



County of San Diego

DAHVIA LYNCH
DIRECTOR

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123
(858) 505-6445 General • (858) 694-2705 Codes
(858) 565-5920 Building Services
www.SDCPDS.org

KATHLEEN A. FLANNERY
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

January 6, 2022

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form (Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G)

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:

Sandia Creek Drive Bridge Replacement/Fish Passage Project; PDS2020-LDGRMJ-30309, PDS2020-LDPIIP-60093, PDS2021-ER-21-02-005

2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 310
San Diego, CA 92123-1239

3. a. Contact Kenneth Brazell, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-2728
c. E-mail: Kenneth.Brazell@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project is located approximately two miles north of the village area of Fallbrook, 160 feet southwest of the intersection of Rock Mountain Drive and Sandia Creek Drive where Sandia Creek Drive crosses the Santa Margarita River in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area of unincorporated San Diego County, California.

Northern portion of APN 102-250-24-00
Latitude: 33.414; Longitude: -117.241

5. Project Applicant name and address:

California Trout
360 Pine Street, Fourth Floor
San Francisco CA 94104

6. General Plan
Community Plan: Fallbrook
Land Use Designation: Public Agency Lands

Density: n/a
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) n/a

7. Zoning
Use Regulation: S80 – Open Space
Minimum Lot Size: 4 acres
Density: 0.25 du/acre
Special Area Regulation: C (Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan Area)

8. Description of project:

The project consists of the removal and replacement of an aging low-flow and flood-prone concrete box culvert river crossing over the Santa Margarita River on Sandia Creek Drive. The box culvert crossing, which has created a significant fish passage barrier on the Santa Margarita River, will be removed following construction of a new steel and concrete span bridge. The new bridge will span the river (574 feet in length), with an abutment including wing walls at either end of the bridge and two piers in between. Thus, the bridge will have three sections, the first section of which will span 214 feet (over the main Santa Margarita River channel), and each of the two remaining sections will span 176 feet. The bridge will provide two paved traffic lanes (12 feet wide) with two shoulders (8 feet wide) within a 68-foot-wide road right-of-way. The road surface of the bridge will range in elevation from just over 354 feet above mean sea level (amsl) at the northern abutment to just over 359 feet near the center of the bridge. In comparison, the ordinary high-water elevation of the river is 331 feet amsl, while the 100-year water surface elevation is just over 346 feet amsl. The new bridge will be constructed about 160 feet downstream of the existing box culvert crossing. The project impact area surrounding the construction and demolition area is approximately 15 acres. The existing box culvert crossing on Sandia Creek Drive will remain open to traffic during construction of the new steel bridge. Construction of this span bridge and removal of the existing crossing will occur over a period of approximately two years.

The new bridge replaces the existing Sandia Creek Drive concrete box culvert low-flow river crossing, which periodically floods and has a limited line of sight in a heavily used trail area. Sandia Creek Drive carries traffic between Fallbrook, approximately two miles south of the site, and residential areas north of the river. The new bridge will straighten out Sandia Creek Drive as it approaches the river from the south to increase safety, and the existing bend in the road will become the entrance way to the existing parking lot for trail access to the recently created Santa Margarita River Preserve. A temporary trail approximately eight feet in width and 600 feet in length will be constructed south of and above Sandia Creek Drive between the south end of the construction zone at Sandia Creek Drive and the existing parking lot for the Santa Margarita Trail Preserve to maintain trail access around the site and to trails upstream and downstream of the project site (see Sheets C4 and C13 of Plans).

Completion of the Project will remove migratory impediments and improve the wildlife migratory corridor to allow endangered Southern California steelhead and other fish and wildlife to move upstream to spawning and rearing habitat in the headwaters of the Santa Margarita River.

The project site lies within this property recently acquired by The Wildlands Conservancy (TWC) who will provide conservation, education and recreational opportunities to the public in perpetuity.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project’s surroundings):

The project site is in a rugged area consisting of the Santa Margarita River corridor surrounded by steep-sided hillsides with native sage scrub and chaparral vegetation. Much of the river corridor is designated Public Agency land and owned by TWC immediately to the north, east, south and west, and by the County of San Diego downstream further to the southwest. A parking lot is located at the south end of the existing box culvert crossing for the public to access trails along the river that are managed by TWC. Lands to the north of the project are designated Rural and contain low density residential and agricultural use. Lands to the south are designated Semi-rural and also contain low-density residential use.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Permit Type/Action	Agency
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
Road Opening	County of San Diego
Road Vacation	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits Construction Permit Excavation Permit Encroachment Permit	County of San Diego
Improvement Plans	County of San Diego
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit – Incidental Take	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
NPDES General Construction Storm Water Permit	RWQCB

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code §21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

YES

NO

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, public lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and to reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process (see Public Resources Code §21083.3.2). Information is also available from the Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code §5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code §21082.3(e) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

Aesthetics

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Air Quality

Biological Resources

Cultural Resources

Energy

Geology & Soils

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Hazards & Hazardous Materials

Hydrology & Water Quality

Land Use & Planning

Mineral Resources

Noise

Population & Housing

Public Services

Recreation

Transportation

Tribal Cultural Resources

Utilities & Service Systems

Wildfire

Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that 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.
- On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

Robert Hingtgen

January 6, 2022

Signature

Date

Robert Hingtgen

Printed Name

Land Use/Environmental Planner

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

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. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups.

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.

Less Than Significant Impact: The viewshed and visible components of the landscape within that viewshed, including the underlying landform and overlaying land cover, establish the visual environment for the scenic vista. The visual environment of the subject scenic vista extends along the Santa Margarita River riparian corridor. The visual composition is that of rugged topography with the narrow Sandia Creek and the Santa Margarita River riparian corridors cutting through steep slopes in native chaparral or coastal sage scrub habitat that rise approximately 350 feet above the water courses to low density residential and agricultural land uses.

The proposed project is the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of the current crossing. Based on photo simulations provided by DUDEK (DUDEK, October 2021), the new bridge will be integrated into the landscape and will not change the overall view of the river corridor by neighboring residences in the area which are out of the line of sight from the current crossing and replacement bridge. The area of the existing crossing will be revegetated with riparian corridor species following demolition and there will be no noticeable addition to roadway footprint in the area. Construction activities for and the resulting temporary trail would not comprise a visible component of the project site from the surrounding area. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. Impacts would be less than significant.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the project has a less than significant impact and no known past, present, or future projects were found within the surrounding viewshed.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic ([Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program](#)). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

No Impact: The proposed project occurs in a rugged and rural area that does not contain any roads listed as part of the County Scenic Highway System (San Diego County General Plan, Table COS-1). The closest designated scenic highway roads are south of Fallbrook and to the east (Interstate-15) going through Rainbow. The project site and surrounding area is not viewable from those designated scenic roads. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources within a state scenic highway nor would it contribute to potential cumulative impacts.

c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding can be characterized as that of rugged topography with the narrow Sandia Creek and the Santa Margarita River riparian corridors cutting through steep slopes covered in native chaparral or coastal sage scrub habitat that rise approximately 350 feet above the water courses.

The proposed project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character. On the contrary, upon completion of the new bridge, it is expected to improve the visual character

of the area through removal of the old and outdated existing box culvert crossing on Sandia Creek Drive and replacement with a new steel and concrete bridge located 160 feet downstream of the existing crossing location. During construction, views within the immediate area may be altered by the presence of construction equipment, grading, and vegetation removal required to remove and replace the existing crossing. However, this work will last for approximately two years and the footprint of the bridge that is removed will be recontoured and revegetated following construction. Impacts to biological resources will also be mitigated in part through revegetation onsite (see Section IV. Biological Resources below). Therefore, impacts related to visual character and quality would be less than significant.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts to visual character because the project has a less than significant impact and no known past, present, or future projects were found within the surrounding viewshed.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project will not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or night-time views in this area. Lighting during evening construction may be needed. However, measures AES-1 through AES-2 will be implemented to reduce the potential for impacts associated with the temporary use of lighting to less than significant. No lighting would be required for construction and operation of the temporary trail. Thus, impacts related to light and glare would be less than significant with this mitigation during construction.

AES-1 Lighting. Contractor will direct lighting away from residential units to the north of project site. To address potential for construction lighting after sunset, San Diego County will require the construction contractor to develop a Construction Monitoring plan to include:

- Monitoring of lighting levels on the north bank of the river at junction of Sandia Creek Drive and Rock Mountain Drive.
- Directing construction lights away from the north bank of the river channel;
- Placing lights at the lowest feasible level relative to the ground surface to provide adequate working light.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Planning & Development Services and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the project has a less than significant impact and no known past, present, or future projects were found within the surrounding viewshed.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map from the California Resources Agency (2016) shows that the project area does not fall within Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance designations. The closest farmland designation is Unique Farmland (irrigated) and Farmland of Local Interest (not irrigated) to the northeast of the project area approximately 1.5 miles but not impacting it. The project consists of the removal of an older box culvert river crossing and replacement with a new steel bridge approximately 160 feet downstream of the existing crossing. Therefore, the project will not convert or impact any of these Farmlands.

- b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project site and surrounding mainly riparian lands are zoned S80 (Open Space), which is not considered to be an agricultural zone. Surrounding lands above the riparian corridors are zoned A70 (Limited Agriculture). The project site's land is not under

a Williamson Act Contract and the nearest offsite Williamson Contract lands are approximately 0.7 miles to the west-northwest. Therefore, the project does not 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 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge that will be located approximately 160 feet downstream of the current crossing. The project site contains forest lands consisting of Coast Live Oak Woodland, Eucalyptus Woodland, Southern Cottonwood-Willow Riparian Forest, and Southern Willow Scrub habitats. However, the project is the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita Rive that will not conflict with the existing zoning or cause rezoning of the site or surrounding area. The County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for or cause the rezoning of forest land, timberland or Timberland Production Zones.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project site including any offsite improvements contain forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g). Specifically, the project site contains Coast Live Oak Woodland, Eucalyptus Woodland, Southern Cottonwood-Willow Riparian Forest, and Southern Willow Scrub habitats.

Forest lands are carbon sinks, or a “reservoir “that accumulates and stores carbon-containing chemical compounds for an indefinite period. Clearing forests causes carbon in vegetation biomass to be converted to CO2 and emitted to the atmosphere. Maintaining and enhancing forest lands is one way to avoid carbon emissions and sequester carbon containing compounds which can play a role in managing climate change (see VII. Greenhouse Gases for a more comprehensive discussion of greenhouse gases and climate change).

Project implementation will result in direct and temporary impacts to 0.89 acres of Southern Cottonwood-Willow Riparian Forest, 0.84 acres of Southern Willow Scrub, 0.27 acres of Coast Live Oak Woodland, and 0.28 acres of Eucalyptus Woodland. However, the project will mitigate these impacts at ratios shown in Tables 7 and 8 of the Biological Resources Letter Report. Eucalyptus Woodland does not require mitigation.

Therefore, project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

- e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project is the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of the current crossing. The project site, surrounding riparian area, and other nearby lands are mapped as Other Land. There is land mapped as Unique Farmland 900 feet to the north, and Farmland of Local Importance 2,000 feet to the east as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. These lands lay at approximately 250 feet higher in elevation than the project site and will not be impacted by the project that would result in conversion of those lands or resources to non-agricultural use. Therefore, no Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance, or active agricultural operations will be converted to a non-agricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Comments: CalEEMod Modeling was conducted by County Staff (see attached reference)

Less than Significant Impact: The Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP), developed by the San Diego County Air Pollution Control

District, rely on the San Diego Association of Government's (SANDAG's) growth projections. The growth projections are developed based on projected buildout of land uses identified in the County's General Plan and for other cities' long range planning documents. Because the RAQS and SIP project future air quality conditions based on growth projections of the County's General Plan, a project that generates equivalent or fewer emissions than what is allowable under its existing General Plan designation would also comply with the RAQS and SIP. According to the 2016 RAQS, mobile sources are the largest contributor to air quality emissions, specifically emissions generated from operations of typical residential and commercial developments, and therefore can be used to define project intensity (i.e., land use types and sizes impacts the level of mobile emissions).

The proposed project is a replacement of an existing box culvert road crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of the current crossing. Temporary air emissions would be produced during project construction activities, as discussed in response 3 (b): Air Quality. However, no new development is proposed, and no long-term emissions from mobile or other sources would be produced once the construction activities are complete. The project is consistent with the intended use of the site and, therefore, consistent with the regional growth projections by SANDAG and those used in the development of the RAQS and SIP. The project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the RAQS or SIP.

b) 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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS, respectively) for ozone (O₃). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM₁₀) and concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 2.5 microns (PM_{2.5}) under the CAAQS. O₃ is formed when Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs) and oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} in both urban and rural areas include motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

The California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) Version 2020.4.0 was used to estimate emissions for the construction phase of the project. The peak construction scenario was modeled as part of the analysis. Inputs into the emissions model included specific construction activities, timing, and types and numbers of construction equipment.

CalEEMod only allows pre-set land use types in the model, therefore, the user defined land use type was selected. The size of the project input into CalEEMod was 15 acres. Table 1 below shows each construction phase for the project, the number of days for each construction phase, and the type and number of equipment used in each phase that was modelled in CalEEMod. The equipment usage includes all phases of construction and associated activities. Material import and export is expected during all phases of construction except during paving.

