



County of San Diego

RICHARD E. CROMPTON
DIRECTOR

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
5510 OVERLAND AVE, SUITE 410
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123-1237
(858) 694-2212 FAX: (858) 694-3597
Web Site: www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/

May 16, 2019

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

1. Title; Project Number(s):

Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project; 1012847

2. Lead agency name and address:
County of San Diego, Department of Public Works
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92123-1239

3. a. Contact: Thomas Duffy, Project Manager
b. Phone number: (858) 694-3907
c. E-mail: Thomas.Duffy@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

This project is located on Buckman Springs Road in southeastern San Diego County, near the Morena Reservoir within the Cleveland National Forest.

Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1277, Grid A7 and Page 1297, Grid D3

5. Project Applicant name and address:

County of San Diego, Department of Public Works
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92123-1666

6. General Plan
Community Plan: Campo
Land Use Designation: Public Agency Lands
Density: 0 du/.05 acre(s)

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) N/A

7. Zoning
 Use Regulation: Agricultural (A72), Special Purpose (S80)
 Minimum Lot Size: 8, 20 acre(s)
 Special Area Regulation: A, -/A

8. Description of project:

The County of San Diego Department of Public Works proposes the Buckman Spring Road Bridge Widening Project, located along Buckman Springs Road where Cottonwood Creek crosses under the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge (Thomas Brother's Guide Page 1277, Grid A7 and Page 1297, Grid D3). The project is a FHWA funded bridge project that proposes the rehabilitation and widening of the existing bridge to meet federal bridge safety requirements.

Buckman Springs Road Bridge is an approximately 450-foot-long, two-lane bridge with a concrete bridge deck and nine piers. The existing 27-foot-wide bridge carries two lanes of traffic over Cottonwood Creek. The project would widen the bridge up to 6 feet, 9 inches total to create two 15-foot-wide lanes. The foundations of four of the piers would be retrofitted by constructing the bottom of the pile cap approximately 10 feet below the ground surface, with the piles extending up to 75 feet below the ground surface. The project would also include the installation of new girders, overhangs, bridge metal railings, and Caltrans' standard timber/metal Midwest guardrail system. The bridge deck surface would be overlaid with a polyester concrete overlay and re-stripped.

To improve the storm water treatment of the bridge, all bridge deck drainage flows would be directed to three corners of the bridge at the approach ends. Curb inlets would allow the deck's sheet-flow to enter storm drain infiltration trenches located at the three corners of the bridge approaches. The storm drain would flow through the infiltration trenches and exit the bottom of the trenches through two 18-inch diameter drain pipes (one at each end of the bridge). The drain pipe would convey the flows to energy dissipater rip rap pads at the bottom of the embankment.

Grading would be required at either end of the bridge. Four oak trees and seven cottonwood trees would be removed to accommodate grading. Graded areas would be revegetated with native species after construction, and trees would be replaced with in-kind species. Two signs, a "slow to 40 mph at the curve" speed limit sign at the eastern end of the bridge, and a 6.5-mile marker at the western end of the bridge, would be relocated to within five to 10 feet of their existing locations. The existing reflective striped delineator signs would be removed during construction. Utilities, including AT&T lines, would be relocated along the alignment of the new bridge.

Construction of the project is expected to take approximately 12 months. During construction, a 16-foot-wide temporary road (for construction vehicles only) would be created immediately northeast of the Buckman Springs Road Bridge from Buckman Springs Road. This would enable construction vehicles to access the underside of the bridge. Construction staging would occur on a City-owned parcel one half mile away on

Morena Stokes Valley Road. Traffic would be limited to a single 12-foot-wide travel lane through the center of the bridge as necessary during construction. The Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) would be temporarily relocated outside the project's impact area along the northeastern boundary of the project during construction. The trail relocation would be accomplished by placing signs to redirect foot traffic and would not include any grading or ground disturbance. After construction a small 10-foot section of the PCT will be re-routed slightly around the base of the new bridge abutment slope. The ground beneath the bridge would be restored to pre-project conditions and replanted with native species after construction.

The public review period runs from May 16, 2019 to June 14, 2019. Written comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration must be received no later than June 14, 2019 at 4:00 p.m. Comments should be addressed to Thomas Duffy, and can be sent to her by mail at 5510 Overland Ave, Suite 410, San Diego, CA 92123, or by e-mail at Thomas.Duffy@sdcounty.ca.gov, or by fax at (858) 694-3925.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The lands immediately surrounding the project site are undeveloped, rural park lands managed by the County of San Diego in the southern portion of the project area and the Cleveland National Forest Service in the northern portion. Pacific Crest Trail (PCT) travels through the south-end of the project site. The U.S Forest Service's Cottonwood Fire Station is located 0.5 miles north of the project site. Mountain Empire High School is located 1.25 miles north of the site, with Morena Village 1.25 miles south of the site. Morena Stokes Valley Road, located approximately 500 feet north of the project, travels south from the project site toward Lake Morena. Old Highway 80 and Interstate 8 (I-8) are located northeast of the site. State Route 94 is located south of the project site.

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

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
CWA §401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
CWA §404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1602 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Section 7 - Consultation	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
Special Use Permit	USFS

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, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

YES
☒NO
☐

In August 2016 the County consulted with all Kumeyaay tribes pursuant AB-52, and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands review of the project site. The NAHC indicated in a response dated August 16, 2018 that no known sacred lands or traditional cultural properties are within the survey area. Initial AB-52 consultation letters were sent by DPW staff to specific tribal representatives on August 9, 2016. In addition, letters were sent on September 20, 2018 to the Native American representatives and interested parties identified by the NAHC. The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians responded in a letter dated September 15, 2016. They request that a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor be on site for ground disturbing activities.

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:

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

☒ I find 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.

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

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

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

Signature

Date

Printed Name

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 –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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

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: A visual impact report was prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX) on January 9, 2019 for this project. This study concludes that the proposed project would not substantially change the existing visual environment of the project corridor. More details regarding these findings can be found in the *Visual Impact Assessment - Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project* (HELIX 2019a).

The project site is located in the Cleveland National Forest south of Interstate 8 (I-8). This section of Buckman Springs Road is listed as a County Scenic Highway in Table COS-1 of the County of San Diego General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element. The Pacific Coast Trail (PCT), noted as a National Scenic Trail in the Regional Trails Plan, crosses north-south through the central portion of the project site as it parallels Cottonwood Creek. Under both examinations, the project site is considered a scenic vista. The visible components of Buckman Springs Road and the PCT viewshed are undeveloped park land comprised of native chaparral, large oak trees, a small grassy valley to the northeast, and rolling hills to the north, south, and west. Construction of the project will require removal of four coast live oak trees (*Quercus agrifolia*) and seven Fremont cottonwood trees (*Populus fremontii*) mostly located on the northwest side of the bridge, to allow for bridge footings to be retrofitted, the two north-most footings to be widened, and for installation of rock/slope protection at the base of abutments. Installation of road-side drainage swales along road shoulders, used to ensure water run-off is purified before entering the water course, ensures obscurity from the viewshed of I-8 and PCT. Placement of temporary access will avoid impacting trees protected in place. Although 11 trees will be removed, a majority of the trees within the vicinity of the project will remain protected in place, reducing any noticeable change within the viewshed of the I-8 and PCT. Restoration of the project will include replacing bridge side-railings with similar railing style, revegetating native habitat, and replacing removed trees with in-kind species. Therefore, while the project will require the removal of trees within the viewshed of a County Scenic Highway and Pacific Coast Trail, the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect on the scenic vista.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on a scenic vista because the proposed project viewshed and past, present, and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated to determine their cumulative effects. Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XXI are located within the scenic vista's viewshed and will not contribute to a cumulative impact because the proposed bridge improvements project, along with the projects listed in Section XXI, would not result in incompatible changes in visual character or degrade the overall visual quality of a scenic vista. Therefore, the projects direct or cumulative effect on scenic vista will be less than significant.

