boundaries and limits of work have been delineated on all maintenance documents? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.1)	Y	The MHPA boundary is shown on IMP – Appendix A, Sheet 2, which located within the San Diego River corridor, approximately 125 feet south of the proposed maintenance area (MMP 58, Reach 1).

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Land Use			
40	Has a qualified biologist (possessing a valid Endangered Species Act Section 10(a)(1)(a) recovery permit) surveyed habitat areas inside and outside the MHPA suspected to serve as habitat for the coastal California gnatcatcher, least Bell's vireo and/or other listed species? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.2)	Y	See Appendix B – IBA. The project site supports potential habitat for least Bell's vireo. Protocol surveys were completed after preparation of the IBA and vireo were not detected. The project is adjacent to area that may support light-footed clapper rail. A qualified monitoring biologist is required to survey the project footprint for any listed species, specifically the light-footed clapper rail, before maintenance activities are conducted each day.
41	Has a qualified acoustician (possessing current noise engineer license or registration with monitoring noise level experience with listed animal species) performed a noise analysis for the proposed maintenance activity? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.3)	Y	Mark Storm, an Institute of Noise Control Engineering Board-Certified member (INCE Bd. Cert.), has supervised and reviewed the predictive noise analysis for the proposed maintenance activity as currently appearing in the INA.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Land Use			
42	Would the proposed maintenance have the potential to impact breeding activities of listed species? If yes, would maintenance activities be restricted to the breeding season? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.4)	Y	<p>As indicated in the INA, if work is proposed between January 15 (start of the raptor nesting season) and August 15, a pre-maintenance survey for active raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in areas supporting suitable habitat. If active raptor nests are found, maintenance shall not occur within 300 feet of a Cooper's Hawk nest, 900 feet of a Northern Harrier's nest, or 500 feet of any other raptor's nest until any fledglings have left the nest. Least Bell's vireo were not detected during focused protocol-level surveys within and adjacent to the project area, so maintenance is not expected to affect this species.</p> <p>Light-footed clapper rail is considered to have a potential to be present in or adjacent to the project area, but it would be impracticable to implement or install attenuation measures and therefore it is recommended that maintenance be performed outside their breeding season.</p>

