2016 Substantial Conformance Review for Individual Maintenance Plan (IMP) and Individual Technical Assessments for Tijuana River Pilot Channel and Smuggler's Gulch, City of San Diego Site Development Permit No. 1134892, Master Storm Water System Maintenance Program

Attachment 3

Substantial Conformance Review Checklist

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

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 modified 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 modified SDP Conditions.

Date:	July 1, 2016
Name of Preparer:	Stephanie Bracci
Phone Number:	(619) 527-3445
Email:	sbracci@sandiego.gov

ACTIVITY INFORMATION

138a, 138b, 138c, 138, & 139
88000300, 88000232
Unnamed Tributary to the Tijuana River
Tijuana River Hydrologic Unit
Southwest of the I-5/905 interchange, East of the Tijuana River Estuary, West and East of Hollister Road, north of Monument Road

DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN CONSISTENCY DETERMINATION PACKAGE

Included	NA	Document
X		Individual Maintenance Plan (IMP)
X		Individual Biological Assessment (IBA)
X		Individual Historical Assessment (IHA)
X		Individual Hydrologic and Hydraulic Assessment (IHHA)
X		Individual Water Quality Assessment (IWQA)
X		Individual Noise Assessment (INA)

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
	er Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting	Program	
	ral 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	 See IMP Attachment 1.b – Master List of BMPs, Maintenance Protocols and Mitigation Measures (subsections on Biological Resource Protection, Historical Resource Protection, and Land Use Policy Protection). Also, see the following IMP Appendices: Biological Resources, see Appendix B – IBA, Attachment 3– Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures (2015 IBA). Historical and Paleontological Resources, see Appendix C – IHA, Attachment 4 – Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures (2013 IHA). Land Use, see Appendix B - IBA (Mitigation section and Attachment 3) (2015 IBA). Paleontological Resources: A paleontological record And also see Attachment 2 -Regulatory Permits, which includes the following: City of San Diego Site Development Permit No. 1134892 California Coastal Commission Coastal Development Permit No. A-6-NOC-11-086 RWQCB Amendment to Water Quality Certification (File No. 09C-077) Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Individual Permit (File No. SPL-2009-00719-RRS) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion (FWS-SDG-08BO600-10F001) CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement No. 1600- 2011-0271-R5

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs: page 3 (WQ 4.8.3), page 12 (BIO-3), page 13 (BIO 4.3.6), and page 28 (HIST-2). See Appendix B –IBA, Attachment 3 (2015 IBA). See Appendix C – IHA, Attachment 4: 4.4.3.2, B and 4.4.3.5, A, 1 (2013 IHA).
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: Modified Master Maintenance Program (MMP) Master Maintenance Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) And also see Attachment 2 -Regulatory Permits, which includes the following: City of San Diego Site Development Permit No. 1134892 California Coastal Commission Coastal Development Permit No. A-6-NOC-11-086 RWQCB Amendment to Water Quality Certification (File No. 09C-077) Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Individual Permit (File No. SPL-2009-00719-RRS) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion (FWS-SDG-08BO600-10F001) CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement No. 1600- 2011-0271-R5

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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	 See Attachment 2 – Regulatory Permits, which includes (among other permits): California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife 1600 Streambed Alteration Agreement (No. 1600-2011-0271-R5) This permit is scheduled to expire on November 30, 2016. An extension request has been submitted to CDFW, which, if accepted, would extend the permit expiration date to November 30, 2021.
Biolo	gical 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	Vipul Joshi is a qualified biologist and, prior to the 2015-2016 maintenance period, he prepared Appendix B – IBA (2015 IBA), which covers each area proposed to be maintained in accordance with the specifications in the Master Program. Following a site assessment in February 2016, the existing conditions of the project area were determined to be sufficiently similar to the conditions described in the 2015 IBA prepared by Mr. Joshi, such that a new technical assessment for the 2016- 2017 maintenance period was not necessary. A cover letter to the IBA includes a summary technical review of the 2015 IBA, as well as an updated California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) records search