- 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

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: A visual impact assessment was prepared by HELIX on January 9, 2019 for this project. This study concludes that the proposed project would not substantially change the existing visual environment of the project corridor. More details regarding these findings can be found in the *Visual Impact Assessment - Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project* (HELIX 2019a).

Interstate 8 is 2.5 miles away from the project sites and is classified as Eligible State Scenic Highways- Not Officially Designated by Caltrans. Although construction of the proposed project will require the removal of 11 trees, the project site is not visible from I-8, therefore removal of these trees would not impose damage to scenic resources within the viewshed of a state scenic highway or national scenic trail.

- c) 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 publically 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: A visual impact assessment was prepared by HELIX on January 9, 2019 for this project. This study concludes that the proposed project would not substantially change the existing visual environment of the project corridor. More details regarding these findings can be found in the *Visual Impact Assessment - Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project* (HELIX 2019a).

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 surroundings can be characterized as a rural landscape comprised of native shrubland with dense tree groupings surrounding vegetated creeks.

The proposed project will involve restoration of Buckman Springs Road Bridge side-railings, bridge widening, replacement/widening of bridge footings, and installation of rock/slope protection and road-side drainage swales. Construction will require the removal of 11 trees to widen piers on the north-end and to install rock/slope protection for abutments. Road-side drainage swales will be installed along the road shoulder out of sight from the I-8, PCT, and on-coming drivers. Approximately 300 feet of PCT will be temporarily relocated outside of the construction zone. Placement of temporary road access will avoid trees protected in place. A majority of trees will be avoided and protected in place and areas temporarily impacted by construction will be revegetated with native and in-kind plants, seeds, and trees. The existing visual landscape is undeveloped land consisting of mixed vegetation: a grassy valley to the northeast, dense oak groves along the north and south roadway, and shrubland on hillsides to the west. The existing bridge will be rehabilitated to look similar to the existing bridge and the 11 trees will be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. Therefore, the visual character and quality of the site and existing surroundings will not be substantially degraded by the temporary removal of smaller trees.

The project will not result in cumulative impacts on visual character or quality because the entire existing viewshed and a list of past, present, and future projects within that viewshed were evaluated. Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. Those projects listed in Section XXI are located within the viewshed surrounding the project and will not contribute to a cumulative impact for the following reasons: the proposed bridge improvements project, along with the projects listed in Section XXI, would not result in incompatible changes in visual character or degrade the overall visual quality of a scenic vista. Therefore, the project will result in less than significant adverse project and cumulative level effect on visual character or quality on-site or in the surrounding area.

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

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☐ Less than Significant Impact

- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project does not propose any use of outdoor lighting or building materials with highly reflective properties such as highly reflective glass or high-gloss surface colors. Therefore, the project will not create any new sources of light pollution that could contribute to skyglow, light trespass, or glare and adversely affect day or nighttime views in area.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is divided by County Park land and Federal Park land located in the Cleveland National Forest. The project site has land designated as Farmland of Local Importance for both parcels, according to the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). However, based on a site visit and a review of historic aerial photography conducted by County staff, there is no evidence of agricultural use on the project site. Additionally, under the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, the United States Forest Service is not likely to allow for conversion of this land for agricultural use. Therefore, this site does not meet the definition of an agricultural resource and no impact project or cumulative level conversion of Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use will occur as a result of this project.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. The project site is located on two parcels; one is owned by County Parks and the other is owned by the Cleveland National Forest. The project site located on the County Park parcel is zoned for agricultural use and the site located on the Federal Park parcel is zoned for special purpose. The project will not inflict zoning changes or create a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or special purpose. Additionally, a record search using the LUEG GIS mapping application confirms that the parcels

are not in a Williamson Act contract. 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project involves bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. The project site does not contain timberland and the County of San Diego does not have any existing Timberland Production Zones. Additionally, the project is consistent with existing zoning and a rezone of the property is not proposed. Therefore, project implementation would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause 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 type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project involves bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. The project would not result in changes to the existing environment that could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use. Therefore, project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project involves bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. The project would not result in changes to the existing environment that could result in conversion of Farmland of Local Importance or other

agricultural resources. 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 –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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project would involve bridge widening and improvements to footings of an existing road bridge. The project would not result in any changes to the existing land uses within or surrounding the site. Completion of the proposed project will not generate additional vehicle trips that could contribute to air quality impacts. The only new emissions from the project would be from the construction phase, which is anticipated to last approximately 12 months and emissions would be minimal, temporary, and localized. Additionally, dust control measures would be implemented during construction. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of either RAQS or the 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

The project is located in the San Diego Air Basin (SDAB), which meets state standards for all criteria pollutant concentrations under the California Ambient Air Quality Standard (CAAQS) except for Ozone (O₃) and particulate matter sized 10 microns or less (PM₁₀). O₃ is formed when volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (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 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.

Less than Significant Impact: Air quality emissions associated with the project include emissions of PM₁₀, NO_x and VOCs from construction/grading activities. Dust control measures would be implemented during the construction phase. Emissions released during the construction phase would be minimal and temporary, resulting in PM₁₀, NO_x and VOC emissions

below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

In addition, a list of past, present and future projects within the surrounding area were evaluated and none of these projects emit significant amounts of criteria pollutants. Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered. The proposed project as well as the past, present, and future projects within the surrounding area, have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance for VOCs and PM₁₀, therefore, the construction and operational emissions associated with the proposed project will have a less than significant impact on net increase of PM₁₀, or any O₃ precursors.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

No Impact: The project site is located on rural park land located in the Cleveland National Forest. As a result, there are no sensitive receptors identified within a quarter-mile (the radius determined by SCAQMD in which the dilution of pollutants is typically significant) of the proposed project site. Additionally, this project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these identified sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near carbon monoxide hotspots. Therefore, the project will have no impact on exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations because the proposed project as well as the listed projects have emissions below the screening-level criteria established by the LUEG guidelines for determining significance.

d) Result in other emissions such as those leading to odors 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing road bridge. The project could result in other emissions, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane,

alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. However, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m³). Subsequently, no significant air quality – odor impacts are expected to affect surrounding receptors. Therefore, the effects of other emissions leading to odors are localized to the immediate surrounding area and will have a less than significant impact.

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 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated: The project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing road bridge. A *Draft Natural Environmental Study* was prepared for this project by HELIX in January 2019 (HELIX 2019b), which includes an analysis of the project's impact on biological resources. Additionally, a Draft Biological Assessment was prepared for the project by HELIX in January 2019 (HELIX 2019c), which assessed the potential for listed species identified by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The project site occurs within an area mapped as Final Critical Habitat for the federally endangered arroyo toad (*Anaxyrus californicus*). The habitat throughout this portion of Cottonwood Creek contains suitable habitat for arroyo toad, and this species' presence on-site was confirmed during arroyo toad protocol surveys that were conducted in 2011. These results are reported in the *Focused Survey Results for the Arroyo Toad on the Buckman Springs Bridge Project Site* letter, dated June 23, 2011 (RECON 2011). The site is considered occupied by arroyo toad and the proposed project has potential to result in impacts to this species. These impacts would be avoided and/or reduced to below a level of significance through the implementation of arroyo toad mitigation measures which are part of the project

The following arroyo toad conservation measures apply at the project site, not including the staging area on Morena Stokes Valley Road:

- Construction activities will only occur during daytime hours. No night lighting is permitted for use during construction of the project. No lighting will be installed on the new roadway as part of this project.
- Arroyo toad exclusionary fencing shall be installed around the PIA by the contractor prior to starting work. This fence will exclude arroyo toads from the PIA, including the access road. Project activities shall be confined within the fenced area. The arroyo toad exclusion fence should consist of filter fabric at least two feet high, staked firmly to the ground with the lower one foot of material stretching outward along the ground and secured with a continuous line of sandbags (i.e.,

there should be no space between the sandbags). No digging or vegetation removal should be associated with the installation of the fence and all materials will be removed when the project is complete.