Table 1. Construction Phases and Equipment Modelled in CalEEMod

Construction Phase	Number of Construction Phase Days	Type of Construction Equipment Used	Number of Construction Equipment Used	Construction Equipment Hours per Day Usage
Site Preparation	44	Air Compressors	1	4
		Forklifts	1	8
		Generator Sets	2	8
		Graders	2	6
		Plate Compactors	1	4
		Scrapers	4	6
		Tractors/Loaders/Bac khoes	2	4
Grading	33	Excavators	2	8
		Forklifts	1	4
		Generator Sets	1	8
		Tractors/Loaders/Bac khoes	1	8
Construction-Substructure	131	Bore/Drill Rigs	1	8
		Cranes	2	8
		Excavators	4	6
		Generator Sets	1	4
		Graders	2	6
		Rollers	8	8
		Scrapers	4	4
		Tractors/Loaders/Bac khoes	3	6
Roadway Construction	55	Generator Sets	1	8
		Pavers	2	8
		Rollers	1	8
		Tractors/Loaders/Bac khoes	2	8
Construction-Superstructure	75	Air Compressors	2	4
		Cranes	2	8
		Forklifts	1	4
		Generator Sets	1	8
		Graders	2	6
		Plate Compactors	1	4
		Pressure Washers	1	4

		Rollers	3	8
		Scrapers	4	4
		Tractors/Loaders/Bac khoes	4	8
Paving	12	Pavers	1	7
Demolition	20	Concrete/Industrial Saws	2	8
		Concrete/Industrial Saws	1	6
		Cranes	1	6
		Rubber Tired Dozers	2	8
		Tractors/Loaders/Bac khoes	2	6

Project specific off-road equipment, truck trips, and worker trips and lengths were considered for the modeling. Fugitive dust control measures recommended by the County of San Diego were also added to the modeling. Based on the modeling exercise, the project would temporarily contribute VOG, PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, NO_x, Carbon Monoxide (CO), and Oxides of Sulfur (SO_x) emissions during construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening-level thresholds (SLTs) as shown in Table 2 below (see CalEEMod file, October 25, 2021). The SLTs were adopted from the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) trigger level thresholds to be protective of NAAQS. Thus, air emissions below the SLTs would meet the NAAQS. The NAAQS were developed to protect public health, specifically the health of “sensitive” populations, including asthmatics, children, and the elderly. The County of San Diego adopted the SDAPCD’s trigger levels as SLTs to be protective of public health.

Table 2. Construction Emissions Compared to Screening Level Thresholds

Year	VOC	NO _x	CO	SO _x	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2022	7.2	74.1	71.2	<1	4.3	3.3
2023	5.1	49.8	45.9	<1	3.4	2.3
Maximum Daily Construction Emissions (lbs/day)	7	74	71	<1	4	3
Threshold of Significance (lbs/day) or SLT	75**	250	550	250	100	55*
Significant Impact?	No	No	No	No	No	No

* EPA “Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards” published September 8, 2005.

**Threshold for VOCs based on the threshold of significance for VOCs from the South Coast Air Quality Management District for the Coachella Valley.

Grading activities associated with construction of the project would be subject to the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, which require the implementation of dust control measures. The project would not have any operational emissions as it is a bridge replacement, and it would not change operations relative to current conditions.

Construction of the temporary trail will utilize only hand tools including shovel, rake, Mattock, Pulaski and limited chain saw use for vegetation trimming.

Cumulative impacts could occur if the most intensive phases of construction for the proposed project occur simultaneously with other intensive phases of proposed projects in close proximity. The most intensive construction phase for the project and for typical developments occurs during earthwork and grading activities. During these phases, the primary criteria air pollutant of concern would be PM₁₀. There are no known cumulative projects in the vicinity that would be constructed at the same time as the project or in close proximity to the project such that the temporary construction emissions would overlap. Further, due to the highly dispersive nature of particulate matter, a cumulative impact during construction activities would only occur if a project adjacent to the proposed project undergoes simultaneous grading/earthwork activities and emits significantly greater PM₁₀ emissions than the project. Because all projects developed within the County would be required to comply with the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55, this scenario is not anticipated to occur.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

Less Than Significant Impact: The closest sensitive receptor to the project site are users of the main trail system in the Santa Margarita Trail Preserve. Emissions of potentially harmful pollutants, including diesel particulate matter (DPM) and fugitive dust, would be generated on-site during construction activities. However, the project would be required to comply with the County Grading Ordinance and SDAPCD Rule 55 which would reduce potential emissions of fugitive dust. Usage of the onsite (new temporary trail) and nearby trails is expected to be highest on weekends when construction activities are not anticipated to occur. In addition, the project-related modeling showed that unmitigated emissions would be well below applicable thresholds as shown in Table 1 above). Construction emissions would be temporary and would not expose sensitive receptors to harmful concentrations of air pollutants.

As indicated in response 3 (b): Air Quality, the trigger level thresholds developed by the SDAPCD and adopted by the County as SLTs would not be exceeded by project construction and sensitive receptors would not be exposed to an incremental health risk. As described earlier, the County's SLTs were adopted to align with the NAAQS, which were developed to be protective of human health. Because the project would not exceed

the County's SLTs, no adverse health impacts would occur especially of sensitive populations.

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the San Diego County Guidelines, land uses associated with odor complaints typically include agricultural uses, wastewater treatment plants, food processing plants, chemical plants, composting, refineries, landfills, dairies, and fiberglass molding. As a bridge replacement project, the proposed project does not include any uses identified by the Air Quality Guidelines as being associated with odors. Thus, operation of the proposed project is not expected to result in objectionable odors for future residents or for the neighboring uses. Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include the use of architectural coatings and solvents, and exhaust from diesel equipment. During construction of the proposed project, such odors would be a temporary source of nuisance to adjacent uses but would not affect a substantial number of people. The construction lay-down and access points are not close to the main trail system in the Santa Margarita Trail Preserve as they will be located across Sandia Creek Drive, very close to the bridge installation site. In addition, usage of the onsite (new temporary trail) and nearby trails is expected to be highest on weekends when construction activities are not anticipated to occur. Thus, the emissions from diesel equipment would dissipate with the increase in distance between the source and the receptor. As odors associated with project construction would be temporary and intermittent in nature, and dissipate from the source over increasing distance, the odors would not be a significant environmental impact. Therefore, impacts are less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, 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 CDFW, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Report (DUDEK, December 2021), it has been determined that the site, and surrounding area, supports native vegetation, including Diegan coastal sage scrub, granitic chamise chaparral, scrub oak

chaparral, non-native grassland, southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, southern willow scrub, and coast live oak woodland habitat. One special status plant species, chaparral sand-verbena (*Abronia villosa* var. *aurita*), was observed within the study area, but outside the proposed impact area. Special status wildlife species observed within and in the direct vicinity of the study area include Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperi*), southwestern pond turtle (*Actinemys pallida*), great blue heron (*Ardea Herodias*), San Diegan tiger whiptail (*Aspidoscelis tigris stejnegeri*), yellow-breasted chat (*Icteria virens*), osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*), double-crested cormorant (*Phalacrocorax auratus*), yellow warbler (*Setophaga petechia*), least Bell's vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*), orange-throated whiptail (*Aspidoscelis hyperythra*), and southern California legless lizard (*Anniella stebbinsi*). The study area also contains U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)-designated Critical Habitat for arroyo toad, least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, and coastal California gnatcatcher.

Direct impacts to special-status plants are not expected to occur. Potential indirect impacts to special-status plants could result from generation of fugitive dust, changes in hydrology, increased human activity, introduction of non-native species, and introduction of chemical pollutants. Clearing, trampling, or grading impacts to special-status plants outside of designated construction zones could occur in the absence of proper avoidance and mitigation measures. The Project would result in the temporary and permanent direct loss of habitat, including foraging habitat, for special-status wildlife species that are present or have a high or moderate potential to occur within the study area. Permanent direct impacts would occur to USFWS-designated critical habitat for arroyo toad, least Bell's vireo, southwestern willow flycatcher, and coastal California gnatcatcher. Construction activities could result in direct impacts to special-status wildlife species individuals if present within the impact area during construction activities such as initial grading or clearing and grubbing of vegetation, and during removal and replacement of the existing box culvert crossing. Potential indirect impacts to special-status wildlife species may result from generation of fugitive dust, introduction of chemical pollutants, changes in hydrology, increased predation, noise, increased human activity, and artificial lighting.

Construction of the temporary trail will utilize hand tools including shovels, rakes, Mattock, Pulaski and limited chain saw for vegetation trimming. The trail is anticipated to be constructed during early 2022 following approval of the grading plan and ahead of the start of bridge construction, in an area that has existing disturbance. The trail alignment does not include riparian or stream channel impact but is primarily located in scrub oak chaparral habitat. The anticipated construction timing is outside of the nesting bird season which would minimize the likelihood of encounter or disturbance. However, a biological monitor would be required to be on site to flush wildlife from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and ground-disturbing activities, thus avoiding and minimizing the potential for direct impacts to protected birds and other special-status wildlife.

Impacts to special-status plant species will be mitigated through biological monitoring, installation of temporary construction fencing or flagging, revegetation, establishment of environmentally sensitive areas (ESA), and implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs). Impacts to special-status wildlife species will be mitigated through biological

monitoring; installation of temporary construction fencing or flagging; obtaining take authorization for listed species; breeding season avoidance for nesting birds and riparian nesting birds; implementation of avoidance measures for special-status reptiles, arroyo toad, southern California steelhead, arroyo chub, special-status bats, and special-status rodents; revegetation; and implementation of BMPs related to hydrology and water quality. Therefore, impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species are less than significant with mitigation incorporated. Please see the Biological Resources Letter Report for additional details regarding analysis, identification of impacts, and mitigation measures.

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Report (DUDEK, December 2021), it has been determined that the site, and surrounding area, supports native vegetation, including Diegan coastal sage scrub, granitic chamise chaparral, scrub oak chaparral, non-native grassland, southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, southern willow scrub, and coast live oak woodland habitat.

Direct permanent impacts would occur to 0.75 acres of sensitive vegetation communities, including scrub oak chaparral, non-native grassland, southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, southern willow scrub, and coast live oak woodland, as a result of project construction. Direct temporary impacts would occur to 2.44 acres of sensitive vegetation communities, including non-native grassland, southern cottonwood-willow riparian forest, southern willow scrub, and coast live oak woodland, as result of project construction. Additionally, 0.02 acres of non-vegetated channel would be permanently impacted, and 0.28 acres of non-vegetated channel (0.11 acres) and fresh water (0.17 acres) would be temporarily impacted. Potential short-term indirect impacts to sensitive vegetation communities would primarily result from construction activities, including the generation of fugitive dust, increased human activity during construction, and the introduction of chemical pollutants. Potential long-term indirect impacts to sensitive vegetation communities would be those occurring after construction and would include changes in hydrology resulting from construction, including sedimentation and erosion.

Construction of the temporary trail will utilize hand tools including shovels, rakes, Mattock, Pulaski and limited chain saw for vegetation trimming. The trail is anticipated to be constructed during early 2022 following approval of the grading plan and ahead of the start of bridge construction, in an area that has existing disturbance. The trail alignment does not include riparian or stream channel impact but is primarily located in scrub oak chaparral habitat. The anticipated construction timing is outside of the nesting bird season

which would minimize the likelihood of encounter or disturbance. However, a biological monitor would be required to be on site to flush wildlife from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and ground-disturbing activities, thus avoiding and minimizing the potential for direct impacts to protected birds and other special-status wildlife.

Impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities will be mitigated through biological monitoring, installation of temporary construction fencing or flagging, revegetation, implementation of BMPs, and implementation of specific channel protection measures (see mitigation measures in the Biological Resources Letter Report by DUDEK, December 2021). Therefore, impacts to riparian habitat and other sensitive natural communities are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and a Biological Resource Report (DUDEK, December 2021), it has been determined that the study area supports one perennial drainage, the Santa Margarita River, and smaller ephemeral drainages present within the northeastern project buffer area. The study area contains approximately 28.60 acres of jurisdictional resources which includes 6.10 acres of USACE/RWQCB jurisdictional non-wetland waters of the United States, 11.75 acres of USACE/RWQCB jurisdictional adjacent wetlands, and 10.75 acres of CDFW jurisdictional riparian area.

The proposed project would result in direct permanent impacts to approximately 0.54 acres of jurisdictional resources and direct temporary impacts to 1.79 acres of jurisdictional resources, including CDFW riparian habitat adjacent to jurisdictional waters. These areas are also considered RPO wetlands. However, the project is exempt from the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO) of San Diego County (2007) pursuant to Section 86.604 (5). According to Section 86.604, crossings of wetlands for roads, driveways, or pathways necessary to access adjacent lands, and which are dedicated and improved to the limitations and standards under the County Trails Program, shall be allowed provided criteria (aa) through (ff) are met. Section 86.604 states that if no reasonable use of the sensitive land would be permitted by the RPO regulations, then an encroachment may be allowed to the minimum extent necessary (County 2007). The project meets conditions (aa) through (ff) for the permitted uses of wetlands.