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (cont)			
Land Use			
43	If maintenance cannot be avoided during an identified breeding season for a listed bird which is determined to be potentially significantly affected by maintenance, would the appropriate measures be taken? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.5)	N	With respect to least Bell's vireo and light-footed clapper rail, as indicated in the INA, areas along Reaches 1 and 2 would not be practical to mitigate because their presence is in the channel area. The area south of the Trolley track also would not be practical to mitigate because the temporary barrier—for it to feasibly provide maintenance noise reduction—would potentially interrupt water flow in the channel. Thus, URS strongly recommends that maintenance activities be conducted outside their respective breeding seasons.
44	Has a pre-maintenance meeting been planned and/or conducted, including the MMC, Project Biologist, and City representative? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.6)	N	See Appendix B – IBA, Attachment 4, General Mitigation 2, and Mitigation Measure 4.3.6. The pre-maintenance meeting has will be planned and/or conducted on site to include MMC, the project biologist and City representative, after permits (i.e. SCR) are approved but prior to initiating maintenance.
45	Does the IMP include appropriate maintenance designs? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.7)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, notes on Sheets 5 & 6.
46	Has the ADD Environmental Designee verified that the MHPA boundaries and the requirements regarding coastal California gnatcatcher been included in the IMP and/or IBA? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.8)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Sheet 2, and IBA - Appendix B and IBA Figure No. 2.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program Protocols			
Water Quality			
47	Does the IMP include measures to stabilize designated access roads (or other graded areas) with permeable protective surfacing (e.g., grasscrete), storm water diversion structures (e.g., brow ditches or berms), or crossing structures (e.g., culverts) to control erosion and prevent off-site sediment transport? (WQ-1)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Notes 6-12 on Sheet 5. Specific construction BMPs that will be implemented during maintenance are further described in the Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP) – Appendix G.
48	Does the IMP include measures to prevent off-site sediment transport during maintenance through the use erosion and sediment controls within storm water facilities, along access routes and around stockpile/staging areas? Will temporary erosion or sediment control measures be removed upon completion of maintenance unless their removal would result in greater environmental impact than leaving them in place? (WQ-2)	Y	The applicable measures are further described in WPCP – Appendix G and included on IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Notes 6-12, & 16 on Sheet 5.
49	Does the IMP require storage of BMP materials on-site in a way that provides complete protection of exposed areas and prevent off-site sediment transport? (WQ-3)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 30 on Sheet 5 and further described in WPCP – Appendix G.
50	Does the IMP require training for personnel responsible for the proper installation, inspection, and maintenance of on-site BMPs. (WQ-4)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 37 on Sheet 5 and further described in WPCP – Appendix G.
51	Does the IMP require revegetation of spoil and staging areas within 30 days of completion of maintenance activities? Does it require monitoring and maintenance of revegetated areas for a period of not less than 25 months following planting? (WQ-5)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 39 on Sheet 5 and further described in WPCP – Appendix G.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program Protocols (cont)			
Water Quality			
52	Does the IMP require sampling and analysis; monitoring and reporting; and post-maintenance management programs per National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and/or City requirements? (WQ-6)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 35 & 39 on Sheet 5 and further described in WPCP – Appendix G.
53	Does the IMP prohibit storing hazardous materials used during maintenance within 50 feet from storm water facilities? Does it require hazardous materials to be managed and stored in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations? (WQ-7)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 22 on Sheet 5 and further described in WPCP – Appendix G.
54	Does the IMP prohibit storage of maintenance-related trash in areas within 50 feet from storm water facilities, and require removal of trash in receptacles at least weekly? (WQ-8)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 23 on Sheet 5 and further described in WPCP – Appendix G.
55	Does the IMP require installation of any check dam or other comparable mechanism identified in the corresponding IHHA? Are these structures required to be removed when vegetation growth has reached a point where the structure is no longer required unless removal would result in greater environmental harm than leaving them in place? (WQ-9)	N	IHHA does not recommend the installation of check dams.
56	Does the IMP require inspection of earthen-bottom storm water facilities within 30 days of the first 2-year storm following maintenance? Are erosion control measures recommended by the field engineer incorporated into the IMP? (WQ-10)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 36 on Sheet 5, Maintenance Protocol Requirement 9 on Sheet 6 and further described in WPCP – Appendix G.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program Protocols (cont)			
Water Quality			
57	Does the IMP incorporate mitigation measures identified in the IWQA and/or Table 4.8-8 of the PEIR?	N	The results of the IWQA – Appendix E suggest that there is a pollutant reduction benefit due to sediment removal as a result of the proposed maintenance activities, and therefore no additional mitigation is necessary. However, the City will implement water quality improvement activities as required by the modified SDP No. 1134892, including one of four improvement options to restore 100 square feet of wetlands for every 200 linear feet of vegetation removed. It is estimated that the proposed maintenance would require approximately 909 square feet of restored wetland habitat.
Biological Resource Protection			
58	Does the IMP restrict vehicles to access designated in the Master Program? (BIO-1)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance Protocol Requirements, Sheet 6 and IBA - Appendix B, pages 21-22.
59	Does the IMP require delineation and flagging of all sensitive biological resources to remain within or adjacent to the maintenance area? (BIO-2)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance Protocol Requirements, Sheet 6 and IBA - Appendix B, pages 21-22.
60	Does the IMP require a pre-maintenance meeting when maintenance will occur within or adjacent to sensitive biological resources? (BIO-3)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance Protocol Requirements, Sheet 6 and IBA - Appendix B, pages 21-22.
61	Are erosion control measures designed to avoid introduction of invasive plant species? (BIO-4)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance Protocol Requirements, Sheet 6 and IBA - Appendix B, pages 21-22.
62	Does the IMP require conducting pre-maintenance protocol surveys if maintenance is proposed during the breeding season of a sensitive animal species? (BIO-5)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance Protocol Requirements, Sheet 6 and IBA - Appendix B, pages 21-22.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program Protocols (cont)			
Biological Resource Protection (cont)			
63	If arundo will be removed during maintenance, does the IMP include appropriate removal methods to minimize downstream dispersal? (BIO-6)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance Protocol Requirements, Sheet 6 and IBA - Appendix B, pages 21-22.
64	Does the IMP prohibit the use of mechanized maintenance within 300 feet of a Cooper's hawk nest, 900 feet of a northern harrier's nest, or 500 feet of any other raptor's nest until any fledglings have left the nest? (BIO-7)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance Protocol Requirements, Sheet 6 and IBA - Appendix B, pages 21-22.
65	Does the IMP include measures to minimize the potential for entrapping wildlife when implementing erosion control measures? (BIO-8).	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance Protocol Requirements, Sheet 6 and IBA - Appendix B, pages 21-22.
Historical Resource Protection			
66	Does the IMP call for flagging, capping, or fencing of all historical resource areas in the field prior to initiation of maintenance activities in the presence of a qualified historical resource specialist, as necessary)? (HIST-1)	N/A	See IHA – Appendix C. Measures to flag, cap or fence historical resources are not required because there are no known significant resources in the APE where maintenance would be conducted.
67	Does the IMP require a pre-maintenance meeting on-site when maintenance activities are determined in the IHA to potentially impact historic resources? (HIST-2)	N	See IHA – Appendix C. Impacts to potentially historic resources during maintenance are considered low since there are no known significant resources present in the APE.
Waste Management			
68	Does the IMP call for disposal of compostable green waste material at an approved composting facility, if available? (WM-1)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 16 on Sheet 5 and further described in WPCP – Appendix G.
69	Does the IMP call for screening of soil, sand, and silt to remove waste debris and, wherever possible, to be re-used as fill material, aggregate, or other raw material? (WM-2)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 21 on Sheet 5 and Maintenance Protocol Requirements Note 17, Sheet 6.

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

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Master Program Protocols (cont)			
Waste Management (cont)			
70	Does the IMP call for separation and transport of waste tires to an appropriate disposal facility, including the completion of a Comprehensive Trip Log (CTL) if more than nine tires are in a vehicle or waste bin at any one time? (WM-3)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 20 on Sheet 5 and Maintenance Protocol Requirements Note 18, Sheet 6.
71	Does the IMP require hazardous materials encountered during maintenance to be logged under a hazardous materials manifest and transported to an approved hazardous waste storage, recycling, treatment or disposal facility? (WM-4)	Y	See IMP – Appendix A, Maintenance BMP Note 20 & 22 on Sheet 5 and Maintenance Protocol Requirements Note 19, Sheet 6.