- The County will be responsible for hiring a Carlsbad Fish and Wildlife Office-approved biologist experienced in handling arroyo toad to work as the project biological monitor and toad expert. The qualified biologist shall monitor the installation of the toad exclusion fencing.
- Once the fence is installed, a qualified biologist would conduct a six-day/six-night arroyo toad survey of the entire area inside the fence to ensure no toads remain in the PIA. If pre-activity conditions are dry, the area inside the exclusionary fencing will be sprayed with water during the arroyo toad survey to simulate a precipitation event. Water spraying will occur at least one hour after sunset when the air temperature is greater than 50 degrees Fahrenheit. If no toads are encountered within the exclusion fencing area, then project activities shall be allowed to commence under the supervision of a biological monitor.
- In the event that arroyo toads are confirmed inside of the exclusionary fencing area, any individuals encountered within the exclusion fencing area will be relocated to suitable habitat outside the PIA by a qualified biologist approved by the USFWS to handle the species. Surveys shall continue until there have been two consecutive nights without toads inside the fence. The final survey shall be conducted within one week prior to the start of project activities.
- The USFWS-authorized biologist should coordinate with appropriate property owners and with the USFWS to determine a specific translocation site prior to moving any arroyo toads. In addition, any arroyo toads captured should be checked for a Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT) tag and be scanned with a PIT-tag reader if a PIT-tag is present. The date, time of capture, specific location of capture (using Global Positioning System [GPS]), PIT-tag code, approximate size, age, and health of the individual should be recorded and provided to the USFWS, within two weeks of the translocation, in both hard copy and digital format.
- Once project activities begin, a biological monitor authorized to handle arroyo toads will be on site weekly or as necessary to ensure the integrity of the exclusionary fencing.
- If any toads are identified by construction personnel, then the resident engineer (RE) should be notified immediately. The RE will then notify the authorized biologist who shall be solely responsible for the translocation of toads outside of the PIA. No one other than the approved biologist is permitted to handle or bother the toads in any way.
- The USFWS-authorized biologist shall maintain a complete record of all arroyo toads encountered and moved from harm's way during the project activities. Information shall include: location, date and time of observation, details of the observed behavior, relocation site, estimated number of toads seen or heard, and photographs (when possible).
- If the arroyo toad exclusion fencing is found damaged during construction, the contractor is responsible for repairing the fence within 24 hours and notifying the RE. If the exclusion fencing is found damaged in such a way thereby allowing arroyo toads access to the PIA, arroyo toad exclusion surveys will be repeated by

the approved biologist for a minimum of three consecutive nights prior to any additional construction activities occurring in the area.

- Prior to the onset of project activities, employees that would work on the project (including temporary workers, contractors, and subcontractors) would be educated and instructed on the arroyo toad conservation measures including the following by the qualified biologist and County staff: limiting activities to within the fenced arroyo toad exclusion area, keeping vehicles and equipment on the bridge and road, and the location of approved staging area and access path. At a minimum, the program will include the following topics: occurrence of the listed and sensitive species in the area (including photographs), their general ecology, sensitivity of the species to human activities, legal protection afforded these species, penalties for violations of Federal and State laws, reporting requirements, and project features designed to reduce the impacts to these species and promote continued successful occupation of the area. It is the contractor's responsibility to inform all workers and subcontractors of the environmental requirements of the project.
- Project work during rain events will be avoided to the greatest extent feasible as arroyo toads may become active during rain events and the movement of personnel and equipment through wet soils may result in sedimentation into breeding habitat. To ensure that work is completed as rapidly as possible such that the temporal disturbance of the habitat is limited, work may continue during a light or intermittent rain, if the USFWS-authorized biologist, using his/her best judgment, determines that increased impacts to arroyo toads are unlikely.
- All trash must be removed from work sites or completely secured in a wildlife proof container at the end of each workday.
- Pets of project personnel are not allowed in the PIA.
- Movement of construction personnel, vehicles, and equipment shall be confined to existing roads and areas within arroyo toad exclusionary fencing. Vehicle ingress/egress will only be allowed from the one location for each enclosed area. The ingress/egress locations will be resealed at the conclusion of each workday (prior to dusk) to ensure the exclusionary fencing is complete and fully functional.
- Siltation and erosion in and around the impact area shall be controlled during construction activities with best management practices (BMPs).
- Equipment storage, repair, and fueling shall only take place in the designated staging and/or work areas and will avoid potential contamination of the waterway. Erodible material shall be stockpiled only within the PIA and in compliance with all wetland and water quality permitting.

The mule fat scrub and southern arroyo willow riparian forest on-site have potential to support both Least Bell's Vireo (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) and southwestern willow flycatcher (*Empidonax traillii extimus*). Both of these species are state and federally listed as endangered. However, no individuals of either of these species were detected during focused protocol least Bell's vireo surveys and protocol southwestern willow flycatcher surveys conducted in 2017. The results of these surveys were reported in separated letter reports, *2017 Least Bell's Vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus) Survey Report for the Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project* (HELIX 2017a) and *2017 Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus) Survey Report for the Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project* (HELIX 2017b), dated August 9, 2017 and August 18, 2017, respectively. Although the protocol surveys were negative, there remains a

moderate potential for least Bell's vireo to occur onsite and a low potential for southwestern willow flycatcher to occur onsite. Therefore, although no significant impacts are expected to occur to southwestern willow flycatcher, the proposed project has potential to result in significant impacts to least Bell's vireo. These impacts would be avoided and/or reduced to below a level of significant through the implementation of the least Bell's vireo design elements described below.

If work is proposed to start during the least Bell's vireo breeding season (March 15 to September 15), a pre-activity nesting bird survey will be conducted within seven days prior to starting work to identify any nesting vireos or other riparian birds within 500 feet of the PIA. If work stops for more than seven days, the pre-activity survey will be repeated before re-starting work during the breeding season.

If there are no nesting birds (includes nest building or other breeding/nesting behavior) within this area, vegetation trimming and other project activities shall be allowed to proceed.

If nesting birds are found, the biologist shall flag the active nests and project activities shall avoid active nests until nesting behavior has ceased, nests have failed, or young have fledged. Project-related maintenance activities that could generate noise in excess of 60 dBA within 300 feet of a nest (500 feet for raptors) shall either: (1) be postponed until a qualified biologist determines the nest(s) is no longer active or until after the respective breeding season; or (2) not occur until a temporary noise barrier or berm is constructed at the edge of the development footprint and/or around the piece of equipment to ensure that noise levels are reduced to below 60 dBA or ambient. Buffer distances may be adjusted as recommended by the qualified biologist depending on the sensitivity of the species.