Impacts to jurisdictional resources would be mitigated through revegetation, implementation of BMPs, implementation of specific channel protection measures, and notification to the appropriate resource agencies and obtaining of permits if necessary (see mitigation measures in the Biological Resources Letter Report by DUDEK,

December 2021). Therefore, impacts to federally protected wetlands are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

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?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant Impact: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, the County's Comprehensive Matrix of Sensitive Species, and a Biological Resource Report (DUDEK, December 2021), it has been determined that implementation of the proposed project would be expected to improve wildlife movement through the study area. The existing concrete box culvert structure beneath Sandia Creek Drive acts as a major impediment to Southern California steelhead movement along the Santa Margarita River. The improved steel bridge structure will enable Southern California steelhead migration between the ocean and upstream freshwater spawning and rearing habitats.

No significant negative direct temporary or permanent impacts would occur to wildlife movement or use of native wildlife nursery sites associated with the implementation of the proposed project. The existing habitat linkage and wildlife corridor functions would remain intact while construction activities are conducted. Following completion of the project, habitat linkages and wildlife corridor functions will have been enhanced for aquatic and terrestrial species. As the existing crossing structure will be replaced with a structure larger in size and higher above the ground, less fragmentation of riparian habitat along the river and improved water flow will allow for unimpeded wildlife movement on the ground and in the water. There would be no permanent indirect impacts to wildlife movement as a result of construction activities. Some indirect temporary impacts to localized wildlife movement could occur due to construction-related noise and presence of construction crew within the project area; however, these impacts would be temporary and would not be expected to significantly disrupt wildlife movement due to the small project footprint in relation to the surrounding habitat, and the ability for wildlife to avoid the impact area.

Therefore, impacts to wildlife movement and nursery sites are less than significant.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records and a Biological Resource Report (DUDEK, December 2021), it has been determined that project construction of the new bridge would be subject to regulations that minimize tree removal during excavation and compliance with ordinances protecting biological resources. In order to protect the shallow root systems of oak trees, County guidelines require that the project include a minimum 50-foot oak root protection zone between the dripline of the oak tree and the nearest ground disturbance (i.e., grading or trenching). Impacts from ground disturbance and compaction in the oak root protection zone will result in proportional impacts to the oak woodland. Where a project results in ground disturbance or compaction within the oak woodland or oak root protection zone, the impact must be mitigated at a 3:1 ratio with oak woodland habitat.

The project will result in permanent direct impacts to 0.23 acres of coast live oak woodland habitat, plus 0.26 acres of the oak root zone. Impacts to these resources will be mitigated through revegetation at a 3:1 ratio. With a 3:1 required mitigation ratio for these impacts, 0.78 acres of the mitigation site will be targeted for 150 oak sapling plantings (approximately 200 oak saplings/acre). Therefore, impacts are less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

- f) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: Refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist dated January 6, 2022 for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan, including, Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: Currently, the project site is undeveloped and does not contain any structures besides the existing Sandia Creek Drive box culvert crossing constructed in 1980 by San Diego County. Based on an analysis of County of San Diego archaeology resource files, archaeological records obtained by DUDEK (March 14, 2019), maps, and aerial photographs, and a field survey by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Sandra Pentney on August 20, 2021, and December 7, 2021, it has been determined that the project site does not contain any historical resources. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any impact on historical resources

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Although no archaeological resources have been identified on the project site through review of archaeological records review by DUDEK (March 14, 2019), and a field survey by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Sandra Pentney on August 20, 2021, and December 7, 2021 there is a potential for obscured or subsurface resources that may qualify as historical resources and/or unique archaeological resources pursuant to CEQA to occur. Disturbance of such resources would be considered a potentially significant impact Therefore the project will be conditioned to monitor all grading and clearing activities for potential cultural resources.

However, incorporation of mitigation measures **CULT#GR-1** through **CULT#GR-6**, described below, would reduce potential project-related impacts to subsurface archaeological deposits to a less than significant level.

PRE-CONSTRUCTION GRADING AND/OR IMPROVEMENTS: *(Prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances.)*

CULT#GR-1 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING

INTENT: In order to mitigate for potential impacts to undiscovered buried archaeological resources on the project site, a grading monitoring program and potential data recovery program shall be implemented pursuant to the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Cultural Resources and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Sections 15064.5 and 15064.7. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** A County Approved Principal Investigator (PI) known as the "Project Archaeologist," shall be contracted to perform cultural resource grading monitoring and a potential data recovery program during all grading, clearing, grubbing, trenching, and construction activities (including for the temporary trail). The following shall be completed:

- a. The Project Archaeologist shall perform the monitoring duties before, during and after construction pursuant to the most current version of the County of San Diego

Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Requirements for Cultural Resources. The Project Archaeologist and Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American monitor shall also evaluate fill soils to determine that they are clean of cultural resources. The contract or letter of acceptance provided to the County shall include an agreement that the archaeological monitoring will be completed, and a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Project Archaeologist and the County of San Diego shall be executed. The contract or letter of acceptance shall include a cost estimate for the monitoring work and reporting.

- b. The Project Archeologist shall provide evidence that a Kumeyaay and Luiseño Native American has been contracted by the property owner or their representative to perform Native American Monitoring for the project. Tribal monitoring shall be conducted on a rotation basis as outlined in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
- c. The cost of the monitoring shall be added to the grading bonds or bonded separately.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall provide a copy of the Archaeological Monitoring Contract or letter of acceptance, copy of the Tribal monitoring contract, cost estimate, and MOU to [PDS, PPD]. Additionally, the cost amount of the monitoring work shall be added to the grading bond cost estimate. **TIMING:** Prior to approval of any grading and or improvement plans and issuance of any Grading or Construction Permits. **MONITORING:** [PDS, PPD] shall review the contracts or letter of acceptance, MOU and cost estimate or separate bonds for compliance with this condition. The cost estimate should be forwarded to [PDS, PPD] for inclusion in the grading bond cost estimate, and grading bonds and the grading monitoring requirement shall be made a condition of the issuance of the grading or construction permit.

CULT#GR-2 - CULTURAL RESOURCES TREATMENT AGREEMENT AND PRESERVATION PLAN

INTENT: In order to mitigate for impacts to Traditional Cultural Properties, develop and enter into a Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan with culturally-affiliated Tribes. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** A single Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall be developed between the applicant or their representative, the County of San Diego, and culturally-affiliated Tribes. The Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall be reviewed and agreed to by the County prior to final signature and authorization. The Cultural Resources Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall include but is not limited to the following:

- a. Parties entering into the agreement and contact information.

- b. Responsibilities of the Property Owner or their representative, Principal Investigator, archaeological monitors, Kumeyaay and Luiseño Native American monitors, and consulting tribes.
- c. Requirements of the Archaeological Monitoring Program including unanticipated discoveries. The requirements shall address grading and grubbing requirements including controlled grading and controlled vegetation removal in areas of cultural sensitivity, and analysis of identified cultural materials. In addition, rotation of tribal monitors shall be addressed. The Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall establish a rotation schedule for Tribal monitors.
- d. Excavated soils. Soils are to stay onsite. Consultation with the culturally-affiliated tribes shall occur should excavated soils need to be exported offsite.
- e. Treatment of identified Native American cultural materials. Any identified Native American cultural materials with the exception of Native American human remains and associated grave goods (described in item g below) are to be reburied onsite. The Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall identify a suitable location for reburial of cultural materials should they be encountered and recovered during construction monitoring. Should the reburial area be required, the location shall be recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms, and an open space easement shall be dedicated for the protection of the resources in perpetuity. If the proposed reburial location is not required, then neither recordation on DPR forms, nor dedication of an open space easement over the proposed location is required.
- f. Deed restriction. Details of the requirement for a deed restriction for reburial of identified Native American cultural materials. The requirements shall address protection of Native American cultural materials, access, and responsibilities for management and maintenance of the open space.
- g. Treatment of Native American human remains and associated grave goods. Consultation with the Most Likely Descendant (MLD) pursuant to Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered. The Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan shall identify a suitable location for reburial of human remains, sacred items, and funerary items, should they be encountered and recovered during construction monitoring. Should the reburial area be required, the location shall be recorded on Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms, and an open space easement shall be dedicated for the protection of the resources in perpetuity. If the proposed reburial location is not required, then neither recordation on DPR forms, nor dedication of an open space easement over the proposed location is required.
- h. Confidentiality of cultural information including location and data.

- i. Revegetation Plan. Revegetation Plan review by culturally-affiliated tribes. A revegetation plan for the project shall take into consideration the unique relationship Native American Tribes have with the natural environment. Consulting tribes may request that certain native species be used over others in accordance with their tribal values.
- j. Interpretive signage. The applicant shall work with the tribes to establish interpretive signage along final trail alignments associated with the project. The signage shall include culturally appropriate information on why the area is important to the tribes, and assist the public to understand the project area within its regional context.
- k. Negotiation of disagreements should they arise during the implementation of the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
- l. Regulations that apply to cultural resources that have been identified or may be identified during project construction.

DOCUMENTATION: A copy of the implemented agreement shall be submitted to the [PDS, PPD] for approval. **TIMING:** Prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances. **MONITORING:** The [PDS, PPD] shall review the implemented agreement for compliance this condition.

CULT#GR-3 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING – PRECONSTRUCTION MEETING

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Significance – Cultural Resources, an Archaeological Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The County approved Project Archaeologist, and Kumeyaay and Luiseño Native American Monitor shall attend the pre-construction meeting with the contractors to explain and coordinate the requirements of the archaeological monitoring program. The Project Archaeologist and, Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American Monitor shall monitor the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits in all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. The Project Archaeologist, and Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American monitor shall also evaluate fill soils to determine that they are clean of cultural resources. The archaeological monitoring program shall comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources and as outlined in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan. **DOCUMENTATION:** The applicant shall have the contracted Project Archeologist and Kumeyaay and Luiseño Native American attend the preconstruction meeting to explain the monitoring requirements. **TIMING:** Prior to any clearing, grubbing, trenching, grading, or any land disturbances this condition shall be completed. **MONITORING:** The [DPW, PDCI] shall confirm the attendance of the approved Project Archaeologist.

DURING CONSTRUCTION: *(The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the grading construction).*

CULT#GR-4 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING – DURING CONSTRUCTION

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, a Cultural Resource Grading Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Archaeologist, and Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American Monitor shall monitor the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits in all areas identified for development including off-site improvements. The archaeological monitoring program shall comply with the following requirements during earth-disturbing activities (including construction of the temporary trail):

- a. **Monitoring.** During the original cutting of previously undisturbed deposits, the Project Archaeologist, and Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American Monitor shall be onsite as determined necessary by the Project Archaeologist. Inspections will vary based on the rate of excavation, the materials excavated, and the presence and abundance of artifacts and features. The frequency and location of inspections will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American Monitor. Monitoring of the cutting of previously disturbed deposits will be determined by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American Monitor.
- b. **Inadvertent Discoveries.** In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered:
 1. The Project Archaeologist or the Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American monitor, shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area of discovery to allow evaluation of potentially significant cultural resources.
 2. At the time of discovery, the Project Archaeologist shall contact the PDS Staff Archaeologist and culturally-affiliated tribes as identified in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
 3. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist, tribal monitor(s), and the tribal representative(s) to discuss the significance of the find. Optionally, the County Archaeologist may attend the meeting to discuss the significance of the find.
 4. All ground disturbance activities within 100 feet of the discovered cultural resources shall be halted until a meeting is convened between the developer, the project archaeologist, tribal monitor(s), and the tribal representative(s) to

- discuss the significance of the find. Optionally, the County Archaeologist may attend the meeting to discuss the significance of the find.
5. Construction activities shall not resume in the area of discovery until an agreement has been reached by all parties as to appropriate mitigation. Work shall be allowed to continue outside of the buffer area and shall be monitored.
 6. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. The isolates and/or non-significant deposits shall be reburied onsite as identified in the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan.
 7. Treatment and avoidance of the newly discovered resources shall be consistent with the Treatment Agreement and Preservation Plan entered into with the appropriate tribes. This may include avoidance of the cultural resources through project design, in-place preservation of cultural resources located in native soils and/or re-burial on the Project property so they are not subject to further disturbance in perpetuity.
 8. If cultural resources are identified, one or more of the following treatments, in order of preference, shall be employed:
 - a. Preservation in place of the Cultural Resources, if feasible. Preservation in place means avoiding the resources, leaving them in place where they were found with no development affecting the integrity of the resources.
 - b. Reburial of the resources on the project property. The measures for reburial shall include, at least, the following:
 - Measures and provisions to protect the future reburial area from any impacts in perpetuity.
 - Reburial shall not occur until all legally required cataloging and basic recordation have been completed, with the exception that sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains are excluded.
 - Any reburial process shall be culturally appropriate.
 - Listing of contents and location of the reburial shall be included in the confidential appendix of the Monitoring Report.
 - The Monitoring Report shall be filed with the County under a confidential cover and is not subject to Public Records requests.
 - c. If preservation in place or reburial is not feasible, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program (Program) shall be prepared by the Project Archaeologist in consultation with the Tribe, and the Kumeyaay and Luiseño Native American Monitor and approved by the County Archaeologist prior to implementation. There shall be no destructive or invasive testing on sacred items, burial goods, and Native American human remains. Results concerning finds of any inadvertent discoveries shall be included in the Monitoring Report.