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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	The TJRV Channel Maintenance Project's IMP and IBA have been reviewed by DSD (i.e. City's ADD Environmental Designee), state and federal regulatory agencies (August 2015 and January 2013) and determined to be in substantial conformance with associated environmental document and permits. Since the City's SCR decision was appealed to the City's Planning Commission, no substantial changes to the project have been made that would impact new environmental resources or trigger additional environmental review.
7	Has an IBA been prepared by a qualified biologist for each proposed maintenance activity, including the required contents? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.3)	Y	See response to #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	Ongoing mitigation efforts will be funded by Transportation & Storm Water Department. Internal Order 11003022 has been set up to track these costs.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
9	Has evidence been provided documenting approval of the proposed maintenance by permitting authorities? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.5)	Y	 See Attachment 2 -Regulatory Permits, which includes the following authorizations from permitting authorities: City of San Diego Site Development Permit No. 1134892 California Coastal Commission Coastal Development Permit No. A-6-NOC-11-086 RWQCB Amendment to Water Quality Certification (File No. 09C-077) Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) Individual Permit (File No. SPL-2009-00719-RRS) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion (FWS-SDG-08BO600-10F001) CDFW Streambed Alteration Agreement No. 1600- 2011-0271-R5
10	Does the IMP call for a pre-maintenance meeting, if identified in the associated IBA? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.6)	Y	 See IMP Attachment 1.b – Master List of BMPs, Maintenance Protocols and Mitigation Measures, in the following sections: PEIR (WQ-4.8.3, page 3) MMP (BIO-3, page 12) PEIR (BIO-4.3.6, page 13) MMP (HIST-2, page 28)
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 Appendix B – IBA, Mitigation section (2015 IBA). The project will not result in impacts to jurisdictional wetlands or waters beyond the acreage previously permitted and mitigated.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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	A Final Wetlands Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (Dudek, February 2013) has been approved by DSD and mitigation installation has been completed. The mitigation will continue with ongoing monitoring and maintenance according to this Plan. Also, and the Tijuana River Valley Mitigation Site Verification Report (Dudek, June 2016) is attached which indicates that the original mitigation for the Pilot Channel construction continues to meet performance standards (Appendix F – Mitigation Documents).
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	N/A. See Appendix B – IBA, Environmental Mitigation Requirements section. The project will not result in impacts to upland habitat that would require mitigation.
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	N/A. See Appendix B – IBA. No suitable coastal California gnatcatcher habitat is within the maintenance area.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
15	 If sensitive biological resources may be impacted, would the monitoring biologist be able to verify that the following actions have been taken: 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 Appendix B – IBA and Appendix E – INA. The monitoring biologist will verify these items before and during work. Work proposed outside the avian breeding season would not result in a significant indirect noise impact and no noise attenuation measures are required. If needed, noise attenuation measures will be implemented during the avian breeding season. Bird nesting and protocol surveys are required if work is proposed during the breeding season and mitigation measures, such as necessary setbacks, will be implemented in conformance with the Master Program and PEIR.
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 would be to exotic species (i.e. Arundo) and will not negatively impact biological resources in the mitigation areas.
17	Does the IBA discuss appropriate actions to offset impacts to listed or endemic sensitive plant species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.15)	Y	See Appendix B – IBA. No such impacts are anticipated; measures to prevent unintended impacts are included.
18	Would maintenance activities meet setback requirements for sensitive species? (Mitigation Measure 4.3.16)	Y	See Appendix B – IBA. Yes, the maintenance activities would meet the setback requirements for sensitive species. This topic is discussed in Attachment 2 of the 2015 IBA under the header Applicable PEIR Mitigation Measures.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)		
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	See Appendix B – IBA. Yes, clearing, grubbing, and grading would be restricted during the breeding season of listed species. At least one protocol survey will be conducted for potentially occurring sensitive species if work is conducted during the breeding season. Adequate mitigation measures are included in Attachment 2 of the 2015 IBA.		
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 Appendix B – IBA. Previous protocol surveys have already been reported; if new surveys are necessary, they will be reported once completed.		
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 Appendix B – IBA. Yes, the IBA includes avoidance of maintenance during sensitive bird breeding season when possible and if no protocol surveys have been conducted. In addition, see response to #15 above in reference to		
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)	N	noise attenuation measures for sensitive wildlife. See Appendix B – IBA. No eucalyptus trees or other trees used by raptors for nesting are planned for removal. If any tree removal is determined to be necessary, appropriate setbacks and limitations will be followed.		
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 Appendix B – IBA. There are no known listed fish species occurring within the project area.		
Biolo	Biological Resources (cont.)				
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?	Ν	See Appendix B – IBA. Listed/narrow endemic plants were not found and are not expected to be found within the maintenance footprint; nearby rare plants will be flagged to protect them from any incidental impacts.		