Aside from arroyo toad, the following ten County special-status species were detected on-site: turkey vulture (*Cathartes aura*), green heron (*Butorides striatus*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus bennettii*), red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), mountain quail (*Oreortyx pictus*), western bluebird (*Sialia mexicana*), yellow warbler (*Dendroica petechia*), and pallid bat (*Antrozous pallidus*). Additionally, the following County special-status species have moderate to high potential to occur on-site: coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma blainvillii*), two-striped gartersnake (*Thamnophis hammondi*), and Dulzura pocket mouse (*Chaetodipus californicus femoralis*).

The proposed project could potentially result in direct impacts to individuals of six avian species: Cooper's hawk, red-shouldered hawk, green heron, white-tailed kite, yellow warbler, and western bluebird; all of which have potential to nest within the project area. Direct impacts may also occur to potentially present San Diego black-tailed jackrabbit, coast horned lizard, two-striped gartersnake, and Dulzura pocket mouse. However, avoidance and mitigation measures would reduce potential direct impacts to the six avian species and four additional wildlife species to below a level of significant. The remaining two avian species observed or with potential to occur, mountain quail and turkey vulture, are not expected to nest in the project area or be directly impacted by the project. Pallid bat was observed to be utilizing the bridge within the project area as a nighttime roost; but this species was not observed using any portion of the site as a daytime roost. No project construction will occur at night; therefore pallid bat is not expected to be directly impacted by the proposed project.

The project is not expected to result in impacts to the local population of any of the wildlife species listed above as a minimal amount of habitat will be impacted relative to the availability of habitat for these species in the project vicinity. Furthermore, mitigation for impacts to sensitive vegetation communities would provide habitat-based mitigation for impacts to these sensitive species. Large trees will be preserved to the greatest extent feasible; however, implementation of the proposed project will result in the removal of four coast live oak trees and seven Fremont cottonwood trees. Although these tree species are not considered rare, threatened, or endangered by any jurisdictional resource agency, replacement trees will be planted at a 2:1 ratio as part of the post-construction on-site habitat mitigation, resulting in a total of eight coast live oak trees and 14 Fremont cottonwood trees planted.

- 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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing road bridge. Based on a field visit conducted by HELIX on July 11, 2018, the following riparian and sensitive natural communities were identified within the project area: southern arroyo willow riparian forest, mule fat scrub, herbaceous wetland, non-vegetated channel, coast live oak woodland, big sagebrush scrub, southern mixed chaparral, and non-native grassland. Minor impacts to these vegetation communities would result from the proposed project. These impacts would be reduced to less than significant through the restoration of the site, after construction.

Specifically, Upon completion of construction activities, temporary impact areas, including 0.32 acre of southern arroyo willow riparian forest, 0.42 acre of mule fat scrub, 0.01 acre of herbaceous wetland, 0.09 acre of non-vegetated channel, 0.1 acre of coast live oak woodland, 0.1 acre of big sagebrush scrub, and 0.5 acre of non-native grassland, will be restored in place, providing on-site, in-kind mitigation at a 1:1 ratio. The impact area shall be restored to its original pre-construction conditions, with respect to contours and vegetation composition, to the extent feasible. Restoration will include planting at least 14 cottonwood trees to replace the seven cottonwood trees to be removed by the project and at least eight coast live oak trees to replace the four coast live oak trees to be removed by the project, resulting in a 2:1 ratio.

- 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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated: The project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing road bridge. Based on a field visit conducted by HELIX on July 11, 2017, areas within the project site were delineated as being both federally- and state-jurisdictional wetlands and non-wetland waters. The project will result in minor temporary impacts to Army Corps of Engineers wetland and non-wetland waters of the U.S., and California Department of Fish and Wildlife streambeds and riparian habitat. The proposed permanent impacts to wetland and non-wetland waters of the U.S. total less than 0.01 acre and three linear feet. The proposed permanent impacts to wetland and non-wetland waters of the State (CDFW riparian and streambed) total less than 0.01 acre and 31 linear feet. Temporary impacts to wetlands and non-wetland waters are proposed to be mitigated via the restoration of temporary impact areas back to their original contours and vegetation communities. No additional mitigation is proposed, unless otherwise required by the ACOE, RWQCB, and/or CDFW during the regulatory permitting process.

- 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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing road bridge. The project site occurs within the floodplain of Cottonwood Creek, which likely serves as a local wildlife corridor. During construction, two 36 inch pipes will extend through the project site to help small animal species move through the project site. Large animal species movement through the site will be restricted. However, any potentially occurring wildlife would be able to move around the project site by crossing over Buckman Springs Road on either side of the bridge, rather than crossing under the bridge. Although this may expose wildlife to potential vehicle strike along the road, Buckman Springs Road does not support consistent traffic, and wildlife vehicle strikes during construction is expected to be minimal. After construction is complete, wildlife would again have access to crossing through the project site under the bridge as no permanent restrictions on the wildlife corridor along Cottonwood Creek are proposed. The project site does not serve as a wildlife nursery site or support migratory fish.

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

<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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The California Oak Conservation Act of 2001 states that local governments shall require mitigation for impacts to oak woodlands. The project would impact 4 oak trees which will be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. Therefore the project does not conflict with any state or local ordinances protecting biological resources.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site occurs within an existing open space and other public/semi-public lands and, thus, is not part of the County of San Diego East County Multiple Species Concept Plan (MSCP) area, nor would it impact connectivity between future preserve areas. The project is not subject to the Resource Protection Ordinance or any HCP or other regional planning effort. The project is not located within the adopted MSCP; therefore the project is not subject to the Biological Mitigation Ordinance regulations regarding Biological Resource Core Areas, existing movement corridors and wildlife linkages, or MSCP narrow endemic species. The project involves improvements to an existing bridge and would not conflict with any future plans, policies or ordinances that protect biological resources.

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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to widen and rehabilitate the Buckman Springs Road Bridge to meet federal bridge safety requirements. County approved archaeologist, Dominique Diaz de Leon of HELIX conducted a records search at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) on September 24, 2018. A pedestrian field survey was conducted by senior archaeologist, Stacie Wilson of HELIX and Kumeyaay Native American monitor, Shuuluk Linton from Red Tail Monitoring and Research, Inc. on October 10, 2018. Based on the analysis of records and pedestrian survey, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources because they do not occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled *Historic Survey Report - Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening* prepared by HELIX (2018). The survey report describes that the bridge was evaluated

by Caltrans in accordance with Section 106. The bridge was listed as Category 5 (previously determined Not Eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places), and remains valid.

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: A records search was conducted by County approved archaeologist Dominique Diaz de Leon of HELIX on September 18, 2018. The records search results indicate that 30 cultural resources have been recorded within one mile of the Buckman Springs Road Bridge. None of the sites are within the Project Impact Area. The project site has been surveyed by County approved senior archaeologist, Stacie Wilson of HELIX and Kumeyaay Native American monitor Shuuluk Linton from Red Tail Monitoring & Research, Inc. on October 10, 2018. Results of this survey can be found in a technical study entitled *Archaeological Survey Report - Buckman Springs Road Bridge*, San Diego County, California, prepared by HELIX (2018). The survey results indicated that the archaeological resources are located outside of the Area of Potential Effect (APE), therefore implementation of the proposed project would not impact the prehistoric sites.

In August 2016 the County consulted with all Kumeyaay tribes pursuant AB-52, and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands review of the project site. The NAHC indicated in a response dated August 16, 2018 that no known sacred lands or traditional cultural properties are within the survey area. Initial AB-52 consultation letters were sent by DPW staff to specific tribal representatives on August 9, 2016. In addition, letters were sent on September 20, 2018 to the Native American representatives and interested parties identified by the NAHC. The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians responded in a letter dated September 15, 2016. They request that a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor be on site for ground disturbing activities.

A qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American monitor will be present during initial ground disturbing activities. They will have the ability to halt the project if any previously unidentified cultural materials are unearthed during the proposed project until a qualified archaeologist can assess the nature and significance of the find. Therefore, no significant impacts to archeological resources are anticipated.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on an analysis of records and a survey of the property on October 10, 2018 by a County of San Diego approved archaeologist, Stacie Wilson, it has been determined that

the project will not disturb any human remains because the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report entitled, *Archaeological Survey Report - Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening*, prepared by HELIX (2018).

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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the Buckman Springs Road Bridge. Construction activities will require the use of large equipment and machinery that will only be used to conduct the necessary bridge and abutment improvements. It is not anticipated that the project operation or construction would result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

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

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the Buckman Springs Road Bridge, and will not interfere with state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plans.

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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Per the the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Public Resources Code, Division 2, Chapter 7.5, §2621 – 2631), the State of California has identified faults that represent a hazard of surface rupture as Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones (AP Zones). The State has also identified "Special Study Zones" which map movement during the past 700,000-1.6 million years known Quaternary faults. The project is not located within an APZ or Quaternary fault zone. Additionally, the project is located in rural park lands with no surrounding residences or businesses. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Seismic waves propagating through the earth's crust result in the ground vibrations felt during an earthquake. Subsequently, this ground shaking is responsible for the resulting earthquake damage. All of San Diego is located within Seismic Zone 4 – the highest Seismic Zone (California Building Code §1629.4.1), and is subject to ground shaking. The County has mapped all known active faults as well as buffers (near-source shaking zones) that identify locations where seismic ground shaking is expected to be the most significant. The project is not located in the vicinity of any known active fault or within a near-source shaking zone. Therefore the project will result in a less than 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Seismic-related ground failure can lead to liquefaction, lateral spreading, fault rupture, and landslides. Liquefaction occurs when loose, saturated soils are shaken as a result of an earthquake, causing the soils to lose strength and behave as a liquid. Liquefaction can cause lateral spreading that occurs when the ground is laterally displaced, potentially resulting in subsidence, cracking, rotation, and/or disintegration of the ground surface. Areas with the potential for liquefaction are typically located in alluvial river valleys/basins and floodplains. The County developed a *Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan*, San Diego, CA (URS, 2004) and composed these maps in the LUEG GIS mapping application.

Less than Significant Impact: Based on the LUEG maps, the project site is located within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. Historically, seismic shaking levels within the County have not been sufficient to trigger liquefaction. Therefore, there would be a less than significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, since liquefaction potential at the site is considered low, earthquake-induced lateral spreading is not considered to be a seismic hazard at the site and impacts would be less than significant.

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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Landslides occur when masses of rock, earth, or debris move down a slope; creep, rock falls, slope failures, and shallow debris flows are types of landslides. Landslides can be triggered by natural factors such as subsurface water flow, topography, floods and earthquakes, or by human activities such as grading/construction/mining activities or irrigation. 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). Also included within Landslide Susceptibility Areas are gabbroic soils on slopes steeper than 15% in grade because these soils are slide prone. No portions of the project site meet these landslide risk criteria. Therefore, 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 on 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 |
|---|--|

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Data collected using the U.S Department of Agriculture (USDA) Web Soil Survey mapping application, found that soils on-site of the project area are identified as Mottsville loamy coarse sand (MvC, 2-9 percent slopes), with a soil erodibility rating of moderate.

The project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil for the following reasons:

- The contractor will prepare a Storm water Management Plan which will detail the Best Management Practices to be used during construction to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site.
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil on a project level.

In addition, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all the of past, present, and future projects included on the list of projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426). Refer to XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance for a comprehensive list of the projects considered.

- 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project would involve the placement of temporary access down the slope of Cottonwood Creek, excavation in the creek bed to expose the footings of the bridge, construction of isolated scour revetments at the footings found to be susceptible to scour, and grading along the slopes of the Cottonwood Creek for installation of storm water

drainage systems. The project site is not located within a Potential Liquefaction Area but is subject to seismic ground shaking. However, historical records indicate that seismic shaking levels within the County have not been sufficient to trigger liquefaction. Therefore, the project is not located on unstable soil or geologic conditions, nor would it cause the area to become unstable, so the potential for an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VII Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: County Staff reviewed the USDA Web Soil Survey mapping tool to determine that the on-site soils are classified as MvC and do not contain expansive soils as defined by Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). These soils have a shrink-swell behavior of low and represent no substantial risks to life or property. Therefore, the project will not create a substantial risk to life or property.

- 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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge and does not propose any septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems since no wastewater will be generated.

- 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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: This project involves bridge improvements to the Buckman Springs Road Bridge. County Staff conducted a desktop search and found that the project site is not located in an area that has the potential to support paleontological resources or unique geological features. Therefore, no impacts to unique paleontological resources or unique geological features are anticipated.

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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

GHGs include carbon dioxide, methane, halocarbons (HFCs), and nitrous oxide, among others. Human induced GHG emissions are a result of energy production and consumption, and personal vehicle use, among other sources. A regional GHG inventory prepared for the San Diego Region¹ identified on-road transportation (cars and trucks) as the largest contributor of GHG emissions in the region, accounting for 46% of the total regional emissions. Electricity and natural gas combustion were the second (25%) and third (9%) largest regional contributors, respectively, to regional GHG emissions.

Climate changes resulting from GHG emissions could produce an array of adverse environmental impacts including water supply shortages, severe drought, increased flooding, sea level rise, air pollution from increased formation of ground level ozone and particulate matter, ecosystem changes, increased wildfire risk, agricultural impacts, ocean and terrestrial species impacts, among other adverse effects.

In 2006, the State passed the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, commonly referred to as AB 32, which set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law requires that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions.

According to the San Diego County Updated Greenhouse Gas Inventory (2013), the region must reduce its GHG emissions by 33 percent from "business-as-usual" emissions to achieve 1990

¹ San Diego County Greenhouse Gas Inventory: An Analysis of Regional Emissions and Strategies to Achieve AB 32 Targets. University of San Diego and the Energy Policy Initiatives Center (EPIC), September 2008.

emissions levels by the year 2020. "Business-as-usual" refers to the 2020 emissions that would have occurred in the absence of the mandated reductions.

Senate Bill 375 (SB 375), passed in 2008, links transportation and land use planning with global warming. It requires the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to set regional targets for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas 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 CEQA. SANDAG has prepared a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which is a new element of the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The strategy identifies how regional greenhouse gas reduction targets, as established by the ARB, will be achieved through development patterns, transportation infrastructure investments, and/or transportation measures or policies that are determined to be feasible. The County of San Diego has also adopted various GHG related goals and policies in the General Plan. For example, Policy COS-14.10 requires County contractors to use low-emission construction vehicles and equipment to improve air quality and reduce GHG emissions; the construction specifications for this project would include this requirement.

It should be noted that an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct impacts under CEQA, as the climate change issue is global in nature, however an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(f) states that an EIR shall analyze greenhouse gas emissions resulting from a proposed project when the incremental contribution of those emissions may be cumulatively considerable.

Guidance from the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) report CEQA & Climate Change, dated January 2008 identifies several potential approaches for assessing a project's GHG emissions (CAPCOA 2008); among these approaches the guidance introduces the concept of establishing thresholds based on GHG emission market capture rates. Following this approach, a lead agency defines an acceptable market capture rate and identifies the corresponding emissions level.