Pursuant to Calif. Pub. Res. Code § 21083.2(b) avoidance is the preferred method of preservation for archaeological resources and cultural resources. If the landowner and the Tribe(s) cannot agree on the significance or the mitigation for the archaeological or cultural resources, these issues will be presented to the Planning & Development Services Director for decision. The Planning & Development Services Director shall make the determination based on the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act with respect to archaeological resources, recommendations of the project archeologist and shall take into account the cultural and religious principles and practices of the Tribe.

c. **Human Remains.** If any human remains are discovered:

1. The Property Owner or their representative shall contact the County Coroner and the PDS Staff Archaeologist.
2. Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the human remains are to be taken offsite for evaluation, they shall be accompanied by the Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American monitor.
3. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the NAHC shall immediately contact the Most Likely Descendant (MLD).
4. The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the MLD regarding their recommendations as required by Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted.
5. The MLD may with the permission of the landowner, or their authorized representative, inspect the site of the discovery of the Native American human remains and may recommend to the owner or the person responsible for the excavation work means for treatment or disposition, with appropriate dignity, of the human remains and any associated grave goods. The descendants shall complete their inspection and make recommendations or preferences for treatment within 48 hours of being granted access to the site.
6. Public Resources Code §5097.98, CEQA §15064.5 and Health & Safety Code §7050.5 shall be followed in the event that human remains are discovered.

d. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** If tribal cultural resources are discovered, the Project Archaeologist shall conduct consultation with culturally-affiliated tribes to determine the most appropriate mitigation. Should the two parties not be able to reach consensus, then the County Archaeologist shall consider the concerns of

the culturally-affiliated tribe and the Project Archaeologist, and the Director of Planning & Development Services shall make a final decision regarding appropriate mitigation.

- e. **Fill Soils.** The Project Archaeologist, and Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American monitor shall evaluate fill soils to determine that they are clean of cultural resources.
- f. **Monthly Reporting.** The Project Archaeologist shall submit monthly status reports to the Director of Planning and Development Services starting from the date of the Notice to Proceed to termination of implementation of the archaeological monitoring program. The report shall briefly summarize all activities during the period and the status of progress on overall plan implementation. Upon completion of the implementation phase, a final report shall be submitted describing the plan compliance procedures and site conditions before and after construction.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall implement the Archaeological Monitoring Program pursuant to this condition. **TIMING:** The following actions shall occur throughout the duration of the earth disturbing activities. **MONITORING:** The [DPW, PDCI] shall make sure that the Project Archeologist is on-site performing the monitoring duties of this condition. The [DPW, PDCI] shall contact the [PDS, PPD] if the Project Archeologist or applicant fails to comply with this condition.

ROUGH GRADING: *(Prior to rough grading approval and issuance of any building permit.)*

CULT#GR-5 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING – ROUGH GRADING [PDS, FEE]

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, an Archaeological Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Archaeologist shall prepare one of the following reports upon completion of the earth-disturbing activities that require monitoring:

- a. **No Archaeological Resources Encountered.** If no archaeological resources are encountered during earth-disturbing activities, then submit a final Negative Monitoring Report substantiating that earth-disturbing activities are completed and no cultural resources were encountered. Archaeological monitoring logs showing the date and time that the monitor was on site and any comments from the Kumeyaay and/or Luiseño Native American Monitor must be included in the Negative Monitoring Report.
- b. **Archaeological Resources Encountered.** If archaeological resources were encountered during the earth disturbing activities, the Project Archaeologist shall provide an Archaeological Monitoring Report stating that the field monitoring activities have been completed, and that resources have been encountered. The

report shall detail all cultural artifacts and deposits discovered during monitoring and the anticipated time schedule for completion of the reburial and/or repatriation phase of the monitoring.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant shall submit the Archaeological Monitoring Report to [PDS, PPD] for review and approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center and any culturally-affiliated Tribe who requests a copy. **TIMING:** Upon completion of all earth-disturbing activities, and prior to Rough Grading Final Inspection (Grading Ordinance SEC 87.421.a.2), the report shall be completed. **MONITORING:** [PDS, PPD] shall review the report or field monitoring memo for compliance with the project MMRP, and inform [DPW, PDCI] that the requirement is completed.

FINAL GRADING RELEASE: *(Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit.)*

CULT#GR-6 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING – FINAL GRADING [PDS, FEE]

INTENT: In order to comply with the County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance and Report Format and Content Requirements for Cultural Resources, an Archaeological Monitoring Program shall be implemented. **DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT:** The Project Archaeologist shall prepare a final report that documents the results, analysis, and conclusions of all phases of the Archaeological Monitoring Program if cultural resources were encountered during earth-disturbing activities (including for the temporary trail). The report shall include the following, if applicable:

- a. Department of Parks and Recreation Primary and Archaeological Site forms.
 - b. Daily Monitoring Logs
 - c. Evidence that all Native American cultural materials in order of preference have been conveyed as follows:
 - (1) Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the archaeological monitoring program have been reburied.
- or
- (2) Evidence that all prehistoric materials collected during the grading monitoring program have been repatriated to a Native American group of appropriate tribal affinity. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the Native American tribe to whom the cultural resources have been repatriated identifying that the archaeological materials have been received.
- d. Evidence that all historic cultural materials have been conveyed as follows:

Historic materials shall be curated at a San Diego curation facility and shall not be curated at a Tribal curation facility or repatriated. The collections and associated records, including title, shall be transferred to the San Diego curation facility and shall be accompanied by payment of the fees necessary for permanent curation. Evidence shall be in the form of a letter from the curation facility stating that the historic materials have been received and that all fees have been paid.

- e. If no cultural resources are discovered, a Negative Monitoring Report must be submitted stating that the archaeological monitoring activities have been completed. Grading Monitoring Logs must be submitted with the negative monitoring report.

DOCUMENTATION: The applicant’s archaeologist shall prepare the final report and submit it to *[PDS, PPD]* for approval. Once approved, a final copy of the report shall be submitted to the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) and any culturally-affiliated Tribe who requests a copy. **TIMING:** Prior to any occupancy, final grading release, or use of the premises in reliance of this permit, the final report shall be prepared. **MONITORING:** *[PDS, PPD]* shall review the final report for compliance with this condition and the report format guidelines. Upon acceptance of the report, *[PDS, PPD]* shall inform *[PDS, LDR]* and *[DPW, PDCI]*, that the requirement is complete, and the bond amount can be relinquished. If the monitoring was bonded separately, then *[PDS, PPD]* shall inform *[PDS or DPW FISCAL]* to release the bond back to the applicant.

- c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Based on an analysis of records by DUDEK (March 14, 2019) and a field survey by County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Sandra Pentney on August 20, 2021, and December 7, 2021, no human remains have been located or are known to occur on the project site. There is no record of a formal cemetery on the project site. Due to the disturbance to the site from past grading excavation activities as well as construction of the existing Sandia Creek Drive box culvert crossing, the likelihood of encountering unknown buried is considered to be very low. Although unlikely, in the event of discovery of unanticipated human remains, the project contractor would be required to implement mitigation measures **CULT#GR-2 and CULT#GR-4**, which requires avoidance of all sacred sites, renouncement of the landowner’s ownership over all cultural resources, and compliance with PRC Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 (see description of these measures in the previous response). Therefore, with implementation of these measures, potential impacts associated with the disturbance of human remains would be less than significant.

VI. ENERGY. Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation No Impact
 Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would result in the use of energy resources during the construction phase. Construction phase activities include site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and demolition. Most energy consumption would result from operation of off-road construction equipment and on-road vehicle trips associated with commutes by construction workers and haul trucks trips. The construction equipment and number of workers were provided by the project applicant. Table 3 below shows the energy required in the form of diesel and gasoline. This energy demand would be temporary, limited, and cease upon completion of construction. Construction activities are not anticipated to involve consumption of natural gas.

Construction would be conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) engine emissions standards, which require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption, and limitations on engine idling times, etc.). Compliance with these regulations would minimize short-term energy demand during the project’s construction to the extent feasible. As such, the energy needs for project construction would be temporary and are not anticipated to require additional capacity or substantially increase peak or base period demands for electricity and other forms of energy. Associated energy consumption would be typical of that associated with bridge construction projects of this size in a rural setting.

Table 3 Construction Fuel Usage Summary

Construction Years	Gasoline (gal/year)	Diesel (gal/year)
2022	8,501	61,738
2023	3,902	15,440

Source: Modeling Conducted by San Diego County Staff

Once construction and demolition activities are complete and the site is restored there wouldn’t be any energy use associated with the project site because it is a replacement

of the bridge, and it wouldn't generate any new traffic beyond current conditions. The project would not result in wasteful or inefficient use of energy.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: Relevant plans that pertain to the efficient use of energy include the Energy Efficiency Action Plan, which focuses on energy efficiency. As noted, construction activities would be conducted in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations (e.g., USEPA and CARB engine emissions standards, which require highly efficient combustion systems that maximize fuel efficiency and reduce unnecessary fuel consumption, and limitations on engine idling times, etc.). Compliance with these regulations would reduce short-term energy demand during the project's construction to the extent feasible and increase the project's energy efficiency. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No impact would occur.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause 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.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project is not located in or near a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: All of San Diego County is located within Seismic Zone 4 (Sec. 1629.4.1 of the California Building Code [CBC]), which is the highest Seismic Zone and, like most of Southern California, is subject to ground shaking. Geophysical survey and geologic reconnaissance of the geotechnical field investigation was performed by the geotechnical firm Southwest Geophysics, Inc. for Diaz Yourman and Associates in 2018 (see Appendix B of the Geotechnical Report prepared by Leighton Consulting, Inc. for KPFF dated December 13, 2019). Analysis of the geotechnical investigation was completed, and preliminary geotechnical conclusions and recommendations. No known active faults are located within the proposed bridge footprint, and the proposed bridge footprint is not located within the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone ([APEFZ]; California Geological Survey [CGS], formerly California Division of Mines and Geology, 2001). The closest major faults are Elsinore (Temecula, FID #378) at 13.09 km; Elsinore (Glen Ivy; FID #365) at 15.48 mi and Elsinore (Julian, FID # 390) at 5.96 miles. The results of the seismic survey indicate that the locations tested within the riverbed show approximately 10 to 20 feet of soil over weathered rock-like material. Therefore, the possibility of surface rupture at the proposed bridge is low. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking.

iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is located within a “Potential Liquefaction Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards due to the presence of Riverwash surficial soils along the Santa Margarita River at the project site. However, the structural design of the new bridge incorporates state-of-the-art engineering to reduce risk and will meet Caltrans and California Building Code seismic standards.

iv. Landslides?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project site is not within a “Landslide Susceptibility Area” as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Landslide Susceptibility Areas were developed based on landslide risk profiles included in the *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, San Diego, CA* (URS, 2004).

Landslide risk areas from this plan were based on data including steep slopes (greater than 25%); soil series data (SANDAG based on USGS 1970s series); soil-slip susceptibility from USGS; and Landslide Hazard Zone Maps (limited to western portion of the County) developed by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (DMG). Based on the geomorphic analysis and grade analysis of the project site, landslide risk is minimal due to channel and overbank characteristics.

Included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. Such soils and slopes exist in the vicinity of the project site along the Santa Margarita River riparian corridor outside of the project site. Since the project is not located within an identified Landslide Susceptibility Area and the geologic environment has a low probability to become unstable, the project would have a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from landslides.

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

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Riverwash, Ramona sandy loam, and Visalia gravelly sandy loam that have a soil erodibility rating of “severe” as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. Construction of the proposed project would include site grading and drainage improvements which has the potential to release sediment and other pollutants associated with construction activities into the river and other downstream receiving waters.

The construction contractor will be required to obtain a NPDES Construction General Permit from the RWQCB and prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prior to construction. The SWPPP will identify site-specific BMPs to control erosion, sediment, and other potential construction-related pollutants, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Proper storage, use, and disposal of construction materials
- Removal of sediment from surface runoff before it leaves the project site by silt fences or other similar devices around the site perimeter, with particular attention to protecting water bodies identified as impaired due to sediment on the Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments.
- Protection of all storm drain inlets on site or downstream of the project site to eliminate entry of sediment.
- Stabilization of cleared or graded slopes.
- Diversion of runoff from uphill areas around disturbed areas of the project site.

- Prevention of tracking soil off-site through use of a gravel strip or wash facilities at exits from the project site.
- Protection or stabilization of stockpiled soils.

In addition, the project will implement a Green Streets Stormwater Quality Management Plan (SWQMP) required by the County of San Diego that includes construction and green streets BMPs (see the SWQMP included as a technical appendix to this Initial Study).

Finally, Sheet C5 (Water Pollution Control) of the Plans shows the location of the silt fencing to prevent sediment from entering the Santa Margarita River, location of the stabilized entrance to the construction laydown area, and location of a vegetated swale along the northwest side of the south bridge approach road surface. Sheet C5 also lists 28 additional erosion control notes.

Compliance with the NPDES Construction General Permit, and implementation of a SWPPP and SWQMP prior to construction which would identify site-specific BMPs to control erosion, sediment, and other potential construction-related pollutants, would maintain the water quality of Santa Margarita River and other downstream receiving waters in accordance with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and construction-related impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts related to erosion or sedimentation because the project has a less than significant impact and no known past, present, or future projects were found within the surrounding area.