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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 Appendix B – IBA. Yes, with the possibility that maintenance could occur after $1/15$ if raptor nest surveys find no active nests.
Histo	rical 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	See Appendix C – IHA. An Archaeological Resource Analysis for the Master Program was completed by Affinis in 2011 and the "Tijuana Hydrologic Unit", which incorporates the Tijuana River Valley Project (Project) area was determined to have high sensitivity for significant historical resources to occur in the maintenance area. Six cultural resources were recorded within the "Tijuana Hydrologic Unit", consisting of three historic sites, two prehistoric lithic scatters and a prehistoric habitation site. Based on these results, an IHA was prepared in 2012 by URS. Archaeological and Native American monitoring was performed in 2013- 2014, at which time the PI determined no significant resources are located within the APE and monitoring of future maintenance activities is no necessary.
27	Has an Individual Historical Assessment (IHA) been prepared for the proposed maintenance? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	See Appendix C - IHA.
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	See Appendix C –IHA, page 13 for field survey methods and IHA pages 15 to 17 for field survey results (2013 IHA).

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
29	Has a record search been requested from the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC)? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	Y	See Appendix C – IHA, page 14 for records search results requested from the SCIC (2013 IHA). Updated records searches were performed in 2015 and 2016 by Dudek.
30	Has an archaeological testing program been performed based on the City's Historical Resources Guidelines? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.1)	N/A	See Appendix C – IHA, page 18 for recommendations (2013 IHA). No archaeological testing has been recommended.
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)	Ν	See Appendix C – IHA, pages 15 to 17 for field survey results (2013 IHA). No significant historical resources have been identified within the proposed maintenance activity APE.
32	Has a Principal Investigator (PI) been selected and approved by the SWD and ADD Environmental Designee? (Mitigation Measure 4.4.2.1)	Y	See Appendix C – IHA, page 1 (2013 IHA). The IHA PI is Brad Comeau, M.Sc., RPA.
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	See Appendix C – IHA, page 17 to 18 (2013 IHA).
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)	N/A	N/A. See Appendix C – IHA and monitoring report from the 2013-2014 channel maintenance (Comeau 2014). Impacts to significant historical resources can be avoided. No significant historical resources are present.
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)	N	See Appendix C – IHA, Attachment 4, General Mitigation 2, and Mitigation Measure 4.4.3.2. A pre- maintenance meeting will be planned and/or conducted on site when SCR is approved (2013 IHA).

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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	See Appendix C – IHA, Attachment 4, and Mitigation Measure 4.4.3.4 Discovery of Human Remains (2013 IHA).
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	See Appendix C – IHA. Yes, the PI and Archaeologist assume required responsibilities.
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	See Appendix C - IHA. Archaeological and Native American monitoring was performed during maintenance activities in 2013-2104, at which time the PI determined that due to disturbances in the area, no significant historical resources are present with the APE (Dudek 2014). As a result, no further mitigation is recommended.
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	See IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans.
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. Surveys have been conducted in the past, and at least one new survey (Ridgeway's rail) will be conducted prior to start of work. A qualified monitoring biologist is required to survey the project footprint for any listed species, specifically the Ridgeway's rail, before maintenance activities are conducted each day. Protocol surveys (or alternative protocol approved by USFWS) will be conducted if work is anticipated during a breeding season of a listed species.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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	See Appendix E - INA. Mark Storm, an INCE Board- Certified noise control engineer performed the predictive noise analysis of the proposed maintenance activity as part of the 2013 INA. Review of the 2013 INA was performed by a qualified acoustician in 2015 and 2016.
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	See Appendix B – IBA. If maintenance occurs after January 15, appropriate bird nesting and protocol surveys will be conducted as required by Mitigation Measure (MM) 4.1.5.
Mast	er Program PEIR Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting	Program	
43	If maintenance cannot be avoided during an identified breeding season for a listed bird which is determined to be potentially significantly affected by maintenance, would the appropriate measures be taken? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.5)	Y	See Appendix B – IBA and Attachment 2 – Regulatory Permits (Biological Opinion document). Yes, in accordance with the mitigation measures as indicated on Attachment 2 of the 2015 IBA, as well as conditions of permits and the Biological Opinion. The provisions of Mitigation Measure (MM) 4.1.5 would be performed if proposed maintenance activity occurs during breeding season(s). Additionally, either the biologist having appropriate experience or training in acoustics, or a qualified acoustician accompanying the biologist, would inspect the installation of noise attenuating devices per the provisions of MM 4.1.5.
44	Has a pre-maintenance meeting been planned and/or conducted, including the MC, Project Biologist, and City representative? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.6)	N	See Appendix B – IBA, General Mitigation 2, and Mitigation Measure 4.3.6. The pre-maintenance meeting will be planned and/or conducted on site when SCR is approved.
45	Does the IMP include appropriate maintenance designs? (Mitigation Measure 4.1.7)	Y	See IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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 Appendix B – IBA and IBA Figure No. 2 (2015 IBA).
Mast	er Program Protocols	÷	
Wate	r 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 Attachment 1c -Water Pollution Control Plan and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.
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	See IMP Attachment 1c -Water Pollution Control Plan and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.
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 – Attachment 1c -Water Pollution Control Plan and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.
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 – Attachment 1c - Water Pollution Control Plan and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.
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 Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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 – Attachment 1c -Water Pollution Control Plan and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.
53	Does the IMP prohibit storing hazardous materials used during maintenance within 50 feet from storm water facilities? Does it require hazardous materials to be managed and stored in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations? (WQ-7)	Y	See IMP – Attachment 1c -Water Pollution Control Plan and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.
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 – Attachment 1c -Water Pollution Control Plan and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.
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	See Appendix A – IHHA. The 2013 IHHA determined that check dams were not necessary. This document was reviewed for the 2015 and 2016 SCR, and conditions were found to be in substantial conformance with the original findings of the 2013 IHHA.
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 – Attachment 1c -Water Pollution Control Plan and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.
57	Does the IMP incorporate mitigation measures identified in the IWQA and/or Table 4.8-8 of the PEIR?	Y	See IMP, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements.