State GHG emissions reduction targets proposed and/or codified by Executive Order S-3-05, Assembly Bill (AB) 32, Executive Order B-30-15, and Senate Bill (SB) 32 include achieving 1990 emission levels by 2020; 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030; and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The most ambitious reduction target, 80 percent below 1990 levels, corresponds to a 90 percent reduction in statewide business-as-usual (BAU) emissions. Thus, the guidance identifies project-level thresholds that would correspond to a 90 percent market capture rate, annual emission of 900 metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO₂E). Following rationale presented in the CAPCOA Guidance, the aggregate emissions from all projects with individual annual emissions that are equal to or less than 900 MT CO₂E would not impede achievement of the state GHG emissions reduction targets codified by AB 32 (2006) and SB 32 (2016) and impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) would therefore be less than cumulatively considerable. As the 900 MT CO₂E annual emissions screening level corresponds to the most ambitious state reduction target, 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050, and does not account for emission reductions achieved by federal, state, and local reduction measures implemented between 2020 and 2050, it is highly conservative.

Projects with annual emissions that exceed 900 MT CO₂E would warrant more detailed analysis for 2020 and 2030 targets.

Development projects typically result in GHG emissions from construction activities and long-term operations. Operational activities are consistent sources of GHG emissions that continue for the entire lifespan of the project. Comparatively, construction emissions are often intensive and vary substantially between phases of construction, but are emitted over a finite time and end at the termination of construction activities. Thus, construction emissions are considered short-term sources of GHG emissions. The annual emissions screening level of 900 MT CO₂E was originally developed to address operational impacts of GHG emissions from land use development. Since the development of the CAPCOA Guidance several air districts in the state have issued additional guidance that construction emissions should be included in the assessment of operational GHG emissions by amortizing the total GHG construction emissions over the lifespan of the project, which are then added to the operational emissions. This approach ensures all GHG emissions that occur from a project are included in the assessment. The project lifespan of typical land use development projects is generally speculative and dependent on the type of land use; consequently land use development projects are conservatively evaluated using an estimated 30-year lifespan. However, the lifespan of individual infrastructure maintenance activities is well known and documented. While similar to land use developments, different improvements or maintenance activities can vary depending on the improvement, unlike typical land use developments where an average lifespan is used, infrastructure projects should be assessed based on the specific improvement life span. The typical lifespan of a bridge is 50 years.

While the 900 MT CO₂E was not intended to be used for temporary GHG emission sources, such as construction, the industry standard practice has been to amortize construction emissions over the life of the project and evaluate the annual emissions from construction using the 900 MT CO₂E. Comparing the summation of amortized construction emissions against a threshold intended to assess operational-related impacts is considered an appropriate approach for assessment of construction related emissions due to the short-term nature of the emissions source. In order to estimate the annual GHG emissions from typical infrastructure maintenance activities, the County of San Diego Department of Public Works prepared a study in 2017 (RECON, 2017: Greenhouse Gas Guidance Letter).

This analysis was based on modeling performed using the Road Construction Emissions Model (RCEM) Version 8.10; this model was developed by the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) to calculate emissions associated with linear roadway construction and maintenance activities. The RCEM model identifies typical construction equipment and scheduling scenarios for these activities and estimates the daily and total air and GHG emissions associated with projects. The RCEM model is capable of modeling construction projects occurring between 2014 and 2025.

For each recurring infrastructure maintenance activity, a scenario was developed and modeled with a construction year of 2017. Scenario parameters such as project phases, equipment use, and material hauling quantities were developed from sample projects, or where no sample project data was available, were modeled using either default values built-in to the RCEM model or reasonably inferred values. Resulting activity emissions were converted linear equivalent emission rate, i.e., MT CO₂E per mile. This value is intended to assist the County in determining

when total annual activities associated with these maintenance activities would exceed the screening levels. To account for variation in individual maintenance activities and ensure an adequate margin of error, a 10 percent contingency was incorporated into all activity emission rates.

Bridge construction typically involves (1) clearing vegetation and grading the project area, (2) developing foundations which may include substantial pile driving, and (3) construction of the structural elements including the bridge support structures and deck. A project scenario was developed based on DPW activities for the Viejas Boulevard Bridge Crossing Sweetwater River. The bridge is approximately 125 feet long and 45 feet wide and includes one lane in each direction. Based on its size, the bridge was estimated to require approximately 950 cubic yards of imported materials. The project scenario was estimated to result in 395 MT CO₂E. Accounting for a 10 percent contingency, the emissions rate was estimated to be 3.48 MT CO₂E per foot of bridge.

To determine if annual maintenance activities would result in potentially significant cumulative emissions, the quantity of each activity should be multiplied by the emission rate and summed. If the summed emissions, after dividing (amortizing) by the life of the project in years, do not exceed the 900 MT CO₂E screening level then it can be concluded that individual County DPW maintenance activities would have a less than cumulatively considerable impact on climate change and would not conflict with or obstruct applicable plans and policies intended to reduce GHG emissions such as state GHG Reduction Goals identified by AB 32 (2006) and SB 32 (2016).

The project will not add any traffic level lanes and will not include additional traffic. The project will widen an existing bridge by up to 6 feet 9 inches so that vehicles do not scrape the bridge railings. As such, the project will not generate any long term operational greenhouse gases. GHG emissions from the construction project are estimated to be 31.32 MT CO₂E over the life of the bridge.

Because the annual GHG emissions from construction of this project are less than the 900 metric ton screening threshold set by CAPCOA and there will be no long term operational GHG emissions, the project will not have a cumulatively considerable impact to GHG emissions. Since construction would not approach or exceed the screening threshold and operation would not alter the existing conditions, a project specific analysis is not warranted, and the project would have a less than significant impact to cumulative GHG emissions. Therefore, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable impacts associated with GHG emissions.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings at the existing bridge on Buckman Springs Road Bridge. The project would not result in the generation of any new vehicle trips or generate additional greenhouse gases, therefore the project would not conflict with any plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of GHG.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge and will require demolition activities. Prior to any demolition activities, the project will be required to install tarps. Prior to demolition activities, paint materials on the bridge deck and railings will be tested for Lead Based Paint (LBP). However, the project will not result in a significant hazard to the public or environment because if found, all storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances will be in full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520.

The project proposes to renovate structures on site that were constructed prior to 1980 and that may contain Lead Based Paint (LBP). Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows and doors. Lead containing materials shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 CCR Division 4.5, the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 CCR Section 1532.1) and the State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). In accordance with existing regulations, the project will be required to complete lead surveys to determine the presence or absence of LBP prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities.

The San Diego County Department of Environmental Health Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) is the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of onsite. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a

hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances or related to the accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- 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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is located approximately 1.6 miles from Mountain Empire High School. The project is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Based on a site visit and regulatory database searches, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances (Cortese) list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRA) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally,

the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank, and is not located on a site with the potential for contamination from historic uses such as intensive agriculture, industrial uses, a gas station or vehicle repair shop. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within an 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

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.

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.

ii. 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.

iii. 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: The Dam Evacuation Plan for Dam Inundation Zones, 1005 will not be interfered with because, even though the project is located within a dam inundation zone, the project is not a unique institution that would be difficult to safely evaluate in the event of a dam failure. Unique institutions, as defined by the Office of Emergency Services, including 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, amphitheaters, or a similar use. Since the project does not propose a unique institution in a dam inundation zone, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan. The project will be constructed so that one lane will remain open at all times so as not to conflict with any evacuation plans.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge located in a rural area of the Cleveland National Forest. The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. The project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Additionally, the project would not result in an increased use of the Buckman Springs Road Bridge. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving hazardous wildland fires. Moreover, the project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact, because all past, present and future projects in the surrounding area are required to comply with the County Fire Code.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY –Would the project:

a) Violate any waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge over the Cottonwood Creek to reduce the potential of scour damage. The project would involve minor dredge and fill work in the bed of Cottonwood Creek, which is a surface water body that qualifies as waters of the state and waters of the U.S. This work would require a Clean Water Act (CWA) §401 Water Quality Certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), a §1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), and a CWA §404 Nationwide Permit (NWP) verification from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The purpose of these authorizations would be to enforce surface water quality objectives and to ensure that the project would not result in violations of waste discharge requirements. The County would ensure that all work is conducted in compliance with all requirements of the RWQCB, CDFW, and ACOE authorizations to conduct the work.