- 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 an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: Please refer to responses to questions a.i – iv and b. above.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project does not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). The soils on-site are identified as Riverwash, Ramona sandy loam, and Visalia gravelly sandy loam that have low, moderate, and low shrink-swell behavior, respectively. These soils do not represent substantial risks to life or property in this respect. This was confirmed by staff review of the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of the current crossing. No septic tanks or wastewater disposal systems are required or proposed.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The geology in the area of the project site is Cretaceous Plutonic, which has a sensitivity rating of zero for the possible occurrence of paleontological resources. The project site is also in an area that is mapped as not having unique geology or a unique geological feature. Therefore, the project has no impact.

VIII GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project would generate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during construction from construction equipment fuel combustion and exhaust, and passenger vehicle travel (i.e., worker commute). The GHG emissions associated with construction of the project were calculated for construction activities using CalEEMod

version 2020.4.0. Results of the GHG emissions calculations are presented in Table 4 below. The CalEEMod construction GHG emissions were amortized over a 30-year lifetime in order to consider these emissions as part of a project’s annualized lifetime total emissions. The amortization value of 30 years is used consistent with the methodology suggested by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) (SCAQMD 2008) These estimated construction GHG emissions are included in Table 5.

Table 4. ESTIMATED UNMITIGATED CONSTRUCTION GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Construction Year	CO ₂ e (Metric Tons) ^{a, b}
2022	1,047
2023	279
Total	1,326
Amortized Emissions (30-years)^c	44

^a Totals may not add up exactly due to rounding in the modeling calculations.

^b CO₂e emissions are calculated using the global warming potential values from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Fourth Assessment Report: 25 for CH₄ and 298 for N₂O (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Fourth Assessment Report: The Physical Science Basis, Summary for Policy Makers, (2007))

^c SCAQMD methodology

Source: Modeled by San Diego County Staff

The project will require revegetation for impacts to biological resources (see M-BI-12 in the Biological Resources Report) and the growth of the new vegetation required were estimated to sequester 700 MTCO₂e per year over a 20-year growing period. Carbon sequestered from tree planting would allow for a reduction in annual GHG emissions over the life of the project. It should be noted that, a minimal amount of vegetation will be removed to construct the bridge to create permanent and temporary impacts, the latter of which will be restored according to M-BI-12 (mitigation for impacts to habitat including revegetation of temporary impact areas following construction), and M-BI-13 (best management practices to prevent avoidable impacts during construction activities).

A screening threshold was used to illustrate that impacts from the project would be less than significant for GHG emissions. In response to Assembly Bill (AB) 32 (reduce emissions to 1990 levels by 2020), the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) white paper titled “CEQA & Climate Change: Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from projects Subject to the CEQA (CAPCOA 2008), provides a methodology used for jurisdictions across the state to identify a screening level for GHG emissions. The CAPCOA guidance states that projects should be screened to determine if their associated GHG emissions exceed 900 MTCO₂e. Since adoption of this threshold, Senate Bill (SB) 32 was passed to set a revised statewide reduction target to reduce emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by year 2030.

As compared to similar mass emissions thresholds adopted by other regional air districts the CAPCOA 900 MTCO₂e threshold is relatively conservative and could be used to support

cumulative impact determination beyond 2020. In April 2020, the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) published updated project screening levels and determined that projects estimated to generate less than 1,100 MTCO_{2e} per year would not result in a significant, cumulative impact (SMAQMD 2020). This threshold was developed to demonstrate compliance with the statewide reduction targets of Senate Bill (SB) 32 by 2030.

Thus, the CAPCOA threshold of 900 MTCO_{2e} represents a more stringent screening level than has been approved by other air districts in compliance with 2030 statewide reduction targets. Due to the aggressive GHG emission capture rate, the CAPCOA threshold would still act as a viable threshold to reduce project GHG emissions proposed after 2020 and meet SB 32 targets. Furthermore, as State legislative requirements such as Building Energy Efficiency Standards and transportation-related efficiency measures become increasingly more stringent overtime, future project GHG emissions would be reduced helping to meet State emission reduction targets.

The project is estimated to generate 44 MTCO_{2e} per year as a result of 30-year amortization of construction emissions (consistent with methodology from the SCAQMD). Furthermore, project emissions would be decreased with revegetation of the site required by M-BI-12. The project would not generate GHG emissions that would result in an impact when compared to the 900 MTCO_{2e} per year CAPCOA or 1,100 MTCO_{2e} per year SMAQMD screening thresholds. However, the project does not rely on the screening level thresholds to determine impact significance, rather to illustrate that the project would not cause a significant direct or cumulative impact from GHG emissions due to the relatively small amount of GHG emissions during construction.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: In 2006, the State of California passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the GHG emissions reduction goal for the state into law. The law requires that by 2020, state emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing GHG emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions. SB 32 (Amendments to the California Global Warming Solutions Action of 2006) extends California’s GHG reduction programs beyond 2020. SB 32 amended the Health and Safety Code to include Section 38566, which contains language to authorize CARB to achieve a statewide GHG emission reduction of at least 40 percent below 1990 levels by no later than December 31, 2030. SB 32 codified the targets established by EO B-30-15 for 2030, which set the next interim step in the State’s continuing efforts to pursue the long-term target expressed in EO B-30-15 of 80 percent below 1990 emissions levels by 2050. With respect to future GHG targets under SB 32 and Executive Order S-3-05, CARB has also made clear its legal interpretation that it has the requisite authority to adopt whatever regulations are necessary, beyond the AB 32 horizon year of 2020, to meet the SB 32 40 percent reduction target by 2030 and the Executive Order S-3-05 80% reduction target by 2050. This legal

interpretation by an expert agency provides evidence that future regulations will be adopted to continue the trajectory toward meeting these future GHG targets.

Senate Bill (SB) 375, passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions from passenger vehicles. Under this law, if regions develop integrated land use, housing, and transportation plans that meet SB 375 targets, new projects in these regions can be relieved of certain review requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). SANDAG has prepared a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) which are elements of the San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan. The strategy identifies how regional GHG reduction targets, as established by CARB, would be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. The 2050 RTP and SCS show that the San Diego region will meet or exceed GHG emissions reduction targets by using land in ways that make developments more compact, conserving open space, and investing in a transportation network that gives residents alternatives to driving alone. Although this project is not directly related operations of a transportation system, this habitat restoration aligns with the SCS/RTP goal to protect sensitive habitat and would not conflict with the SCS/RTP policies.

Through its goals, policies, and land use designations, the County's General Plan aims to reduce County-wide GHG emissions. For instance, the project is a carbon dioxide consuming landscape and maximizes the preservation of open spaces consistent with Policy LU-6.3 related to Conservation-Oriented Project Design and Policy LU-6.6 which promotes Integration of Natural Features into Project Design. Furthermore, the proposed project does not fall within an area where primary opportunities to reduce air quality pollutants and GHG emissions are in effect such as urbanized areas of the County where there are land use patterns that can best support the increased use of transit and pedestrian activities since most GHGs and air pollutants result from mobile source emissions (San Diego County General Plan, Conservation and Open Space section). The proposed project is in accordance with relevant COS (Community Open Space)-14 Sustainable Land Development policies (COS-14.10 Use of low-emission construction vehicles for construction; COS-14.11 Native Vegetation will be replanted with similar genetic vegetative stock at a 3:1 ratio unless otherwise stated). These policies provide direction for individual development projects to reduce GHG emissions and help the County meet its GHG emission reduction targets.

As discussed in response 8(a): Greenhouse Gas Emissions above, the project's emissions would be below the 900 MTCO_{2e} per year screening level. Therefore, projects that do not exceed the threshold would have a nominal, and therefore less than cumulatively considerable, impact on GHG emissions. The project's consistency with the policies discussed above would assist in meeting the County's contribution to GHG emissions reduction targets in California. As such, the project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHG. Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: Construction of the proposed bridge would involve the transport of gasoline and other petroleum-based products associated with construction equipment. These materials are considered hazardous as they could cause temporary localized soil and water contamination. Incidents of spills or other localized contamination could occur during refueling, operation of machinery, undetected fluid leaks, or mechanical failure. In addition, construction of the proposed project would use paints, solvents, and other materials, such as wood and cement sealers, which are not considered acutely hazardous. However, all storage, handling, and disposal of these materials are regulated by California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the North County Fire Department. All construction activities involving the transportation, usage and disposal of hazardous materials would be subject to all applicable federal, state, and local requirements, which would reduce impacts associated with the use and handling of hazardous materials during construction to less than significant.

Operation of the proposed project would involve periodic maintenance of the steel bridge crossing structure. San Diego County maintenance professionals will be used to complete these jobs to ensure safe use of any potentially hazardous materials. Therefore, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant

b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: There are no schools located within 0.25-mile of the project site. The closest school is Fallbrook Elementary School in the town of Fallbrook at over 2 miles away. Further, the transport and handling of minor amounts of hazardous materials during construction and operation would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations that control hazardous material handling. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been

subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant Impact: According to the database search of Envirostor and Geotracker, the project site is not identified as a hazardous materials site (Envirostor, 2018; Geotracker 2018). Thus, the project site is not identified as being a listed hazardous materials site and is not located adjacent to an active listed hazardous site. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment and impacts would be less than significant.

d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The nearest public airport to the project site is the Fallbrook Airpark, over three miles to the south. The proposed project is not located within the Fallbrook Airpark Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. Also, the project does not propose construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, constituting a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Therefore, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

e) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency

planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out. The new bridge will improve access between the Fallbrook village area and areas north the Santa Margarita River facilitating emergency response plans and emergency evacuation plans.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

Less Than Significant Impact: Even though the bridge replacement project is located within a dam inundation zone (Vail Lake dam and Lake Skinner dam), the project is not a unique institution that would be difficult to safely evacuate in the event of a dam failure. Unique institutions, as defined by the Office of Emergency Services, include hospitals, schools, skilled nursing facilities, retirement homes, mental health care facilities, care facilities for patients with disabilities, adult and childcare facilities, jails/detention facilities, stadiums, arenas, amphitheatres, or a similar use. Due to the access benefits of the proposed bridge during wet weather (flooding) by not overtopping and blocking emergency access, the new bridge will facilitate improved access between the Fallbrook village area and areas to the north of the Santa Margarita River thereby further facilitating a dam evacuation plan.

f) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project is the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge crossing, located approximately 160 feet downstream of the current crossing. The project site is adjacent to and within wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires; however, the project will not place additional residents or other habitable land uses within this area. Thus, implementation of the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Post-construction, the new bridge will help facilitate improved emergency response between the Pendleton-Deluz and Fallbrook Community Planning Areas.

g) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert bridge crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The project is the does not involve or support uses that allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural irrigation ponds). Also, the project does not propose or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses, or place new residents near such uses. Therefore, the project will not substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: Construction of the proposed project would include site grading and drainage improvements which has the potential to release sediment and other pollutants associated with construction activities into the river and other downstream receiving waters. Sediment associated with earthmoving activities and exposed soil is the most common pollutant associated with construction sites. Other pollutants associated with construction include debris,

trash, and other materials generated during construction activities; hydrocarbons from leaks or spills of fuels, oils, and other fluids associated with construction equipment; and paints, concrete slurries, asphalt materials, and other hazardous materials. Mitigation actions to minimize impact of sediment and solutions potentially entering the waterway are covered in Priority Development Project Green Streets Stormwater Quality Management Plan (PDP Exemption GS SWQMP), which discusses river channel protection via sandbags, fiber mats, cofferdams, or other methods during construction; as well as containment of fuel and solvent leaks, and other applicable Temporary Construction and Permanent Post Construction Site Design and Source Control BMPs.

In addition to MS4/SWQMP requirements, the project is required to obtain a NPDES Construction General Permit and prepare and implement a SWPPP prior to construction. The SWPPP would identify site-specific BMPs to control erosion, sediment, and other potential construction-related pollutants, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Proper storage, use, and disposal of construction materials
- Removal of sediment from surface runoff before it leaves the project site by silt fences or other similar devices around the site perimeter, with particular attention to protecting water bodies identified as impaired due to sediment on the Section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments.
- Protection of all storm drain inlets on site or downstream of the project site to eliminate entry of sediment.
- Stabilization of cleared or graded slopes.
- Diversion of runoff from uphill areas around disturbed areas of the project site.
- Prevention of tracking soil off-site through use of a gravel strip or wash facilities at exits from the project site.
- Protection or stabilization of stockpiled soils.

Compliance with the RWQCB MS4 and NPDES Construction General Permit, and implementation of a PDP Exemption SWQMP and a SWPPP prior to construction which would identify site-specific BMPs for control erosion, sediment, and other potential construction-related pollutants and other applicable Temporary Construction and Permanent Post Construction Site Design and Source Control BMPs, would maintain the water quality of Santa Margarita River and other downstream receiving waters in accordance with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and construction-related impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

This project consists of the removal and replacement of an aging low-flow concrete box culvert river crossing. Since the old bridge and most of the old road are being removed, this is a realignment of an existing road rather than a whole new road. Even though the project proposes more impervious surface than the existing bridge/road, Green Street PDP Exemption projects may expand a roadway if BMPs are proposed. Therefore, the project qualifies for a Green Streets PDP Exemption, and a PDP Exemption SWQMP would be required. The Green Streets PDP Exemption performance standard does not require hydromodification management. A bioswale is designed as per Appendix K of the County BMP Design Manual, at Green Infrastructure Resources section of the Development Resources web page at www.sandiegocounty.gov/stormwater.