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
Mast	er Program Protocols (cont.)		
Biolo	gical Resource Protection		
58	Does the IMP restrict vehicles to access designated in the Master Program? (BIO-1)	Y	See IMP, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements
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, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements
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, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements
61	Are erosion control measures designed to avoid introduction of invasive plant species? (BIO-4)	Y	See IMP, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements
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, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements
63	If arundo will be removed during maintenance, does the IMP include appropriate removal methods to minimize downstream dispersal? (BIO-6)	Y	See IMP, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements
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, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements
65	Does the IMP include measures to minimize the potential for entrapping wildlife when implementing erosion control measures? (BIO-8).	Y	See IMP, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)	
Histo	prical 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)	Ν	See IMP, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements. See also Appendix C – IHA, page 18 under Recommendations for specific recommendations regarding the resources within the Project APE (2013 IHA). This document was reviewed as part of the 2015 and 2016 SCR, and conditions were found to be in substantial conformance with the original findings of the 2013 IHA.	
67	Does the IMP require a pre-maintenance meeting on-site when maintenance activities are determined in the IHA to potentially impact historic resources? (HIST-2)	Y	See IMP, Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs and IMP Attachment 1a - Construction Plans for Construction BMP Notes and Requirements. See also Appendix C – IHA, Attachment 4, General Mitigation 2, and Mitigation Measure 4.4.3.2 (2013 IHA). Currently, activities are not expected to impact any historical resources and no pre-maintenance meeting is planned. A pre-maintenance meeting will be planned and/or conducted if maintenance activities are determined to potentially impact historic resources by the IHA.	
Waste Management				
68	Does the IMP call for disposable of compostable green waste material at an approved composting facility, if available? (WM-1)	Y	See IMP Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs, page 35, and IMP Attachment 1a – Construction Plans, Construction BMP Notes: #12 for guidance on WM-1.	
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 Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs, page 35, and IMP Attachment 1a – Construction Plans, Construction BMP Notes: #12 for guidance on WM-2.	

SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE REVIEW CHECKLIST (2016 SCR)

No.	Measure/Criteria	Y/N/NA	Basis for Determination (attach separate sheet(s) as necessary)
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 Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs, page 35, and IMP Attachment 1a – Construction Plans, Construction BMP Notes: #12 for guidance on WM-3.
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 Attachment 1b - Master List of BMPs, page 35, and IMP Attachment 1a – Construction Plans, Construction BMP Notes: #14 for guidance on WM-4. Spill cleanup materials shall be available on site at all times.