The project site proposes and will be required to implement the following site design measures and/or source control best management practices (BMPs) and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff: erosion control measures such as silt fencing along the perimeter of the temporary impact area, a temporary stabilized construction access, and placement of fiber rolls on graded areas. In addition, general site management measures including concrete waste management, solid waste management, and spill prevention and control would be implemented for the duration of the construction phase.

All project work would be conducted in compliance with all waste discharge requirements of the San Diego Municipal Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2013-0001). This permit is implemented through the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP). The JURMP and SUSMP are derived

from State regulations, and address human health and water quality concerns. Compliance with these requirements would further ensure that waste discharge requirements would not be violated.

The project's conformance to the waste discharge requirements above would ensure that the project would not violate any waste discharge requirements. Since no waste discharge requirements would be violated, the project would not result in cumulative water quality impacts related to waste discharge.

Groundwater may be encountered during construction. If so, the County will apply for a dewatering permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The permit will have conditions to ensure that any groundwater deposited on the surface does not contain any pollutants. To do so, groundwater will be tested for impurities. If any impurities are found, water will be purified until they are no longer present.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. Dewatering may be required during retrofitting of the existing bridge footings. This dewatering would only occur in a localized area around each of the four underground pier footings that are to be retrofitted, and only last for two weeks. Due to the small area of dewatering and the short duration, groundwater supplies are not expected to be substantially depleted. Additionally, the dewatering is not expected to substantially interfere with groundwater recharge.

In order to understand the dynamics of the localized groundwater, a Groundwater Dewatering Study (GWDS) would be conducted. This would involve drilling three eight-inch diameter holes adjacent to the existing bridge and monitoring water drawdown. The water that is encountered during the GWDS will be pumped out of the hole and tested for impurities before being deposited downstream of the bridge so groundwater supplies are not expected to be substantially depleted. Water quality testing will occur prior to depositing groundwater onto the creek bed to ensure there is no increase in pollutants as a result of this process. The GWDS will take two days to conduct. Additionally, the operations are not expected to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Therefore, a less than significant impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- c) 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 surfaces 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvement to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. The project will not alter the existing drainage pattern of the site.

- ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The proposed project involves bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. The project will not significantly increase the amount of runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site because the additional impervious surface area created by the bridge widening will be directed to three corners of the bridge at the approach ends. Curb inlets would allow the deck's sheet-flow to enter storm drain infiltration trenches located at the three corners of the bridge approaches. The storm drain would flow through the infiltration trenches and exit the bottom of the trenches through two 18-inch diameter drain pipes (one at each end of the bridge). The drain pipe would convey the flows to energy dissipater rip rap pads at the bottom of the embankment.

Therefore, the project will not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site.

- iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact:

The proposed project involves bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. Two storm water drainage facilities will be constructed per the County's Storm water permit regulations, to capture the capacity of runoff water generated by

the new impervious surfaces that result from widening the bridge 6 foot, 9 inches. These drainage facilities will be constructed to meet runoff water capacity.

The proposed project may produce a potential sources of polluted runoff during construction activities. However, 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 runoff to the maximum extent practicable: silt fencing along perimeter of temporary impact area, temporary stabilized construction access, placement of fiber rolls around active excavation areas, concrete waste management, solid waste management, and spill prevention and control. Therefore, installation of the storm water drainage facilities will ensure that the project does not create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

No Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is not located within a landslide susceptibility zone. The geologic environment of the project area has a low probability to be located within an area of potential or pre-existing conditions that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity. In addition, though the project does propose land disturbance that will expose unprotected soils, the project is not located downstream from unprotected, exposed soils within a landslide susceptibility zone. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the project will expose people or property to inundation due to a mudflow.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project will not use groundwater for the long-term operation of the bridge. However, during construction dewatering may be required. Any such dewatering will take place according to permit conditions imposed by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, to insure that there are no conflicts with any water quality control plans or sustainable groundwater management plans. Any groundwater encountered will be tested for impurities and purified before depositing in surface waters.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING –Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such major roadways or water supply systems, or utilities to the area. Therefore, the proposed project will not significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and minor improvements to the footing of an existing rural road bridge. The project is consistent with all applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations of the County's General Plan as well as the Mountain Empire Subregion Plan. The project will not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding of mitigating an environmental effect.

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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is within land classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area where geologic information indicates no significant mineral deposits are present (MRZ-1). Moreover, if the resources are not considered significant mineral deposits, loss of these resources cannot contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact.

- 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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands or is located within 1,300 feet of such lands. The proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan would occur as a result of this project.

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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the Buckman Springs Road Bridge, located in a rural area of the Cleveland National Forest. There are no residences or businesses nearby or surrounding the project site. The nearest sensitive receptor is located more than 1 mile from the project site. The project does not propose additional average daily traffic (ADT) volumes. Therefore, the proposed project would not have traffic noise impact on sensitive receptors.

Construction activities would involve a number of different operations and equipment including but not limited to earthwork including excavations, loading, and hauling of material with an excavator or backhoe, a bulldozer, and a number of trucks; drilling with a large drill rig; and construction of concrete footing improvements with concrete truck and concrete pump truck. Trucks; and other general construction activities. Construction noise levels would be temporary

in nature and would not exceed County noise level standards for construction activities. The project will not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-410). Construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36-410. Also, it is not anticipated that the project will operate construction equipment in excess of 75 dB for more than 8 hours during a 24-hour period. Therefore, there would be no significant construction noise impact to nearby residents or other uses. 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, or 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 areas to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA) for single residences (including senior housing, convalescent homes), and 65 dBA CNEL for multi-family residences (including mixed-use commercial/residential). Moreover, if the project is excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to the 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. Project implementation is not expected to 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 because, other than the construction phase, the proposed project (existing bridge footing improvements) is not noise generating. Therefore, the project would 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

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 proposed project does not involve any noise producing equipment that would exceed applicable noise levels at the adjoining property line.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

The project would not generate construction noise that may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations would occur only during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409. Also, it is not anticipated that the project would operate construction equipment in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM.

Finally, the project's conformance to the County of San Diego General Plan Noise Element and County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36-404 and 36.410) ensures the project would not create cumulatively considerable noise impacts, because the project would not exceed the local noise standards for noise sensitive areas; and the project would 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 would not contribute to the 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 | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings to the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. 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. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) for airports or within 2 miles of a public airport or public use airport. Therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

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)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would involve bridge widening and improvements to footings to an existing rural road bridge. The project would 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?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would widen and improve the footings for an existing rural road bridge located in rural forest land with no surrounding residences or businesses. Therefore, the project would not displace a substantial number of existing people or 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 |
|---|---|

- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project includes bridge widening and minor improvements to the footings to the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge and would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities. The project does not involve the construction of new or physically altered governmental facilities including but not limited to fire or police protection facilities, schools, or parks or other public facilities. Therefore the project would not have any adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of the new or physically altered governmental facilities or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities that would result in environmental impacts.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings to an existing road bridge located in rural forest land containing no residences or businesses. A section of the Pacific Crest Trail will be temporarily impacted due to a minor detour near the bridge abutments. The detour will not result in any adverse physical effect on the trail or environment. The project does not propose any residential use, including but not limited to a residential subdivision, mobile home park, or construction for a single-family residence that may increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities in the vicinity.