During operation, the new bridge will not contribute any water quality impairment compounds. The curbed roadway and bridge direct car oils to soils away from river. Biofiltration materials will be used for sides of roadways to minimize oil absorption into the soils. Compliance with the NPDES Construction General Permit and the SWQMP, and implementation of a SWPPP prior to construction under ambient and high flows which would identify site-specific BMPs for control erosion, sediment, and other potential construction-related pollutants, would maintain the water quality of Santa Margarita River and other downstream receiving waters in accordance with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) standards. Examples of such BMPs include removal of potential pollutant sources prior to storm to higher land, installation of straw bales to prevent flow into river, secondary containment as appropriate for potential pollutant sources. Thus, the operation-related impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

Erosion Control and Construction BMP plan (Sheet C5 (Water Pollution Control) of the Plans, and Sheet A4 found in Attachment 2 of the GS SWQMP) provides BMP location(s) such as silt fencing to prevent sediment from entering the Santa Margarita River, stabilized construction entrance to the construction laydown area, and location of a vegetated swale along the northwest side of the south bridge approach road surface and other erosion control notes.

b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project lies in the Gavilan hydrologic subarea (902.22), within the Santa Margarita hydrologic unit. Waters downstream from the project site within this watershed include the Santa Margarita Lagoon and Santa Margarita River in the 902.11 and 902.22 hydrologic subareas. These waters are impaired for eutrophic (Santa Margarita Lagoon), enterococcus, fecal coliform, Phosphorus, and total Nitrogen (902.11), and Phosphorus and toxicity (902.22).

Construction of the proposed project would include site grading and drainage improvements which has the potential to release sediment and other pollutants associated with construction activities into the river and other downstream receiving waters. Sediment associated with earthmoving activities and exposed soil is the most common pollutant associated with construction sites. Other pollutants associated with construction include debris, trash, and other materials generated during construction activities; hydrocarbons from leaks or spills of fuels, oils, and other fluids associated with construction equipment; and concrete slurries and asphalt materials. Mitigation actions to minimize impact of sediment and solutions potentially entering the waterway are covered in the PDP Exemption GS SWQMP, which discusses river channel protection via sandbags, fiber mats, cofferdams, or other methods during construction; as well as

containment of fuel and solvent leaks, and other applicable Temporary Construction and Permanent Post Construction Site Design and Source Control BMPs.

The following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced in any runoff to the maximum extent practicable so as not to increase the level of these pollutants in receiving waters: A bioswale is designed as per Appendix K of the County BMP Design Manual, at Green Infrastructure Resources section of the Development Resources web page at www.sandiegocounty.gov/stormwater

The proposed BMPs are consistent with regional surface water and storm water planning and permitting process that has been established to improve the overall water quality in County watersheds. As a result the project will not contribute to a cumulative impact to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d). Regional surface water and storm water permitting regulation for County of San Diego includes the following: San Diego Region, Order No. R9-2013-0001; County Watershed Protection Ordinance; Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO); and County Stormwater Standards Manual. The stated purposes of these ordinances are to protect the health, safety and general welfare of the County of San Diego residents; to protect water resources and to improve water quality; to cause the use of management practices by the County and its citizens that will reduce the adverse effects of polluted runoff discharges on waters of the state; to secure benefits from the use of storm water as a resource; and to ensure the County is compliant with applicable state and federal laws. The Watershed Protection Ordinance has discharge prohibitions, and requirements that vary depending on type of land use activity and location in the County. Each project subject to WPO is required to prepare a Stormwater Management Plan that details a project’s pollutant discharge contribution to a given watershed and propose BMPs or design measures to mitigate any impacts that may occur in the watershed.

c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less than Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The Regional Water Quality Control Board has designated water quality objectives for waters of the San Diego Region to protect the existing and potential beneficial uses of each hydrologic unit. The project lies in the Gavilan hydrologic subarea (902.22), within the Santa Margarita hydrologic unit that has the following existing and potential beneficial uses for inland surface waters, coastal waters, and ground water: municipal and domestic supply; agricultural supply; industrial process supply; contact water recreation; non-contact water recreation; warm freshwater habitat; cold freshwater habitat; wildlife habitat; estuarine habitat; marine habitat; migration of aquatic organisms; rare, threatened, or endangered species habitat, and spawning, reproduction, and/or early development.

Construction of the proposed project would include site grading and drainage improvements which has the potential to release sediment and other pollutants associated with construction

activities into the river and other downstream receiving waters. Sediment associated with earthmoving activities and exposed soil is the most common pollutant associated with construction sites. Other pollutants associated with construction include debris, trash, and other materials generated during construction activities; hydrocarbons from leaks or spills of fuels, oils, and other fluids associated with construction equipment; and concrete slurries and asphalt materials.

The following site design measures and/or source control BMPs and/or treatment control BMPs will be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable, such that the proposed project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses: A bioswale is designed as per Appendix K of the County BMP Design Manual, at Green Infrastructure Resources section of the Development Resources web page at www.sandiegocounty.gov/stormwater. A catch basin is provided at the southern end of the vegetated swale to serve as an overflow device, overflow runoff will be conveyed with the underdrain flow to discharge into the proposed rip rap which will provide energy dissipation to reduce erosion. The discharge pipe (12" at 1% slope) and the rip rap have been sized to provide enough capacity and energy dissipation for the 100-yr storm. The top of grate for the catch basin is set above the minimum required ponding depth to capture flow from storm events larger than 85th percentile. See Sheet C5 of the Plans and Sheet A4 in Attachment 2 of the GS SWQMP.

d) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project is the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or through the addition of impervious surface, in a manner which would:

(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. During construction of the proposed project, local drainage patterns could be temporarily altered at the project site due to ground-disturbing activities, such as grading and excavation, construction of new bridge foundations, and demolition of the existing Sandia Creek Drive crossing. Such alterations in the drainage pattern could potentially but temporarily result in erosion or siltation.

The proposed project would not discharge stormwater into the Santa Margarita River or stormwater run-off system. During construction of the proposed project, local drainage patterns could be temporarily altered at the project site due to ground-disturbing activities, such as grading and excavation, construction of new bridge foundations, and trenching. Such alterations in the drainage pattern may temporarily result in erosion or siltation and/or increase the rate or amount of surface runoff if substantial drainage is rerouted. However, Green Street PDP Exemption SWQMP applicable Temporary Construction, Permanent Post Construction Site Design, Source Control, and Structural BMPs and compliance with the NPDES Construction General Permit, which requires implementation of a SWPPP prior to construction, would minimize the potential for erosion or siltation, and flooding through the implementation of BMPs. Therefore, impacts related to substantial erosion or siltation and temporary drainage alterations during construction would be less than significant.

As outlined in the Green Street PDP Exemption Storm water Quality Management Plan (GS SWQMP) dated 11/19/2021 and prepared by KPFF, the project will implement the following site design measures, source control, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: A bioswale is designed as per Appendix K of the County BMP Design Manual, at Green Infrastructure Resources section of the Development Resources web page at www.sandiegocounty.gov/stormwater. A catch basin is provided at the southern end of the vegetated swale to serve as an overflow device, overflow runoff will be conveyed with the underdrain flow to discharge into the proposed rip rap which will provide energy dissipation to reduce erosion. The discharge pipe (12" at 1% slope) and the rip rap have been sized to provide enough capacity and energy dissipation for the 100-yr storm. The top of grate for the catch basin is set above the minimum required ponding depth to capture flow from storm events larger than 85th percentile. See Sheet C5 of the Plans and Sheet A4 in Attachment 2 of the GS SWQMP. These measures will control erosion and sedimentation and satisfy waste discharge requirements as required by the Land-Use Planning for New Development and Redevelopment Component of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2015-0001), as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and Waste Discharge Requirements for discharges from the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4s) draining the watersheds within the San Diego region. The GS SWQMP specifies and describes the implementation process of all BMPs that will address equipment operation and materials management, prevent the erosion process from occurring, and prevent sedimentation in any onsite and downstream drainage swales. The Department of Public Works will ensure that the Plan is implemented as proposed. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion or sedimentation potential and will not

alter any drainage patterns of the site or area on- or off-site. In addition, because erosion and sedimentation will be controlled within the boundaries of the project, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. For further information on soil erosion refer to VI., Geology and Soils, Question b.

(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff as there will be only a minimal increase in hard surface area created compared to the existing Sandia Creek Drive crossing. The new bridge would provide one foot of freeboard above the projected 100-year flood event as required by the San Diego County Hydraulic Design Manual. The existing concrete box culvert crossing that routinely floods during high flows would be removed.

(iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The proposed project does not propose any stormwater drainage systems nor is one required. Therefore, the project would not contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. The project proposes no substantial additional sources of polluted runoff other than those potential sources identified in response Section X.a above. The proposed project would not contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Any construction-related effects would be mitigated as described in response X.a above.

(iv) impede or redirect flood flows?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed bridge would not impede or redirect flood flows. The proposed bridge is designed to allow 100-year flood flows to pass beneath it with one foot of freeboard, thereby neither re-directing nor amplifying effect of flood flows.

The Project Area is within a FEMA Zone A floodplain, which means that this reach of the Santa Margarita River was studied and mapped using approximate methods. Given the Zone A (approximate) floodplain, a FEMA regulatory floodway has not been established for the study area. In addition, the following conditions apply in this case:

- There are no habitable structures within or in the vicinity in the Project Site.
- Any localized increase in the Base (100-year) Flood Elevation (BFE) due to the project would be less than 0.5 ft and would have no impact on any habitable structures.
- The project reach is part of an approximately 1,390-acre property along the Santa Margarita River with a single owner, The Wildlands Conservancy who will preserve the property in perpetuity.
- The County of San Diego has not designated their own floodplain or flood way for the Santa Margarita River.

Santa Margarita River (SMR) / Hydrology Report and Hydraulic Scour Report have been presented to and reviewed by San Diego County Department of Public Works (DPW) Flood Control Division. These reports are attached to this Initial Study as technical appendices. Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) application and studies have been submitted to FEMA for review. The Santa Margarita River watershed was modeled using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' HEC-HMS (Hydrologic Modeling System), version 4.7.1 (HEC, 2021). Model data and parameters were selected based on the methodology of the San Diego County Hydrology Manual (County of San Diego, 2003). Briefly, watershed data including topographic data, soils data, land cover/land use data was used to derive an NRCS curve number. This analyses, combined with the precipitation data and reservoir data formed the basis of the hydrology modeling according to the USACE HEC-HMS modeling system. Peak rate factors were generated based on sub-basin units and routing reaches. Peak discharges for the study reach were computed using HEC-HMS for the 2% annual chance exceedance (50-year) and 1% annual chance exceedance (100-year) events. The 50-and 100-year computed Santa Margarita River peak discharges for the Sandia Creek Drive Bridge are presented in Table 4-1 of the SMR Hydrology Report (River Focus, 2021).

To confirm that computed peak discharges from the hydrologic model were producing reasonable results, computed flows were compared to flood-frequency analysis results at three USGS stream gage locations. Using Bulletin 17C Guidelines (England et al., 2019), River Focus performed a statistical analysis of annual peak flows using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' HEC-S SP (Statistical Software Package) software (HEC, 2019). Figure 4.7 (of the SMR Hydrology Report) compares observed flows over an almost 100-year period of record with the computed flows at this location. The HMS model with variable peak runoff factor provides reasonable results based on the historic record.

Hydraulic modeling was performed using the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' HEC-RAS (River Analysis System), version 5.0.7 (HEC, 2019). River Focus created a 1-D steady flow

hydraulic model to compute flood elevations for the 2% and 1% annual chance exceedance (50-year and 100-year) events. Based on the San Diego County Hydraulic Design Manual (HDM), new bridges should be designed to pass the 100-year peak discharge with one foot of freeboard (County of San Diego Hydraulic Design Manual, 2014).

Discharge values (Q) and Water Surface Elevations (WSE) were calculated for the 100-year flood (Q). The bridge minimum low-chord elevation shall meet the County requirement of at least one foot of freeboard for the 100-year discharge. It shall also meet the Caltrans freeboard requirement of at least 2 feet of freeboard for the 50-year discharge. Figure 2-11 of the SMR Hydraulic Scour Report shows that the low chord of the bridge (minimum elevation: 347.58 ft, NAVD88) has one foot of available freeboard based on the 100-year flood elevation (346.58ft) and 2.75 ft of available freeboard based on the 50-year flood elevation (344.83ft). The one foot of freeboard is also shown on Sheet B1 of the Improvement Plans.

f) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

i. FLOOD HAZARD

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a replacement bridge composed of concrete and steel, and there is no risk of release of pollutants due to project inundation. The Project Area is within a FEMA Zone A floodplain, which means that this reach of the Santa Margarita River was studied and mapped using approximate methods. Given the Zone A (approximate) floodplain, a FEMA regulatory floodway has not been established for the study area. In addition, the following conditions apply in this case:

- There are no habitable structures within or in the vicinity in the Project Site.
- Any localized increase in the Base (100-year) Flood Elevation (BFE) due to the project would be less than 0.5 ft and would have no impact on any habitable structures.
- The project reach is part of an approximately 1,390-acre property along the Santa Margarita River with a single owner, The Wildlands Conservancy who will preserve the property in perpetuity.
- The County of San Diego has not designated their own floodplain or flood way for the Santa Margarita River.
- Supervising project civil engineer and superintendent on-site will monitor weather conditions and ensure all equipment and materials are stored away from or moved out of the way of potential flood events.