- 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes widening a rural, existing road bridge and improving the bridge footings. The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. A section of the Pacific Crest Trail will be temporarily impacted due to a minor detour near the bridge abutments. The detour will not result in any adverse physical effects on the trail or environment. Therefore, the construction or expansion of recreational facilities cannot have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION –Would the project:

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

Discussion/Explanation:

The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and Mobility Element, the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program and the Congestion Management Program.

No Impact: The proposed project would involve bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing rural road bridge. The project would not result in any additional vehicle trips and will not alter the surrounding circulation system in any way, therefore the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness of the circulation system including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) of which the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is an element to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs, and identify appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified.

No Impact: The proposed project involves bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing rural road bridge. The project does not propose any additional ADTs; therefore, the proposed project is consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3 subdivision (b).

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project would include bridge widening and minor improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. Temporary traffic control and signage would be utilized during construction. The project would not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create or place curves, slopes or walls which impedes adequate sight distance on a road.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <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 |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes improvements to footings and bridge widening to an existing rural road bridge. The proposed project will not result in inadequate emergency access. The project is not served by a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum cumulative length permitted by the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code, therefore, the project has adequate emergency access. Additionally, roads used to access the proposed project site are up to County standards. During construction, one lane will remain open at all times. Therefore the project would not interfere with any emergency access.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES –Would the project:

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:

a) 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 type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: Pursuant to AB-52 and Sacred Lands regulations, consultation was initiated with culturally affiliated tribes. In August 2016 the County consulted with all Kumeyaay tribes pursuant AB-52, and the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a Sacred Lands review of the project site. The NAHC indicated in a response dated August 16, 2018 that no known sacred lands or traditional cultural properties are within the survey area. Initial AB-52 consultation letters were sent by DPW staff to specific tribal representatives on August 9, 2016. In addition, letters were sent on September 20, 2018 to the Native American representatives and interested parties identified by the NAHC. The Viejas Band of Kumeyaay Indians responded in a letter dated September 15, 2016. They request that a Kumeyaay Cultural Monitor be on site for ground disturbing activities.

County approved archaeologist, Dominique Diaz de Leon of HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. conducted a records search at the South Coastal Information Center (SCIC) on September 24, 2018. A pedestrian archaeological field survey was conducted by senior archaeologist, Stacie Wilson of HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. and Kumeyaay Native American monitor, Shuuluk Linton from Red Tail Monitoring and Research, Inc. on October 10, 2018. Based on the analysis of records and pedestrian survey, it has been determined that no tribal cultural resources occur within the project site. The results of the survey are provided in an historical resources report titled *Archaeological Survey Report - Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening* prepared by HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX 2018). As such, there are no impacts to tribal cultural resources.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS –Would the project:

- a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new water or wastewater treatment or storm water 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 type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project involves bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. Per the County of San Diego's Storm water Permit regulations, the project proposes two new storm water drainage facilities to account for additional

impervious surface created by the project. The two storm water drainage facilities will collect runoff at both ends of the bridge. The project does not require the relocation or construction of new water or wastewater treatment, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities which could cause significant environmental effects.

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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project involves bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing rural road bridge. The project does not involve or require water services from a water district and does not rely on water service for any purpose now or in the reasonably foreseeable future development.

- 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?

<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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The proposed project for bridge widening and improvements to the footings of an existing rural road bridge and will not produce any wastewater; therefore, the project will not interfere with any wastewater treatment providers service capacity.

- 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?

<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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge and will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.

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

<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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project is for bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge and will not generate any solid waste nor place any burden on the existing permitted capacity of any landfill or transfer station within San Diego County. Therefore, compliance with any Federal, State, or local statutes or regulation related to solid waste is not applicable to this project.

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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

As mentioned in section IX part e), the following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. One traffic lane will remain open at all times so as not to conflict emergency response 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.

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.

ii. 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.

iii. 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: The Dam Evacuation Plan for Dam Inundation Zones, 1005 will not be interfered with because, even though the project is located within a dam inundation zone, the project is not a unique institution that would be difficult to safely evaluate in the event of a dam failure. Unique institutions, as defined by the Office of Emergency Services, including 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, amphitheaters, or a similar use. Since the project does not propose a unique institution in a dam inundation zone, the project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the implementation of an emergency response plan.

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

<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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes bridge widening and improvements to the footings of the existing Buckman Springs Road Bridge. Construction will be in compliance with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan (OAEP) and is not anticipated to expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.

- 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?

<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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes improvements to an existing road bridge and will not require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure that may exacerbate fire risk or result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.

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

<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

Discussion/Explanation:

No Impact: The project proposes to widen an existing road bridge and will not expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant 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 and V 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 significant would be potentially impacted by the project, particularly biological resources. However, mitigation has been included that clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. This includes mitigation measures for potential impacts to sensitive wildlife species and sensitive vegetation communities, and clearly reduces these effects to a level below significance. 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 meet 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)?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

FOR ALL RESPONSES

The following list of past, present, and future projects were considered and evaluated as a part of this Initial Study:

PROJECT NAME	PERMIT/MAP NUMBER
General Plan Property Specific Requests	PDS2012-3800-12-005
Verizon Cameron Valley MUP	PDS2016-MUP-04-019M2
IC for 13 T-Mobile upgrade Sites, Various Locations	PDS2016-IC-16-011

Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XX of this form. 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 meet 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?

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

Discussion/Explanation:

Less than Significant 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. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX Hydrology and Water Quality XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there is no substantial evidence that there are adverse effects on human beings associated with this project. Therefore, this project has been determined not to meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XXII. 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.

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>)

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX), 2019a: *Visual Impact Assessment - Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project*. Prepared for the California Department of

Transportation and the County of San Diego Department of Public Works. December.

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 (NLPPI), 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/legisregs/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.conserv.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.sdcountry.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

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)

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.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX)

2017a: *2017 Least Bell's Vireo (Vireo bellii pusillus) Survey Report for the Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project*. Prepared for the County of San Diego Department of Public Works. August 9.

2017b: *2017 Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (Empidonax traillii extimus) Survey Report for the Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project*, Prepared for the County of San Diego Department of Public Works. August 18.

2019b: *Draft Natural Environmental Study: Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project*. Prepared for the California Department of Transportation and the County of San Diego Department of Public Works. January.

2019c: *Draft Biological Assessment: Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening Project*. Prepared for the California Department of Transportation and the County of San Diego Department of Public Works. January.

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.

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.

RECON Environmental, Inc. (RECON)

2011: *Focused Survey Results for the Arroyo Toad on the Buckman Springs Bridge Project Site*. Prepared for the County of San Diego Department of Public Works. June 23.

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)

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.

HELIX Environmental Planning, Inc. (HELIX), 2018: *Archaeological Survey Report - Buckman Springs Road Bridge Widening*. Prepared for the California Department of Transportation and the County of San Diego Department of Public Works. December.

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 Tanks and Seepage Pits. (www.amllegal.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.sdcountry.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

RECON, "Greenhouse Gas Guidance Letter (RECON Number 8249)", July 2017.

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)

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)

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)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

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.

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/>)

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)

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

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

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcountry.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.sdcountry.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.