Thus, the project would have a less than significant impact.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is not located in a tsunami zone and thus there would be risk of release of pollutants due to inundation from a tsunami.

iii. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located in a zone subject to seiches and thus there would be risk of release of pollutants due to inundation from a seiche.

g) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project is a replacement bridge that does not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Santa Margarita River Watershed Water Quality Improvement Plan (WQIP), sustainable groundwater management plan (SGMA), or the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (Region 9 Basin Plan). Potential pollutants from construction-related activities would be addressed through implementation of BMPs in the GS SWQMP and in a SWPPP that will be reviewed and approved by The Regional Water Quality Control Board in their review and approval of a NPDES General Construction Permit (see responses X.a-c above).

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

No Impact: The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The project site is located in a rural area with low residential density. The existing box culvert crossing will remain in use while the new bridge is being constructed. Only when the new bridge is operational and in use will the existing box culvert crossing be demolished. Implementation of the project would not divide an existing community but would create a safer connection between areas north and south of the Santa Margarita River.

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of the current crossing. Replacement of the existing structure does not change the Mobility Element classification of Sandia Creek Drive as a 2.3C minor collector roadway (San Diego County General Plan, Mobility Element Network map, Figure M-A-7). The proposed project does not conflict with goals, policies and implementation of the County’s General Plan or Fallbrook Community Plan. The proposed bridge project positively impacts community mobility, safety, and conservation goals. Furthermore, the proposed project does not conflict with the Integrated Management Plan by The Wildlands Conservancy.

XII. 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: Replacement of the existing box culvert crossing with a steel bridge would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource as it does not represent the type of project that would cause loss of access to mineral resources. In addition, the land on which the bridge will be built is owned by The Wildlands Conservancy for conservation and low-impact recreation uses in perpetuity. Therefore, the project would not cause any further loss of access to any mineral resources that might be present.

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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands nor is it located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s). The project site and surrounding area does not have a zoning classification of S82 for mineral resource extraction.

XIII. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project consists of removing and replacing the existing Sandia Creek Drive box culvert crossing with a steel bridge that is not meant for habitation. Based on the Noise Report for the Sandia Creek Drive Bridge Replacement and Fish Passage Project (Noise Analysis) prepared by Dudek and dated December 2021, the surrounding area supports open spaces, vacant lands, and residences. The project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities as mentioned within Tables N-1 and N-2. Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Dudek dated December 2021, project implementation will not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to road, airport, heliport, railroad, industrial or other noise in excess of the 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL. The project consists of replacement the existing culvert crossing with a new bridge, no new vehicular trips would be generated, and a traffic study was not needed. In addition, the nearest NSLUs are single-family residences located approximately 1,300 feet or more from the existing crossing, at that distance, the noise levels from the proposed project would not expose the existing or future noise sensitive land uses to noise levels that exceed the County's standard. Therefore, the project will not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Dudek and dated December 2021, non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the project's property line. The project site and surround parcels to the north, east, and south are zoned Open Space (S80) that has a one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA daytime and 45 dBA nighttime. The adjacent properties to the west are zoned Limited Agriculture (A70) and have one-hour average sound limit of 50 dBA daytime and 45 dBA nighttime. Three short-term noise measurements were made and found that the existing ambient noise levels within the vicinity of the proposed project range from 34.2 dBA to 43.9 dBA. The operation of the proposed replacement bridge would not require, include or involve any noise-generating mechanical equipment or machinery, beyond routine inspections and maintenance similar to that required for the existing crossing. Maintenance of the proposed steel bridge would consist of truck inspection every two years and use of a UBIT (Under Bridge Inspection Truck) every four years. These activities use 2-axle utility trucks (i.e., not heavy trucks) and are not anticipated to create high noise levels. The Noise Analysis states that the project's noise levels at the adjoining properties would be less than 45 dBA and therefore, will not exceed County Noise Standards.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Based on a Noise Analysis prepared by Dudek and dated December 2021, the project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

The project site is zoned Open Space (S80) and consists of sensitive vegetation communities and species. As the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance does not have an established noise limit for biologically sensitive habitats, noise limits for sensitive habitats have been taken from the Biological Resources Guidelines for Determining Significance, which requires that noise levels to sensitive avian species are limited to less than 60 dBA LEQ (1-hour) or the ambient noise level plus 3 decibels, whichever is greater, at active nest locations. Impacts to the on-site sensitive biological species are analyzed in the Biological Assessment prepared by DUDEK, which consists of impact analysis and mitigation measures, that is also appropriate for reducing the impacts from noise.

Finally, the project’s conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project will not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project will not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project will not exceed the applicable noise level limits at the property line or construction noise limits, derived from State regulation to address human health and quality of life concerns. Therefore, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable exposure of persons or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, and applicable standards of other agencies.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, residences and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area. The project consists of removing the existing box culvert crossing and replacing it with a new steel bridge. Based on the noise report, the new bridge would not generate additional traffic. Furthermore, the nearest noise sensitive receptors are located at approximately 1300 feet from the project site.

On-site construction equipment that would cause the most groundborne vibration and noise would be associated with the substructure and concrete retaining walls phase and the demolition phase. During the substructure and retaining walls phase, the largest vibration levels are anticipated to be generated by the use of tractors, graders, excavators, a drill rig, rollers, and similar heavy equipment. According to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA 2018), vibration levels associated with the use of these types of heavy equipment generate vibration levels of 0.089 to 0.210 inch per second PPV or 87 to 94 vibration decibels (VdB) at 25 feet. Additionally, loaded trucks used for soil hauling during grading could generate vibration levels of approximately 0.076 inch per second PPV or 86 VdB at 25 feet. As discussed in the Noise Report prepared for the project, vibration levels would fall below the County-recommended Caltrans thresholds for residences of 0.004 inch, per second root mean square (RMS), beyond a distance of approximately 170 feet from large bulldozers and similar heavy equipment and 300 feet from vibratory rollers. Loaded trucks would fall below the threshold approximately 150 feet away. The nearest sensitive receptors to on-site construction are the residences southwest of the project site located approximately 1,300 feet from the site. For the equipment type with the highest vibration level anticipated for this project (the vibratory roller), the estimated vibration level would be approximately 0.0004 inch per second RMS. Therefore, vibration levels would be well below the County threshold of 0.004 inch per second RMS from construction activities at the nearest receptors (Appendix E).

The project site is zoned Open Space (S80) and consists of sensitive vegetation communities and species. As the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance does not have an established noise limit for biologically sensitive habitats, noise limits for sensitive habitats have been taken from the Biological Resources Guidelines for Determining Significance, which requires that noise levels to sensitive avian species are limited to less than 60 dBA LEQ (1-hour) or the ambient noise level plus 3 decibels, whichever is greater, at active nest locations. Impacts to the on-site sensitive biological species are analyzed in the Biological Assessment prepared by DUDEK, which consists of impact analysis and mitigation measures, that is also appropriate for reducing the impacts from noise.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Potentially Significant Impact

Less than Significant Impact

- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The nearest public airport to the project site is the Fallbrook Airpark, over three miles to the south. The proposed project is not located within the Fallbrook Airpark Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. The project will not place additional residents in an area where they could be exposed to excessive noise from an airport nor will workers on the project be exposed to excessive noise levels from an airport.

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The proposed project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area including, but limited to the following: new or extended infrastructure or public facilities; new commercial or industrial facilities; large-scale residential development; accelerated conversion of homes to commercial or multi-family use; or regulatory changes including General Plan amendments, specific plan amendments, zone reclassifications, sewer or water annexations; or LAFCO annexation actions.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

- Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The proposed project will not displace any existing housing as the project site does not contain any housing.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES.

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision 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 service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The proposed project will not result in the need for significantly altered or new public services or facilities including but not limited to fire protection facilities, sheriff facilities, schools, or parks in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios or objectives for any public services. Post-construction, the new bridge will help facilitate improved emergency response between the Fallbrook village area and areas to the north of the Santa Margarita River during times when the river may flood.

XVI. RECREATION.

a) Would the project 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge, located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. There is no component of the project that would result in an increase in the local population, thereby resulting in the deterioration of existing parks or the need to construct new parks.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge that will be located approximately 160 feet downstream of the current crossing. There will be occasional/temporary

placement of construction materials in the Santa Margarita Trail Preserve parking lot, but most all construction equipment and materials will be located in the lay-down area in disturbed areas southwest of the bridge construction site (see Sheet C4 (Project Impact Area) of Plans). The construction access and lay-down areas are on the opposite side of Sandia Creek Drive and separate from the Preserve parking lot; however, activities in these areas could potentially impact trail use through the site during construction and demolition activities.

To maintain trail connectivity during construction, signage will be employed to alert trail riders to possible closures during roadway grading and construction, working closely with Fallbrook Trails Council to alert the equestrian community and local residents about construction phasing. To increase trail accessibility and safety during construction, a temporary trail will be constructed to route horse riders and hikers away from the construction zone. This temporary trail is a project design feature and is show on Sheet C4 of the Plans. The trail will be approximately eight feet in width and 600 feet long on the east side of Sandia Creek Drive and south of the river. Construction of the trial will utilize hand tools including shovel, rake, Mattock, Pulaski and limited chain saw for brush trimming. Construction of the trail will not increase potential impacts of the project addressed elsewhere in this document. The trail will be constructed during in early 2022 following approval of the grading plan, and ahead of the start of bridge construction. The new temporary trail will also have a safety crossing at the southwest end of the trial on Sandia Creek Drive. Potential trail erosion will be controlled through appropriate trail slope and construction of water bars and ground disturbing activities during construction will be monitored for cultural and tribal cultural resources. With implementation of this project design feature, there will be less than significant impact to Recreation.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:

a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a new steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location on Sandia Creek Drive two miles north of Fallbrook. The road is used for access between the area north of the Santa Margarita River and the Fallbrook community to the south. According to the Fallbrook Mobility Network Appendix located in the Fallbrook Community Plan, Sandia Creek Drive is a 2.3C Minor Collector. The General Plan Mobility Section Table M1-b defines the Minor Collector Series as roadways with a low design speed that is appropriate for highly constrained rural areas and for areas within a Village with heavy non-motorized circulation and transit activities.

The alignment of the new bridge straightens out the roadway approach from the south side thereby increasing road safety and will create a safer approach for turning into parking lot used to access trails along the Santa Margarita River. The new bridge will also make travel safer during flood events by decreasing the potential for overtopping by elevating the roadway

and bridge to accommodate a 100-year flow event with one foot of freeboard as required by the San Diego County Hydraulic Design Manual.

The proposed project is consistent with key elements of the General Plan Mobility Element chapter including efficient and effective movement of people and goods, accommodation of all users of the road right-of-way; a road network balanced with other General Plan goals such as environmental and personal protection; and road design, operation, and maintenance that reflects community character and the Community Plan. Thus, the project has less than significant impact.

b) Would the project conflict or be consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a new steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location on Sandia Creek Drive two miles north of Fallbrook. The project is considered to be a transportation project that will have a less than significant impact on vehicle miles travelled pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b)(2). The project does not increase roadway capacity and the temporary nature of the project does not provide a permanent place of employment from which VMT could be measured for employees.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project design provides improved safety for all roadway users by removing a sharp curve next to the existing Santa Margarita Trail Preserve trailhead parking lot (see Sheet C4 (Project Impact Area) of Plans), adding space for pedestrian/bicycle passage on both sides of the bridge, and provide required sight distance on Sandia Creek Drive where the new bridge will connect with that roadway on the north side of the River (see Sight Distance Certification included as a technical appendix to this Initial Study). Thus, the proposed project has less than significant impact related to increased roadway hazards.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a new steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location on a rural road (Sandia Creek Drive) two miles north of Fallbrook. During construction the existing Sandia Creek Drive crossing will remain operational to enable uninterrupted emergency access. Emergency access is expected to be more dependable in times of flood events as the new bridge and roadway approaches will accommodate a 100-year flow event with one foot of freeboard. Therefore, impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, as defined in Public Resources Code §21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

i. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of Historical Resources as defined in Public Resources Code §5020.1(k), or

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated: The County reached out to 12 tribes for the project via certified mail on August 30, 2021 for AB 52 consultations. Responses were received from four tribes. The Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians deferred to other tribes closer to the project site. The County is in active consultation with the San Pasqual Band of Mission Indians, Rincon Band of Luiseño, and the Pechanga Band of Mission Indians.

Neither Rincon nor San Pasqual have identified tribal cultural resources within the project boundaries, however, both have expressed concern for buried archaeological deposits. Pechanga has not yet met with the County to discuss their concerns. The discovery of buried cultural resources poses a potential significant impact to tribal cultural resources; however, implementation of Mitigation Measures **CULT#GR-1 through CULT#GR-6** would reduce this impact to less than significant (see responses to V. Cultural Resources (b and c) above.

ii. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code §5024.1, the Lead Agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: As stated above, there are no documented resources within the project site; however, the general area is known to be sensitive for both archaeology and areas that may be considered tribal cultural resources for local tribes.

Rincon expressed concerns about tree or vegetation removals necessary to the project and has asked that they be consulted on the revegetation plan to ensure that any oaks, elderberry, willow trees or other species of tribal importance are replenished in the revegetation efforts. Implementation of **TCR-1** reduces this impact to a level of less than significance.

TCR-1: During preparation of the project’s revegetation plan, the County shall request input from the actively consulting Tribes. The County will fully consider tribal comments on the revegetation plan and work to ensure plants of particular importance to the tribe are included in the plan.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

- a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. No relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, natural gas or telecommunications facilities is required. There is an electrical transmission line running alongside the existing box culvert crossing that will be kept in place unless it conflicts with demolition of the existing crossing. If the line needs to be moved, the construction superintendent will coordinate with SDG&E to re-route the line. Potential impacts will be less than significant.

- b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will require minimal water usage during construction of the new bridge structure and demolition of the existing crossing. Water will be accessed from water lines in the area through an agreement with Fallbrook Public Utility

District. Water will be required for dust control, drilling and cement mixing. No water will be required upon completion of the project. Potential impacts will be less than significant.

- c) 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?

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project is a bridge replacement project and does not require wastewater treatment service. The generation of wastewater by construction workers will be minimal. Portable restroom facilities will be provided by a private contractor to the project site for use by construction workers. Therefore, the project will have no impact related to wastewater treatment.

- d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The project will generate solid waste during construction of the new bridge and demolition of the old crossing. Types or sources of solid waste include a variety of building materials that can be recycled such as cardboard and other paper products, metals, plastics and other building materials. Total construction and demolition (C&D) debris estimates are presented by construction type per year (US EPA 2009). Solid waste generated during construction activities would be taken to the Fallbrook Transfer Station in Fallbrook and from there would be sorted for recycling or transported to an appropriate disposal site. Given the small tonnage of debris anticipated from this project, the recipient landfill will have adequate capacity to accept all project construction waste.

Slurries from soil cores and other construction materials will be put into drums and stored on site until tested. The material will be tested for pollutants by lab analysis according to the project SWPP. Once the drum material has been assessed to be below San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board limits for off-site disposal, material will be hauled to the Fallbrook Transfer Station for transportation to an appropriate disposal site. C&D debris from bridge construction and demolition of the crossing will be loaded into dump trucks, covered, and hauled to Fallbrook Transfer Station for separation for recycling or disposed of at an appropriate facility, if necessary (see Haul Route Exhibit included as a technical appendix to this Initial Study).

All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency

issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will transport waste and debris at the Fallbrook Recycling and Transfer Station where material will be sorted for recycling or transferred to a landfill for disposal. Handling of all waste, transport, and recycling/disposal will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste (see Haul Route Exhibit attached to this Initial Study as a technical appendix).

XX. WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: Please see response to IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials (e) above.

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentration from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?

- Potentially Significant Impact
- Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
- Less than Significant Impact
- No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project is a bridge replacement project and will not exacerbate wildlife risks. Although the project area is within a very high fire hazard severity zone (San Diego County General Plan, Safety Section, Figure S-1), no roadway lane closures would be required for construction of the proposed project during construction. The existing Sandia Creek Drive will remain open for traffic until the new structure is completed. The old structure will then be demolished to re-create a more natural condition.

Operation of the proposed project would not exacerbate wildfire risk and proposes no project occupants that could be exposed to wildfire risks. The project will enhance emergency response and evacuation plans as the new bridge provides more reliable passage and enhanced safety by increasing line-of-sight distances from the south side. In compliance with County Code, the project is designed to allow for emergency passage and would improve access routes. Furthermore, the proposed project would not involve activities that could disrupt surrounding roadways.

- c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The new bridge will require ongoing inspection and maintenance by San Diego County Department of Public Works employees or contractors. That work will not exacerbate fire risk and the project will have a less than significant impact.

- d) Expose people or structure to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?

Potentially Significant Impact Less than Significant Impact
 Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project consists of the replacement of an existing box culvert crossing over the Santa Margarita River with a steel bridge located approximately 160 feet downstream of its current location. The new bridge will be exposed to flood events; however, the bridge design is consistent with stringent engineering design principles and alternatives analysis. Engineering design was based on flood hydrology; flood frequency analysis; hydraulic modeling and 100-year flood analysis in terms of water surface elevation, velocity and scour projections; fish passage analysis under range of flow conditions and streambed conditions; geotechnical and geomorphic analysis and sediment transport. Multiple iterations were performed with state-of-the-art HEC-RAS models to identify optimal

solutions for fish passage, including determining fish passage design flow ranges that meet CDFW and NMFS requirements, and testing structural solutions for scour and water surface elevation and velocity at 100 yr flow. The new bridge will not expose people or other structures to significant risks, including downstream flooding or landslides, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, 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 were considered in the response to each question in sections IV, V and XVIII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. Resources that have been evaluated as potentially significant when or if impacted by the project include sensitive biological habitats, cultural resources, and tribal cultural resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance (see sections IV, V, and XVIII above). As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, significant effects associated with this project would result. Therefore, this project has been determined not to exceed the threshold for this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

b) Does the project 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 future projects)?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

A search was conducted in the project area (north of Fallbrook and north of the Santa Margarita River) for recent past, present and future projects that could be considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study for cumulative impacts. The only project found was PDS2020-MUP-20-011, Double Z Wedding Facility over two miles west of the project on De

Luz Road. This project involves only the remodeling or conversion of existing structures and minor grading for minor improvements to a driveway and parking lot on a property currently in agricultural production. This project is currently in processing; however, no potentially significant impacts have yet been identified that could potentially combine with the proposed project to cause cumulative impacts. No other projects were found that could potentially contribute to cumulative impacts. The other types of projects that were found included mainly administrative permits, variances, and boundary adjustments that are usually exempt from CEQA.

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the responses in sections I through XX above as necessary. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are cumulative effects associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to exceed the threshold for this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> | Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> | No Impact |

In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions, IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, X Hydrology and Water Quality, XIII. Noise, XIV. Population and Housing, XVI. Recreation, XVII. Transportation and Traffic, and XX. Wildfire. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects to human beings related to the following nighttime lighting (section I. Aesthetics). However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that, after mitigation, there are adverse effects to human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to exceed the threshold for this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

The following technical appendices are available electronically on the PDS public review webpage, or on flash drive at the Fallbrook Library and at the Zoning Counter on the first floor at PDS. See the public notice for details.

Biological Resources Letter Report for the Santa Margarita River Fish Passage and Bridge Replacement Project, DUDEK, December 2021

CalEEMod Version CalEEMod.2020.4.0 file, Alyssa Way, Air Quality and GHG Specialist – Independent Contractor, Planning & Development Services, October 25, 2021

Construction and Improvement Plans (including Grading Plan) for Sandia Creek Drive Bridge Replacement (Sheets C1-C13 and B1-B41), KPFF Consulting Engineers, 2021

Cultural Resources Survey Report for the Sandia Creek Drive Bridge Replacement Project, County of San Diego, August 20, 2021

Energy Use – Calculations Summary (based on EMFAC2021 (v1.0.1) Emissions Inventory), Alyssa Way, Air Quality and GHG Specialist – Independent Contractor, Planning & Development Services, October 2021

Geotechnical Report Proposed Sandia Creek Drive Bridge Replacement Project, Leighton Consulting, Inc., December 13, 2019

Haul Route Exhibit, KPFF Consulting Engineers, November 19, 2021

Noise Report for the Sandia Creek Drive Bridge Replacement and Fish Passage Project, DUDEK, December 2021

Preliminary Hydrology Report, KPFF Consulting Engineers, December 16, 2021

Sandia Creek Drive Bridge Replacement Project, Hydraulic/Scour Report, River Focus Water Resource Consultants, May 2021

Santa Margarita River Hydrology Report, River Focus Water Resource Consultants, May 2021

Sight Distance Certification, KPFF Consulting Engineers, November 22, 2021

Stormwater Quality Management Plan, KPFF Consulting Engineers, December 16, 2021

Visual Simulations, Figures 1 through 3, DUDEK, October 2021

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances. (www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996). (<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000 (<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997. (www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center, National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPIP), Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003. (www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline Map, San Diego, CA. (<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System. (www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the National Highway System. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965. (www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996. (www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4. Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report," 2002. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System. (www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85 Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

16 USC 703–712. Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended.

66 FR 3853–3856. Executive Order 13186: "Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds." January 17, 2001.

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines. CDFW and California Resources Agency, Sacramento, California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2020a. California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB). Accessed September 2020. <https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB>

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2020. *Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants* (online edition v8-03 0.45). Sacramento: CNPS, Rare Plant Program. Accessed July 2020. www.rareplants.cnps.org

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6, Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord. Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and between United States Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Wildlife and County of San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

County of San Diego. 2012b. *Resource Management Plan for Santa Margarita Preserve San Diego County*. Released June 29, 2012. Approved June 30, 2012. Accessed August 2020. https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/parks/RMD/RMPs%20and%20Trails/Santa%20Margarita_Final%20RMP_6_29.12.pdf.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States*. FWS/OBS-79/31. Prepared for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. December 1979. Reprinted 1992. <http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/documents/classification-of-wetlands-and-deepwater-habitats-of-the-united-states.pdf>.

Crother, B.I. 2012. *Scientific and Standard English Names of Amphibians and Reptiles of North America North of Mexico, with Comments Regarding Confidence in our Understanding*, edited by J.J. Moriarty. 7th ed. Society for the Study of Amphibians and Reptiles (SSAR); Herpetological Circular no. 39. August 2012. Available at: http://home.gwu.edu/~rpyron/publications/Crother_et_al_2012.pdf.

Davenport Biological Services. 2008. Final Wildlife Survey Report, Santa Margarita River Conjunctive Use Project Open Space Management Zone, Fallbrook Public Utility District, California. September 12.

The Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force (DAPTF). *The Declining Amphibian Task Force Fieldwork Code of Practice*. <https://www.fws.gov/ventura/docs/species/protocols/DAFTA.pdf>

Flora Project. 2018. "Index to California Plant Names." <http://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/db/icpn/>.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial Natural Communities of California. State of California, Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Sacramento, California, 1986.

Lichvar, R.W., Butterwick, M., Melvin, N. and W. Kirchner. 2014. The National Wetland Plant List. 2014 Update of Wetland Ratings

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire District's Association of San Diego County.

Moyle, P.B. 2002. *Inland Fishes of California*. Revised and expanded. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Sawyer, J., T. Keeler-Wolf, and J. Evens. 2009. *A Manual of California Vegetation*. Second Edition. Sacramento, California: California Native Plant Society in collaboration with California Department of Fish and Game.

Stebbins, R.C. 2003. *Western Reptiles and Amphibians*. 3rd ed. Peterson Field Guide. New York, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d 54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987. (<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands: our vital link between land and water. Office of Water, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon, 1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern 2002. Division of Migratory. 2002. (migratorybirds.fws.gov)

Zych, A. 2015. Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Survey 45-day Report for Fallbrook Public Utility District Open Space Management Zone (OSMZ), Fallbrook, San Diego County, California.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.

County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.

Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.

U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.arnlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

California Air Pollution Control Officers Association. 2008. CEQA and Climate Change. Available: <http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/05/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>. Accessed October 28, 2021.

California Emissions Estimator Module. 2017. User's Guide. Prepared for California Air pollution Control Officers Association. Prepared by Breeze Software, A Division of Trinity Consulting in collaboration with South Coast Air Quality Management District and the California Air Districts

South Coast Air Quality Management District. 2008. Draft Guidance Document – Interim CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Significance Threshold. Available: [http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-\(ghg\)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgattachmente.pdf](http://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/ceqa/handbook/greenhouse-gases-(ghg)-ceqa-significance-thresholds/ghgattachmente.pdf). Accessed October 28, 2021.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD). 2020. Greenhouse Gas Thresholds for Sacramento County. Available: <http://www.airquality.org/LandUseTransportation/Documents/MAQMDGHGThresholds2020-03-04v2.pdf>. Accessed October 28, 2021.

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.

California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)

California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

- California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- EnviroStor. 2018. Online Web tracker for hazardous materials. Available at: <https://www.dtsc.ca.gov/other/your-envirostor.cfm>
- Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)
- Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)
- USEPA. 2017. National Priorities List (NPL) Sites – by State. Available at <https://www.epa.gov/superfund/national-priorities-list-npl-sites-state>. Accessed October 4, 2017
- HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**
- American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government
- California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)
- California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.
- California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). 1994. *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin (9)*. September Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sandiego/water_issues/programs/basin_plan/. Accessed May 31, 2018.
- County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>)
- County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)
- County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)
- County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co-san-diego.ca.us)
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)
- Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.
- HEC (2016a). HEC-SSP Statistical Software Package – User's Manual, Version 2.1, July 2016, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC), Davis, California.
- HEC (2016b). HEC-RAS River Analysis System – User's Manual, Version 5.0, February 2016, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center (HEC), Davis, California.
- Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)
- National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)
- Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)
- San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)
- LAND USE & PLANNING**
- California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations, Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, effective August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

FTA (U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration). 2018. Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. September 2018. Accessed September 2020. https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf.

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Caltrans (2017). Highway Design Manual. 6th Edition. California Department of Transportation, Sacramento, California.

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attach.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority ALUCP'S (http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport_initiatives/land_use/adopted_docs.aspx)

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations
(FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter
1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
(BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway
Projects.

WILDFIRE

CalFire. 2018. San Diego County FHSZ Maps. Available at:
http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fhsz_maps_sandiego